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SECTION 1
PERSONNEL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

1A. PROJECT PERSONNEL AND GROUPS

1A-1 GRANT ADMINISTRATION

The role of the co-PIs and central office staff (Director, GAs) shifted in 2011-2012. The co-PIs are engaged in carrying out research outlined in the proposal to NSF that analyze the impact of interventions of the study. The ADAPP-ADVANCE Director and staff have focused their efforts on coordinating and supporting 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. The Lead co-PI continues to direct the development of the Faculty Information Tool (FIT). A description of progress on that project (and other projects) is provided later in this document.

The Grant Management Team (GMT) meets as necessary (approximately once each month) to promote the grant’s scholarly communication goals. ADAPP-ADVANCE’s central office provides a web site for co-PIs to assist with the development and implementation of their research projects, and to help disseminate findings. The central ADAPP-ADVANCE office and co-PIs support the production and dissemination of resources (e.g., toolkits, newsletters) at the University level. The central ADAPP-ADVANCE office continues to serve as liaison to the Faculty Advisory Committee and External Advisory Board.

1A-2 INSTITUTIONALIZATION ACTION GROUP (IAG)

In September, 2011, MSU established a new group to ensure the successful institutionalization of policies and practices and innovative programs of ADAPP-ADVANCE into existing structures. 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. Provost Wilcox meets with this group once a semester. The continuation of the IAG, its structure and responsibilities, will be considered over the year as programs are expanded and institutionalized. It is anticipated that this committee or a variation of this committee or working group will have an ongoing role in convening an FEA consortium comprised of FEAs from all degree-granting colleges.

Each week a subset of the IAG, the administrators (non-deans) in this group (Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources; Director of Planning; and the Director of the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives) meets with Melissa McDaniels, ADAPP-ADVANCE
Director, and Estelle McGroarty, Lead co-PI to continue the discussions related to institutionalization of policy, evaluation, and programmatic developments. This sub-group replaces the ADAPP-ADVANCE ACT.

The IAG:

- Sets the agenda and design strategies to achieve the institutionalization goals for ADAPP-ADVANCE, and MSU more broadly.
- Helps define the role that central administrative offices (e.g., ADAPP-ADVANCE central office, F&OD, AHR, FRC, WRC) have in supporting college-based efforts.
- Decides upon most effective and appropriate best practices, and make recommendations about policy and practice changes, as well as identify data needed to guide decision-making.
- With input from the Council of Deans, identifies the role of the FEA Consortium and sets agendas for meetings. It is anticipated that the steering committee will have at least one meeting per semester with the Council of Deans to discuss outcomes of college initiatives, to share best practices, and to determine how ongoing engagement of FEs/Deans in other colleges will best be supported.

IA-3 FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE & EXTERNAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- Membership is unchanged. We held an open house for this group in early December 2011 and a meeting was held on 1.27.12 on the topic of LEADERSHIP (Appendix A).
- We anticipate scheduling another external advisory committee meeting in June, 2012.
1B. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

1B-1. GRANT MANAGEMENT TEAM MEMBERS

- 6.20.11 – 6.22.11
  Who: McDaniels
  What: National Science Foundation Joint Annual Meeting
  Where: Washington, D.C.

- 6.29.11
  Who: GMT + project support offices + evaluator
  What: Sustainability Retreat
  Where: on-campus

- 10.25.11 – 10.26.11
  Who: McGroarty.
  What: AAU Senior Research Administrators Workshop on the STAR METRICS initiative to learn about how FIT may interface with STAR METRICS.
  Where: AAU Offices (Washington, D.C.)

- 11.13.11 – 11.15.11
  Who: Grant Management Team
  What: National Science Foundation ADVANCE co-PI Meeting
  Where: Washington, D.C.

- 11.16.11 – 11.20.11
  Who: McDaniels
  What: Association for the Study of Higher Education
  Where: Charlotte, NC

- 12.12.2011
  Who: McGroarty.
  What: Office of Science and Technology Policy Consultation Meeting at the National Press Club. How STAR METRICS might interface with FIT.
  Where: Washington, D.C.

- 2.28.12 & 3.22.12
  Who: Grant Management Team
  What: Visit by Dr. Ann Austin, Principal Investigator, NSF ADVANCE PAID GRANT; Discussed results of her research (strategies for sustainability and institutionalization).
• 3.20.12-3.21.12
  Who: McGroarty.
  What: Academic Analytics Workshop. To learn more about how Academic Analytics and FIT will be able to interact.
  Where: Duke University campus (Durham, NC).

1B-2. FACULTY EXCELLENCE ADVOCATES

• FEA Consortium Meetings
  • Topic: The Academic Planning Process (and role of FEA in that process) (10.31.11)
  • Topic: Negotiating Your Role as FEA (2.3.12)
  • Topic: Role of FEA in Search (4.27.11)

• Optional Webinars
  • “Diversity Inclusion: A New Systems-Based Institutional Transformation Framework” (October 7, 2011). Although MSU did not develop this webinar, we promoted it to our Faculty Excellence Advocates.
  • “Avoiding a Mid-Career Crisis: Helping Faculty Manage their Careers” (September 20, 2011). Although MSU did not develop this webinar, we promoted it to our Faculty Excellence Advocates.
  • “Implicit Bias: The Power of Automatic, Unintended Mindsets.” Although MSU did not develop this webinar, we promoted it to our Faculty Excellence Advocates.
2A. OVERVIEW

In 2011-2012 (YR4), the Michigan State University ADAPP-ADVANCE team focused on the following questions related to institutionalization and sustainability of our project:

- What are we trying to sustain?
- 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?

In June 2011 (immediately after Michigan State’s submission of its response to our YR3 Site Visit Report), we held a retreat that brought together our Grant Management Team, Project Support Offices, and colleagues from the Office of the Provost (Budget Officer; Director of Academic Human Resources) to start answering these questions. During the retreat, we identified four dimensions of ADAPP-ADVANCE that we see as important to sustain our initiative beyond August 2013:

- The FEA role and related network efforts;
- Our innovative approach to data collection, management and use to drive change;
- Accountability and evaluation structures related to college achievement of faculty diversity benchmarks; and
- New communication strategies initiated by ADAPP-ADVANCE.

2B. INSTITUTIONALIZING THE FEA ROLE AND THE FEA NETWORK

During the fall of 2011, we developed “A Guide to Developing the Faculty Excellence Advocate Description” (Appendix B) and shared this resource with College Deans and FEAs, asking that all colleges submit an FEA position description to Associate Vice Provost Terry Curry by December 1, 2011 for evaluation.

In December 2011, Associate Vice Provost Curry, Provost Budget Officer Corinne Reardon and Director Melissa McDaniels met to identify and start to address a set of important policy questions related to institutionalizing the FEA role at the University (Appendix C).

The Institutionalization Action Group (new leadership team described in Section 1
of this report) decided that each FEA would report to both the college dean and the Provost. Making the policy decisions mentioned in the previous paragraph will allow us to institutionalize accountability and quality controls related to FEA selection, evaluation, and examination of their roles, regardless of college.

2C. INSTITUTIONALIZING DATA MANAGEMENT & USE (FACULTY INFORMATION TOOL)

The Faculty Information Tool (FIT) is being designed to institutionalize how we collect and use faculty professional accomplishments data. During the fourth year of the project, the Faculty Information Tool (FIT) development team devised a business model and time line for the development of this tool, incorporating the needs of both important internal (faculty & administrators) and external (federal agencies) stakeholders.

Internal Stakeholders. Six focus group meetings with faculty and administrators were held during November and December 2011. Discussions at these meetings identified issues and barriers and helped in defining the functionalities of the tool and the process of implementing the tool. Participants completed a form to rate the potential functionalities of the tool. Summary of that input is attached (Appendix D).

Input from other Institutions. The development team conducted phone interviews with 13 other institutions that have implemented some form of faculty professional accomplishment software systems. The personnel at these institutions were asked to identify issues and barriers in instituting such a system at their universities and provided input on the potential functionalities of the Faculty Information Tool under consideration at MSU (Appendix E).

External Stakeholders. FIT MSU is participating in level 1 STAR METRICS, and FIT will be help meet the STAR Metrics reporting requirements, perhaps by incorporating or interfacing with SciENCV as outlined in the Federal Demonstration Project https://sites.google.com/site/fdpera/home/profiles---lattes).

From these inputs the Team refined the business model and on January 23, 2012 presented this business model and a time line for the development of FIT to the Provost, Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources, Assistant Vice President of the Office of Planning and Budgets, and Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies (Appendix F). The meeting resulted in the approval to develop and distribute of a Request for Applications (RFA) to vendors (both commercial and open source systems) requesting solutions that would best meet the specifications for a Faculty Information Tool at MSU. A summary of the FIT functionalities based on input from various sectors are included in Appendix G. The RFA is scheduled to be completed and distributed in early May. The applications received will be reviewed by the Development Team in mid-summer, and a recommendation will be presented to the University’s senior administrators in August 2012 for the licensing of a software product that would best connect to current university central databases and maintain faculty professional activities and accomplishments.
In addition, in December, 2011 the FIT Development Team finalized a three year license with Elsevier for the implementation of SciVal Experts and SciVal Funding modules, which will be part of the FIT portfolio. The SciVal Experts module will provide a download of faculty publications from the Scopus database to be included as part of faculty’s data on professional accomplishments. The FIT Development Team is in the process of implementing the modules and developing training materials for faculty to use the SciVal systems.

And finally, the FIT Development Team explored the purchase of a license for Academic Analytics, which will complement the FIT portfolio. Three members of the Development Team attended an Academic Analytics workshop in March to learn more about the system and to determine if this product could augment the FIT portfolio. The University is now in the process of purchasing a license for Academic Analytics

2D. INSTITUTIONALIZING ACCOUNTABILITY STRUCTURES

2D-1. ACADEMIC PLANNING

In fall 2011, Provost Kim Wilcox announced that diversity benchmarking would be fully integrated throughout the academic planning process at Michigan State. The academic planning process is run on a multi-year cycle that involves fall discussion of unit and college strategic plans, followed by a spring budget meeting to determine the extent to which budget requests: (1) are aligned with unit (and University) strategic directions; and (2) identify what is needed to execute strategic plans.

This year, colleges were asked to update their strategic plans for the first stage of the planning cycle by producing documents that described how each college:

- Establishes or reaffirms a programmatic vision that is sustainable and at the same time dynamic and responsive to strategic opportunities;
- Focuses priorities and effort;
- Supports or aligns with broader university college initiatives;
- Defines and uses metrics to demonstrate results and accountability; and
- Commits internal funds as well as requested funds to new efforts or initiatives, as appropriate.

It is particularly important that these college plans are aligned with MSU’s values of quality and inclusion, both hallmark values of the institution. As a direct outcome of the ADAPP-ADVANCE NSF grant, MSU intentionally prioritized progress on diversity as an accountability metric and incentivized the focus on diversity by allocating additional funding in 2011-12 to those colleges that had made measurable strides in enhancing diversity (approximately 1% of the university’s annual recurring allocation budget-$400,000.) Seven colleges were awarded incentive funding of $50,000-$100,000 each in summer 2011 in recognition of their progress on six key diversity metrics (Appendix H). To institutionalize university accountability for diversity and to refine our
internal set of metrics, each college was reviewed for two common indicators of success, including: (1) the number of underrepresented faculty members in each college; and (2) the distribution of underrepresented faculty members across ranks. Colleges were asked to identify and describe additional indicators (and timelines for specific initiatives) they wanted to be evaluated on next year to gauge progress towards increasing the number of women and underrepresented minority faculty recruited, retained, and advanced in that college.

In addition, colleges were asked to highlight any programmatic initiatives that were emblematic of progress on diversity across the college and what quantifiable impact they had. Finally, as a part of the planning and budgeting process, each college dean was asked to discuss the role of the FEA, his/her expectations for them in the coming year, and how their success and impact, and thereby that of the college, would be measured in this effort.

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 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 this year, the 2012 College Level Planning meetings are being 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). These metrics form the basis for the discussions in summer/fall 2012 regarding the unit's efforts to achieve faculty excellence and diversity. The CLP meetings will also incorporate unit efforts associated with ADAPP-
ADVANCE grant activities, including the efforts of FEAs in achieving outcomes associated with the grant.

2E. INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF COMMUNICATION PRACTICES

The communication portion of this report can be found in Section 4. However, over the next year, decisions need to be made about what communication strategies initiated by the ADVANCE grant should be sustained. We have not explicitly considered plans for the institutionalization of communication practices, but this process will be initiated in summer, 2012.
3A. INCREASE THE RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION OF WOMEN FACULTY

3A-1 CROSS-COLLEGE CONTRIBUTIONS

- Mark Roehling and Paulette Granberry Russell created a new example of a Candidate Evaluation Tool that includes a diversity-related competency as a criterion on which candidates are evaluated (August, 2011) with examples of interview questions that assess candidates’ knowledge of and experience with: diverse populations (faculty, students); diversity-related Research, curriculum development, or broader efforts associated with creating inclusive learning environments.

- On September 20, 2011, Paulette Granberry Russell, Mark Roehling and Terry Curry offered a workshop as a part of the department chair training series (LEAD). The workshop was entitled, “Success in the academic hiring process from start to finish: Clarifying procedures, avoiding delays and increasing faculty quality and diversity”.

- Throughout fall 2011, Associate Vice Provost for Academic and Human Resources (Terry Curry) met with every faculty search committee in the Colleges of Natural Science and Engineering and outlined best practices as articulated in the ADAPP-ADVANCE Faculty Search and Hiring Toolkit.

- Mark Roehling and Paulette Granberry Russell prepared a faculty search toolkit for being branded and printed to be consistent with the already-existing mentoring, annual review and RP&T toolkits (April 2012).

- On April 27, Paulette Granberry Russell and Mark Roehling presented a faculty search workshop for FEAs from all 17 colleges.

- Mark Roehling conducted a session on Fair and Effective Faculty Searches for all department chairs in the College of Business (July 12, 2011).

- Mark Roehling consulted with ongoing search committee in the School of Human Resources and Labor Relations (e.g., evaluating proposed search process, providing specific recommendations, and providing revisions in their contemplated candidate evaluation tool; multiple occasions in June and August).
3A-2 COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

- In part of our annual planning document for the College of Engineering, we defined a new process for faculty search and recruitment to ensure clarity, fairness and inclusiveness. The new process incorporates the involvement of the FEA at several stages during the search process. The details of the new process are described in the attached document (Appendix I).

- We recruited one woman (tenure-stream) faculty in our Mechanical Engineering dept., who started in fall semester 2011.

- The Mechanical Engineering Department carried out a faculty search in AY 2011-12. Among the three new recruits who received faculty offers, one is a new women PhD graduate.

3A-3 COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE

The College implemented a formalized procedure for conducting faculty searches which incorporated many of the “best practices” identified by the ADAPP-ADVANCE team, and included the following elements.

- Submission of written position descriptions and criteria for evaluating candidates for college level review/approval before posting positions.

- Attendance of the FEA (and this year also Terry Curry, co-PI and VP Academic Human Resources) at the first search committee meeting to distribute ADAPP-ADVANCE material and review best practices.

- Submission of “interview lists” for college level review/approval before forwarding to the Office of Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives.

- Continued discussions between the FEA/Dean, search committees and unit chairs/directors during the entire interview/hiring process.

These procedures were followed for all searches for tenure track positions in the college, including ones in the following units: Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Chemistry, Physics (3 searches), Plant Biology, Plant Research Lab, Neuroscience Program (2 positions), Mathematics Education, and Mathematics (2 positions). In the case of the Department of Mathematics, special provisions were made so that the department could utilize an on-line application service (mathjobs.org) that is used by virtually every Math department in the country, and which provides access to a large and diverse pool of applicants.
A meeting of the Dean, Associate Dean, FEA and Chairs/Directors of hiring units will be held on April 27 in which the process and outcomes of this year’s searches will be reviewed.

3A-4  
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

- 6.1.11 – 8.31.11
  - There were a number of faculty job searches this year. In preparation for these searches, both the Dean and the Assistant Dean for Equity, Diversity & Inclusive Affair met with the ADAPP-ADVANCE Project Director to request ADAPP-ADVANCE assistance in developing training for search committee chairs and committee members. The ADAPP-ADVANCE grant management team is currently considering this request.
  - The CSS Dean’s office prepared a memo for the Provost outlining the College’s diversity achievements during the years 2005-2006 through 2009-2010. Based on these accomplishments, the Provost awarded the College a $50,000 Diversity Incentive Bonus in its upcoming recurring budget.
  - The College used its Diversity Incentive Bonus to fund a Diversity Hiring Initiative faculty position in African American history; one of its five priority budget areas for the coming year.

- 9.1.11 – 11.30.11
  - Senior staff met with Terry Curry to go over the faculty search toolkit and plan subsequent meetings with each CSS search committee to share best practices.
  - FEA team attended the LEAD presentation on conducting effective faculty searches.
  - Discussed the process for the Dean’s Office to engage in the faculty search process by revising and enhancing forms used for assessing potential candidates and providing feedback to units.
  - DeBrenna Agbényiga and Pamela Gray (College FEAs) met with the Director and faculty in the School of Human Resources and Labor Relations to provide an understanding of diversity, inclusion, position allocation and the search process that supports building a diverse faculty.
  - Issued an RFP for a diversity hiring initiative and awarded the Provost’s diversity and incentive funding for hiring a faculty member in African American History.
  - Conducted meetings with search committee chairs and others -new to the search process twice a year to discuss goals, objectives, roles and expectations that are aligned with current ADAPP-ADVANCE practices and policies.
• 12.1.11 – 2.29.12
  
  o Provided support and guidance as History began the process of hiring a faculty member in the African-American History program. Diverse pools of candidates were invited for interviews that included three African-American women and one African-American male. Two offers are being made to African-American women; one offer has been accepted and another offer will go out shortly.
  
  o DeBrenna Agbényiga (Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Inclusion and FEA) and Pamela Gray continued to follow-up with the Director of the School of Human Resources and Labor Relations after the discussion during the last quarter relating to diversity, inclusion, position allocation and the search process that supports a diverse faculty. This has led to an offer being presented and accepted by top-ranked African-American female faculty member.
  
  o Finalizing the revision of the faculty feedback form that is used by the Dean’s Office to evaluate potential faculty.
  
  o Preliminary planning for aspects needed for inclusion in a College-wide training of committee chairs and others engaged in the search process that will clarify roles and expectations.
  
  o The FEA continued to attend various LEAD seminars relating to recruitment, retention and mentoring of faculty.

• 3.1.12 – 5.31.12
  
  o The FEA continued to attend various LEAD seminars relating to recruitment, retention and mentoring of faculty.

3B. INCREASE RETENTION AND ADVANCEMENT OF FEMALE FACULTY

3B-1 CROSS-COLLEGE CONTRIBUTIONS

• On August 16, 2011 a new University Faculty Mentoring Policy went into effect and requires that all colleges develop and implement a mentoring program. Mentoring resources were expanded to assist colleges and units as they develop unit-level mentoring programs. The ADAPP-ADVANCE mentoring workgroup continues to provide consultation to units and FEAs regarding mentoring.
• The Michigan State University Mentoring Toolkit was produced in both hard copy and on-line form (http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/Faculty-Mentoring-Toolkit).

• We created a new resource entitled, “Parenting and Caregiving Resources for Faculty” (http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/parenting-caregiving-resources-faculty).

• On Sept 8, 2011, Estelle McGroarty, met with the faculty of the Department of Statistics and Probability during their mentoring orientation program to answer questions about implementation of the mentoring policy.

• On November 10, 2011, Clare Luz and Paulette Granberry Russell ran a workshop for faculty called “Effective Faculty Mentoring”.

• On November 30, Faculty & Organizational Development ran a workshop for chairs and other academic leaders called, “Associate Dean: What does this Entail?” ADAPP-ADVANCE co-sponsored this event.

• On April 17, 2012, Clare Luz and Paulette Granberry Russell ran a workshop called, “Evaluating Faculty Mentoring Programs and Relationships”.

• On 12/2/11, co-PI Terry Curry and Senior Associate Provost June Youatt ran a workshop called “Survive and Thrive in the Tenure System”. The workshop is designed for Assistant Professors to provide assistance and transparency to promote successful navigation of pre-tenure faculty life at MSU.

• Pipeline into Leadership Project
  
  o The leadership team (Tamara Reid Bush, Karen Klomparens, Deb DeZure, and Allyn Shaw) met to discuss interviews that Faculty and Organizational Development (an ADAPP-ADVANCE project support office) conducted with faculty on the topic of “Pipeines to Academic Leadership”. Developed a summary document and discussed the possibility to inviting Stew Friedman and/or Adrianna Kezar to campus to speak. Suggested the creation of a slide to visually depict the timeline for pre-tenure faculty – this slide was shared at the fall Survive and Thrive workshop.

  o Based upon this leadership team meeting, DeZure, Klomparens and Bush requested a change in the Chair Inventory to include a question asking whether chairs ask if faculty have an interest in leadership.

  o Four focus groups were held with male leaders in late 2011 (Appendix J). These paralleled those conducted with women in the second year of MSU’s ADVANCE grant and were composed of male administrators (Deans, Associate and
Assistant Deans, Chairs, Directors) and leaders in their disciplinary societies. The questions were the same (as those asked of the women’s focus groups). Since we held the focus groups with women leaders two years ago, the university context has changed dramatically. The men who participated in the chairs’ focus group gave us a sense of being under siege, having little support in their college and none at upper administrative levels as they pursued their work as unit administrators. That is in marked contrast from the sense we had of women chairs and directors, who hardly mentioned budgets or the expansion of class sizes. This may be due to the fact that they were more attuned to personal issues (including family care, men taking credit for their work, etc.).

The second striking change is the difference between how men who are leaders in their disciplinary/professional (disc/prof) societies talked about their experiences. Perhaps it is a difference in expectations, but the women we talked with two years ago mentioned personal and organizational benefits accruing from their participation while men could only talk about how indifferent the University generally is to their “volunteering” in this way.

There was very little difference in the ways titled leaders – men and women – talked about their careers. In terms of career paths, there was a mix of Deans and chairs promoted from inside and hired from the outside in both groups. Everyone that we talked with at the Associate/Assistant (Assc/Asst) Dean level had been asked by their Dean to take that position.

3B-2 COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING CONTRIBUTIONS

- Our CEE department created their formal mentoring program over the summer. All departments in our College now have a written mentoring policy in place.

- The FEA has formed a small work group of six faculty, one from each department, to focus on our College’s mentoring programs. The group is looking into mechanisms to formally assess our 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. A subset of this group has the task of discussing various faculty mentoring approaches with Dr. Mary Deane Sorcinelli of UMASS-Amherst and exploring ways to collaborate with her on possible implementation in our College of some of their best practices. This mentoring workgroup held small group meetings with our entire pre-tenure faculty to get their direct input on our current mentoring efforts in the College. The collected information is being analyzed to define the elements that need improvement. Based on our initial evaluation of this information, we have decided to prepare a web-based assessment tool and engage all of our tenure stream faculty in the evaluation of mentoring needs, and its assessment effectiveness.
• The FEA and the College development team continued to work on improvements to our web-based Faculty Activity Information System (FAIS). The College development team met several times with the MSU FIT development team to discuss how FAIS may be adapted to serve all colleges in the University.

• The FEA and the College development team implemented improvements to our College’s web-based system for preparation and reporting of RP&T documents by faculty and administrators. This system was developed to bring more consistency and transparency to our tenure and promotion evaluation process. After the successful launch and test of the early version of the system in the 2010-11 RP&T cycle, all RP&T cases in our College in the 2011-12 cycle used the new online system. Input from the faculty and the various evaluation committees has been very positive towards our new system of RP&T document preparation.

• The FEA organized the College of Engineering New Faculty Orientation at the beginning of fall semester. In this event Dean Udpa lead the discussion of “Evaluation and Promotion,” where our college’s standards for success and expectations for tenure and promotion were articulated. In addition to learning about various resources in the College, the new faculty received a focused 90-minute exposure to matters related to teaching, assessment, and evaluation. The new faculty also received the Annual Performance Review Toolkit and the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Toolkit that have been developed by the ADAPP-ADVANCE team. A survey tool was used to assess the effectiveness of the orientation program. Comments by the new faculty were quite positive and helpful suggestions were made for further improvement.

• A new set of workshops on Essential Teaching Techniques was introduced under the sponsorship of the Colleges of Engineering (The Center for Engineering Education Research, CEER), Natural Science, Agriculture and Natural Resources, and Lyman Briggs College. Our new faculty were informed about these “brown bag” style workshops and their scheduling.

• The Dean and FEA continue to work with department chairs to promote recognition of our women faculty. Some highlights include:

  o Dr. Daina Briedis, Professor of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science, has accepted a half-time appointment as Assistant Dean for Student Advancement and Program Assessment. In this leadership role, she will lead the College's efforts in:

    ▪ Development of initiatives to more directly engage our high achieving students and developing new initiatives related to academic and service learning.
    ▪ College assessment and quality improvement efforts, ranging from the cornerstone and residential programs, to ABET accreditation, to other college
activities. She will also represent the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies in all matters in his absence.

- Dr. Susan Maston, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering, received the Withrow Teaching Excellence Award in the CEE Dept.

- Dr. Laura Genik, academic specialist in Mechanical Engineering, received the Withrow Teaching Excellence Award in the ME Dept.

- Dr. Lalita Udpa, Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering, received the Withrow Distinguished Scholar Award.

- Dr. Laura Dillon, Professor of Computer science and Engineering, received the Withrow Exceptional Service Award.

- Dr. Christina Chan, Professor of Chemical Engineering, was elected to the American Institute for Medical and Biological Engineering (AIMBE) College of Fellows for her pioneering work in applying bioinformatics and systems biology techniques to understanding cellular processes dysregulated by fatty acids.

- Prof. Diana Briedis, Professor of Chemical Engineering, was elected AIChE Fellow for her outstanding service to AIChE (American Institute of Chemical Engineering) and ASEE (American Society of Engineering Education).

### 3B-3 COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE CONTRIBUTIONS

- Faculty Development:
  - A series of meetings and workshops were conducted during the year including the following:
    - Welcome for new faculty, August 2011
    - CNS Grant Workshop, September 2011.
    - Reappointment/Promotion/Tenure Workshops, September 2011 & April 2012.
    - “Teaching Essentials” Workshop Series (7 total; August 2011-March 2012).
    - Luncheon with women faculty, November, 2011.
    - Meeting with first year faculty, April 2012. The primary goal of this meeting was to discuss whether the needs of these faculty members (mentoring, etc.) were being met.

  - In addition, CNS established a contract with Biotechnology Business Consultants (BBC) to provide grant writing support for CNS faculty. CNS will subsidize 50% of
the cost, with the balance to be provided by the Department or PI.

- **Annual Review/RP&T:**
  - CNS previously established clear criteria to judge candidates for promotion and tenure. In addition, a new policy was implemented in which chairs are required to submit copies of written annual evaluations for all tenure track assistant and associate professors. An evaluation tool that could be used for this purpose was provided, or chairs could choose their own format. In either case, the evaluations were reviewed by Dean Kirkpatrick and Associate Dean Chivukula, with the goal of identifying any significant accomplishments or deficiencies.

- **Mentoring:**
  - All departments in the college were required to establish (if not already in place) mentoring programs that were consistent with both University and College Mentoring Policies. Written descriptions of these programs were submitted to the CNS Dean’s office in June-July 2011, and were reviewed by the FEA and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development. Feedback was provided, and where necessary policies were modified.

- **Evaluation:**
  - An on-line survey/questionnaire concerning the use and/or need for professional development resources (CNS workshops, university workshops, etc.) was prepared and circulated to all faculty members in the college. In addition, Assistant and Associate Professors received questions about their satisfaction with current mentoring programs. The results of these surveys are currently being summarized and analyzed.

3B-4 COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE CONTRIBUTIONS

- **6.1.11 – 8.31.11**
  - **Retention**
    - We continue to develop and implement the pilot mentoring demonstration projects in the Department of Psychology and the School of Social Work.
    - Dean Baba and Psychology Chair Juli Wade met with Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Human Resources, Terry Curry to discuss the mentoring pilots. Specifically they discussed how the CSS would coordinate with the Ohio Evaluation & Assessment Center (OEAC) to implement and
evaluate the pilot programs. An agreement was reached to guide the interface between OEAC and the personnel of the Psychology Department.

- Dean Baba, Associate Provost Curry, and Chairperson Wade then met with Dr. Sarah Woodruff from OEAC to implement this agreement.

- The Provost has released funding for the mentoring pilots and the Department of Psychology has selected the staff for the program. The School of Social Work is in the process of launching its pilot mentoring program.

- The CSS ADAPP-ADVANCE FEA team developed the proposed College of Social Science policy on Mentoring in accordance with the newly adopted University policy. Representatives from the Chairs and Directors (C&Ds) reviewed this draft policy on August 16, 2011.

- After the review and approval process is complete, the policy will be submitted to the Provost. The Dean’s office will present the new mentoring policy to the C&Ds at their annual retreat in September. This item will be a major part of the retreat agenda.

  o Advancement

  - We continue our examination of CSS Annual Performance Review practices in an attempt to make them more consistent across units, more comprehensive, and more transparent. The Dean will lead a discussion of this topic at an upcoming C&D meeting.

  - The Dean has revised her procedures for the Annual Performance Review of Chairs and Directors. This year she prepared written summaries of each C&D’s performance. She also did this in her review of the Assistant and Associate Deans of the College.

  - The Chairs and Directors will be asked to send out copies of their unit by-laws to all junior faculty with the criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RP&T) highlighted. Where by-law revisions are necessary to promote accuracy, consistency, and transparency, they will be encouraged.

  - This quarter we are planning to conduct RP&T workshops targeted to specific cohorts of faculty (e.g., faculty before reappointment review, faculty before tenure review, newly promoted faculty, etc.) We believe that this format will increase the relevance and usefulness of the information offered.
Chairs and Directors will be asked to consistently include an evaluation of faculty involvement and leadership in disciplinary societies. This is in recognition that women faculty often choose this area to develop their leadership potential rather than opting for leadership positions within the University administration.

The training of faculty search committee members will also provide some leadership experience opportunities for women.

We continue to develop a more structured mentoring program for new Chairs and Directors. This will build upon the currently existing informal peer-mentoring activities.

Dean Baba and Assistant Dean Agbényiga met with Project Director McDaniels to discuss the possibility of developing an educational session for women seeking campus leadership positions. Several ideas were presented and are currently being considered by the Grant Management Team.

The comments and suggestions made by the attendees of the first annual CSS luncheon for women faculty have been analyzed and organized. Results indicate that women in CSS would like to see more of these networking opportunities and they find them valuable. Additionally, the women provided feedback on mentoring, and other professional development needs that they have.

To establish the current level of participation of women in University leadership positions, the Dean’s office determined that there were over a dozen CSS women faculty in important campus leadership positions – many in cross-disciplinary roles.

- 9.1.11 – 11.30.11
  - Analyzed and shared the comments from the last CSS women’s luncheon.
  - Spoke to the chairs of the Engineering College about faculty mentoring programs in CSS. There was a special emphasis on their evaluation.
  - FEA team attended the LEAD workshop on mentoring.
  - Discussions are underway for the next college-wide women’s leadership luncheon.

- 12.1.11 – 2.29.12
  - DeBrenna Agbényiga (Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Inclusion and FEA) is overseeing a new college committee charged with designing guidelines for the
annual review process. The primary focus of the committee will be to provide uniformity of standards for annual review across the schools and units. The committee consists of Chairs/Directors from various units in the College (College of Social Science).

- Chris Maxwell (Associate Dean for Research) is overseeing a new college committee charged with providing guidelines for obtaining external letters as a part of the RP&T process. The primary focus of this committee is to ensure uniformity of standards in selection of external evaluators and content of evaluators’ letters. The committee consists of Chairs/Directors from various units in the College, a member of the college Research Committee, and a member of the Dean’s Advisory Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (DARPT) Committee.

- Dean Baba, DeBrenna Agbényiga (Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Inclusion and FEA), Bob Caldwell (former FEA team member) and Psychology Chair Juli Wade met with the Ohio Evaluation & Assessment Center (OEAC) leader, Sarah Woodruff to discuss the progress of the pilot mentoring programs and the current evaluation plan (College of Social Science).

- All units submitted their mentoring program plan in accordance with the College’s approved mentor policy.

- The Dean’s office is in the process of reviewing all of the units’ mentoring programs and providing feedback for necessary changes (College of Social Science).

- Dean Baba, DeBrenna Agbényiga (Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Inclusion and FEA), and Chris Maxwell (Associate Dean for Research) worked as a team to review files for reappointment, tenure and promotion. The group conducted an extra assessment of all cases that did not receive a favorable recommendation from the DARPT Committee. Upon completion of the analysis, the team met with the Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources to discuss proposed options.

- Dean Baba, DeBrenna Agbényiga (Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Inclusion and FEA), and Chris Maxwell (Associate Dean for Research) served on a panel to address faculty who were recently reappointed along with their unit leader. The session included a review of the College’s RP&T process and direction for productive and protocol for submitting their tenure dossier (College of Social Science).

- Dean Baba, Chris Maxwell (Associate Dean for Research) and Michelle Strobel met with the department Chairs who attended the recently reappointed faculty meeting to gain feedback for future meetings and to discuss ways to enhance sponsored research in college units (College of Social Science).
A survey has been sent to faculty who participated in the reappointment meeting to obtain their feedback for improvement (College of Social Science).

Dean Baba and DeBrenna Agbényiga (FEA) met with Jodie Linley to discuss the next phase for meeting with women in the College with a focus on leadership (College of Social Science).

The College’s Women in Leadership luncheon will be held on April 9, 2012 at the Kellogg Conference Center. The luncheon will include a distinguish panel of women leaders in the College. They will discuss the path to leadership and provide guidance to assist women in the process of moving from faculty to different levels of leadership (College of Social Science).

We continue to develop, implement and assess the pilot mentoring demonstration projects in the Department of Psychology and the School of Social Work (College of Social Science).

3.1.12 – 5.31.12

DeBrenna Agbényiga (Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Inclusion and FEA) held the first committee meeting to design a formalized guideline for the annual review process. The committee includes Chairs/Directors and faculty members. The committee is using the ADAPP-ADVANCE Annual Review Toolkit as a guide for designing a template for annual review letters and the Chair letter that is a part of the faculty dossier for tenure and promotion.

Chris Maxwell (Associate Dean for Research) held the first committee meeting to design a formalized plan for obtaining external letters that are a part of the faculty dossier for tenure and promotion.

Psychology submitted their pilot mentor project report that includes next steps for the department. The report was reviewed by Dean Baba and DeBrenna Agbényiga (Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Inclusion and FEA) and sent to the Ohio Evaluation & Assessment Center (OEAC) leader, Sarah Woodruff.

The Dean’s senior staff is reviewing the department mentoring pilot plans using a guideline designed by DeBrenna Agbényiga (Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Inclusion and FEA).

Dean Baba, DeBrenna Agbényiga (Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Inclusion and FEA), and Chris Maxwell (Associate Dean for Research) continued to work as a team to review files for reappointment, tenure and promotion. The team has designed new practices to support a more inclusive RP&T process that includes a
meeting with Chairs/Directors to discuss the process and outcome of their cases that includes feedback from the Provost office.

- The College’s Women in Leadership luncheon was held on April 9, 2012, at the Kellogg Conference Center. The luncheon included a networking segment with women from all faculty levels in the College. A panel that included Juli Wade, Chair Psychology, Cynthia Jackson-Elmore, Dean Honors College/Professor Social Work, DeBrenna Agbényiga, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Inclusion and FEA, Anne Ferguson, Co-Director of the Gender Center in a Global Context, and Beth Drexler, Director Peace and Justice Specialization and was moderated by Dean Baba. The panelist provided their insight on aspects of leadership in their respective roles and the process for moving in to various leadership positions.

- The luncheon included information from the ADAPP-ADVANCE office on the new communication initiative using social media and the Faculty and Organizational Development office provided information on mid-career faculty and programs they offer to support faculty.

- Participants at the luncheon completed an evaluation and they were given a leadership contact card. The leadership contact card allowed women to note their interest in leadership positions and a timeframe for moving into the specified roles. The information has been placed into a data base as point of reference when various leadership roles are being advertised throughout campus. Overwhelmingly, the women ranked the luncheon as being very successful.

3C. IMPROVE THE WORK ENVIRONMENT FOR FEMALE FACULTY

3C-1 CROSS-COLLEGE CONTRIBUTIONS

- Care.com service has been offered to MSU affiliates for six months. One of the responses from a satisfaction survey respondent was: “by far this care.com service is one of the best campus resources offered to faculty” (Lori Strom, Director, Project Support Unit). The ADAPP-ADVANCE web site now provides a comprehensive page that provides an overview of the “top” MSU faculty resources related to parenting and caregiving.

3C-2 COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING CONTRIBUTIONS

- We have created a Worklife at Engineering website (http://www.egr.msu.edu/WE) that is being referenced in our faculty recruitment announcements. It contains information on how MSU supports some of the most pressing issues our faculty recruits typically would like to know about.
• We held focus group meetings with all of our pre-tenure faculty to get their direct input on strengths and weaknesses of our current support programs and mentoring efforts in the College. The information collected is being analyzed to define the elements that need improvement. This information has also been shared with Dr. Sarah Woodruff for formal analysis by Ohio’s Evaluation and Assessment Center for Mathematics and Science Education and Discovery Center.

3C-3 COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE CONTRIBUTIONS

• It is hoped that many of the policies described above (mentoring, annual review, etc.) will contribute to improving the workplace climate. In addition, one issue that was raised at the meeting with women faculty in Fall 2011 was the difficulty finding information about university policies related to work/life balance and family resources. CNS has added a section on these topics to the college web site. In addition, ADAPP-ADVANCE put together a web site on Parenting and Caregiving Resources for Faculty.

3C-4 COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE CONTRIBUTIONS

• 6.1.11 – 8.31.11
  o A group of chairs and directors met with the Dean and the CSS FEA team to review the design and content of the Fall 2011 ADAPP-ADVANCE Inventory. We reviewed each question and made suggestions that would improve the data the inventory yielded. Changes were suggested in language, question order, and instructions. The Dean summarized these suggestions in a memo that was submitted to the Project.

• 9.1.11 – 11.30.11
  o The College held meetings with Chairs and Directors to review and revise the proposed college-wide mentor policy.

  o College completed and received approval of our mentoring policy.

  o During the College’s annual retreat in October, a session was dedicated to cover the newly approved mentor policy and guidelines were discussed for the design of unit-level plans.

  o Anne-Marie Ryan and Juli Wade (Psychology) shared tools for assessing mentor program and data collected as a part of her discussion of the departments pilot mentor program at the College retreat.
- Gary Anderson (Social Work) shared the assessment tools being used and the collaborative mentor process that includes F&OD as a part of their mentor pilot program.

- All units in the College are writing their mentor plan that includes details outlined in the Provost and College’s mentor policy. The mentor plans are due in the College at the end of the Fall semester. All plans will be reviewed by the College’s senior staff.

12.1.11 – 2.29.12

- The dean’s office is in the process of conducting a review of the units’ mentoring programs to ensure that they are inclusive and supportive of faculty success (College of Social Science).

- DeBrenna Agbényiga (Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Inclusion and FEA) held individual meetings with female faculty to discuss the RP&T process and structure in the College.

- Dean Baba and DeBrenna Agbényiga have had discussions about the mentoring pilots and how some best practices might be implemented in other units (College of Social Science).

- Dean Baba made official offers to Chairs/Directors to engage the FEA to come to their units and discuss the role of diversity, inclusion, position allocation and the search process that supports a diverse faculty.

- Dean Baba and DeBrenna Agbényiga provide biweekly or monthly updates on ADAPP-ADVANCE at the Chairs/Directors meetings that are held bi-weekly (College of Social Science).

- DeBrenna Agbényiga was promoted to Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Inclusion which enhances the visibility and support for the FEA role (College of Social Science).

- The College changed their FEA model from a team approach to assigning the newly appointed Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Inclusion as the only FEA (College of Social Science).

- Dean Baba and DeBrenna Agbényiga met to discuss the role of the FEA and submitted a final copy of the CSS FEA job description to the Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources.

- Clarified the role of the CSS FEA in the RP&T process; the FEA now is included in all RP&T activities.
A survey is being conducted by Neal Schmitt to assess faculty research capacity and support structures in CSS. It is believed that the findings from the survey will provide insight into the needs of faculty in relation to research and scholarship that will support faculty development and advancement through the RP&T process (College of Social Science).

3.1.12 – 5.31.12

The Dean Baba is continuing to meet with every unit to discuss the College’s new strategic agenda and obtain feedback from faculty on the strategic direction for the next few years.

The College held its annual forum on April 16 at the Kellogg Conference Center. The forum included presentations from faculty members currently leading research platforms to illustrate how faculty can collaborate across disciplines within the College.

DeBrenna Agbényiga (Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Inclusion and FEA) conducted exit interviews with faculty who stated that they were leaving MSU at the end of the academic year (exclusive of retirement).

Dean Baba and DeBrenna Agbényiga continue to provide biweekly or monthly updates on ADAPP-ADVANCE at the Chairs/Directors meetings that are held biweekly.

3D. OTHER ADAPP-ADVANCE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

3D-1 COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Dr. Daina Briedis, Professor of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science, has accepted a halftime appointment as Assistant Dean for Student Advancement and Program Assessment. In this leadership role, she will lead the College's efforts in: development of initiatives to more directly engage our high achieving students and developing new initiatives related to academic and service learning; and college assessment and quality improvement efforts, ranging from the cornerstone and residential programs, to ABET accreditation, to other college activities. She will also represent the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies in all matters in his absence.

Dr. Jane Prey Visit on April 11, 2012 (co-sponsor)

Jane Prey led the Tablet Technologies in Higher Education Initiative and the Gender Equity and Pipeline Strategy for Microsoft Research. She is currently a member of the ACM Education Board, the Computer Research Association Board, the IEEE CS Board of Governors and numerous university advisory boards. She has served as
chair of the Frontiers in Education Steering Committee and as well as general chair for the ACM SIGCSE conference. She spent 11 years on the faculty of the Computer Science Department at the University of Virginia. In addition, Dr. Prey also spent two years as a program director in the Division of Undergraduate Education at the National Science Foundation. She joined Microsoft Research in 2004 and is recently retired.

- Dr. Laura Genik received the Withrow Excellence in Teaching Award. She is the first woman to receive the award in the Mechanical Engineering Department.
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:

- Institutionalization
- Resource Dissemination
- Outcomes Dissemination
- Enhance Faculty Networking
- Increase Faculty Input

4A. COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES AND RELATED COMMUNICATION GOALS

4A-1 INSTITUTIONALIZATION

In order to support the institutionalization process, we chose strategies that were designed to bring together appropriate stakeholders (sometimes in groups that hadn’t existed before YR4) for targeted meetings to ensure channels of communication are in place as we move into YR5.

Faculty voices are critical to institutionalization, as are those of senior administrators and grant co-PIs. By organizing regular meetings of these groups, we increased the cross-college and cross-support unit collaboration.

Strategy I: Institutionalization Action Group (IAG) meetings
Strategy II: Sustainability Retreats
Strategy III: Grant Management Team (GMT) meetings
Strategy IV: Faculty Excellence Advocate (FEA) Consortium meetings
Strategy V: Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) meetings

4A-2. RESOURCE DISSEMINATION

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

- Annual Review (print & on-line)
- Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (print & on-line)
- Mentoring (print & on-line) YR4 (Appendix K)
- Faculty Search (print by April 25 & on-line by May 4) YR4 (Appendix L)

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.

**Strategy VII:** Send all chairs and active search committees a copy of the Faculty Search Toolkit.

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

Toolkit dissemination for YR4 is summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOOLKIT</th>
<th>NUMBER DISTRIBUTED</th>
<th>PURPOSE/REQUESTED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Search Toolkit</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>All Department Chairs&lt;br&gt;Current Faculty Search Committee Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Date: April 20, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Mentoring Toolkit</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>Tenure system faculty mailing&lt;br&gt;College-Level Requests:&lt;br&gt;College of Arts &amp; Letters&lt;br&gt;College of Nursing&lt;br&gt;College of Agriculture &amp; Natural Resources&lt;br&gt;College of Comm Arts &amp; Sciences Mentoring Wkshp&lt;br&gt;College of Law&lt;br&gt;Academic Department/Program Requests:&lt;br&gt;Chem Engineering &amp; Material Science&lt;br&gt;School of Planning, Design &amp; Construction&lt;br&gt;Art, Art History &amp; Design&lt;br&gt;Romance &amp; Classical Studies&lt;br&gt;Chemistry&lt;br&gt;Pathobiology &amp; Diagnostic Investigation&lt;br&gt;Administrative Offices:&lt;br&gt;Faculty &amp; Org Development&lt;br&gt;Office of Inclusion &amp; Intercultural Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review Toolkit</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Academic Units:&lt;br&gt;College of Business&lt;br&gt;Philosophy&lt;br&gt;Pathobiology &amp; Diagnostic Investigation&lt;br&gt;Administrative Offices:&lt;br&gt;Faculty &amp; Org Development&lt;br&gt;Hospitality Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment, Promotion &amp; Tenure Toolkit</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>Academic Units:&lt;br&gt;College of Agriculture &amp; Natural Resources; College of Arts &amp; Letters&lt;br&gt;College of Business; College of Human Medicine&lt;br&gt;Philosophy&lt;br&gt;Pathobiology &amp; Diagnostic Investigation&lt;br&gt;Linguistics&lt;br&gt;Administrative Offices:&lt;br&gt;Faculty &amp; Org Development&lt;br&gt;Hospitality Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During May and June, our designer will be developing a marketing “folder” to hold each of the four toolkits.

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). A copy of the new parenting and caregiving resource list for faculty can be found in Appendix M.

**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 message replaces the newsletter. Instead of highlighting the work of ADAPP-ADVANCE, the electronic message highlights 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. Appendix N contains copies of the February, March, and April listserv messages. We also created and are maintaining an ADAPP-ADVANCE e-News Blog, a space for colleagues to publicly reflect upon relevant local, regional, national and international topics.

**Strategy XI: Support the work of FEAs and communication specialists in disseminating resources at the college level.**

In fall 2011, Jodi Linley (Graduate Assistant for Communications) met with the communication specialists from the Colleges of Engineering, Natural Science, and Social Science, in an effort to understand the unique ways to reach faculty in each of the three colleges (Appendix O). These meetings, to incorporate the ADAPP-ADVANCE principles of quality, inclusiveness, transparency, objectivity, consistency and alignment, will provided a foundation for the 2011-2012 ADAPP-ADVANCE communications plan.

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.
• Grant Management Team

• Tamara Reid Bush
  o Meeting with University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Assistant Dean for Women in Engineering and Director for ISTEM Educational Initiative (March 5, 2012).
  o Met with Harry Dankowicz, diversity officer for Mechanical Science and Engineering at University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (March 5, 2012).
  o Toolkits were mailed to three women faculty in the Mechanical Engineering Department and the Assistant Dean for Women in Engineering at University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign following Bush’s visit.

• Paulette Granberry Russell
  o Granberry Russell, P. “MSU ADVANCE: Catalyzing Scientific Workforce Excellence and Advancing Diversity through the Alignment of Policies and Practices” at the NSF Large Facilities Operations Workshop, MSU National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory (April 25, 2012)
  o Luz, C., & Granberry Russell. “Formal Faculty Mentoring: Strategies for Work/Life Success” at the College and University Work Family Association Conference, Ann Arbor,
MI (May 2012).

- Clare Luz

- Melissa McDaniels
  - On-campus:
    - Lacy, S., McDaniels, M, Smith, S. “Cultivating Research and Publication Success by Cultivating your Mentoring Network.” Workshop with pre-tenure faculty in the College of Communications Arts & Sciences (December, 8, 2011).
    - Chivukula, S., & McDaniels, M. “Cultivating research and publication success: Knowing what you need and being savvy about getting it!” Workshop with first year faculty in the College of Natural Science, Michigan State University (April 6, 2012)
  - Off-campus:

- McDaniels, M. (2012). Advancing Diversity through the Alignment of Policies and Practices. A conversation with the staff at the University of Massachusetts Center for Teaching and Faculty Development. (February, 2012)

- Meeting with Dr. Mary Deane Sorcinelli, Associate Provost, University of Massachusetts. Topic: assessment of mentoring. (February, 2012)

- Meeting with Dr. Lily Hsu, Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy. Topic: faculty mentoring (February, 2012).

- Meeting with Dr. Donna Qualters, Director of Faculty Development, Tufts University. Topic: faculty mentoring (February, 2012).

- Estelle McGroarty
  - Presented on the mentoring policy Department of Statistics and Probability

- Mark Roehling

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 each of the three grant colleges. On November 18, 2011, 24 faculty attended the College of Natural Science Luncheon. Dean Kirkpatrick, Sue Conrad (FEA), and Sekhar Chivukula (Associate Dean) were also in attendance. Faculty dialogue at this luncheon led to our creation of the parenting and caregiving website (discussed above).
On April 9, 58 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 18 and 14 faculty attended. Co-PI Tamara Reid Bush was in attendance. Although networking was the major goal, other topics discussed included the role of the FEA, chair awareness of work-family policies and resources, the need for anonymity in Engineering surveys and dual career hires.

*Strategy XIII:*

*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. Currently, the group has 31 members. Jodi Linley is in the process of recruiting new members to the group by sending invitations through the LinkedIn system to FEAs and FAC members who have LinkedIn profiles.

**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. 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.
### 4A-5. NEW COMMUNICATION TOOLS

The new tools created this year are summarized below for quick review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOOL</th>
<th>CONTENT PRODUCER(S)</th>
<th>TARGET AUDIENCE</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>CONTENT EXAMPLES</th>
<th>CONTACT CYCLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e-News Blog</td>
<td>- Deans</td>
<td>All MSU faculty</td>
<td>Reflections on relevant topics (local, regional, national, international)</td>
<td>- FEA attend Mentoring LEAD &amp; write response - Tammy/Melissa discuss what they’ve learned in writing up their research on positional leadership</td>
<td>3-4 x/semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- FEAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- GMT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- FAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listserv</td>
<td>Central Staff</td>
<td>Initial target aud: Women &amp; junior faculty in CNS, CSS &amp; ENG; all FEAs</td>
<td>Promote best practices, event notifications &amp; communicate relevant local updates/news</td>
<td>- Announce new resource webpage on caregiving - Visiting scholars/speakers - Mentoring policy analysis</td>
<td>1st Monday of each month, year-round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn Group</td>
<td>Central Staff</td>
<td>Faculty &amp; FEAs (not exclusive to MSU)</td>
<td>Communicate interest pieces &amp; encourage networking to facilitate inclusive excellence</td>
<td>- Research re: implicit bias - National news (i.e., Pipeline Press)</td>
<td>Continuous – invite members Jan 2012; all can post at any time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any group member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 will be submitting a full YR4 evaluation report to NSF on or before June 1, 2012 (per e-mail between Melissa McDaniels and Kelly Mack on March 24, 2012). The NSF indicator data can be found in Appendix P.

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 Q 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 penetration 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 2011-2012 meetings in the paragraphs below.

5C-1. SUSTAINABILITY PLANNING RETREAT (6/29/2011)

In preparation for a June 29, 2011 sustainability retreat, we identified four questions that Michigan State must answer over the next two years (YRS 4 & 5) in order to sustain the changes and accomplishments of the ADAPP-ADVANCE grant:

- What are we trying to sustain?
- What evidence do we have to suggest these initiatives are worth sustaining?
- What supports/structures/policies need to be in place?
- What capacity is necessary and where will it come from?

The following individuals participated in the retreat:

- ADAPP-ADVANCE co-PIs (Curry, McGroarty, Luz, Roehling, Bush)
- Director, Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives & GMT Member (Paulette Granberry Russell)
- Director of Planning, Office of the Provost (Rene Stewart O’Neal)
- Budget Officer, Office of the Provost (Corinne Reardon)
- Associate Director of Academic Human Resources, Office of the Provost (Donna Zischke)
- Director, ADAPP-ADVANCE & GMT Member (Melissa McDaniels)
The group initially identified nine areas that should be the focus of sustainability efforts. Of the nine areas, four components were identified by at least 50% of the retreat participants as areas to be given highest priority:

- Faculty Excellence Advocates
- Data Management and Use
- Accountability / Evaluation
- Communication

These reflect the priorities for institutionalization mentioned in Section 2 of this report.

5C-2. EVALUATION TELECONFERENCE CONVERSATION (8/27/2011)

- In this phone conference, we discussed progress and next steps related to the Ohio E&A producing “boutique” reports for the participating deans.

- A decision was made to include analyses of data including: W/E survey data, original inventory data, other MSU demographic data, and documents containing information on AR & RP&T Policy.

- Plans for deployment of a new/revised (from YR1) chair inventory were discussed.

- An early October visit from the Ohio E&A team to MSU was planned.

5C-3. 2-DAY EVALUATOR VISIT (10/6/11-10/7/11)

- Discussed institutionalization efforts, search committee evaluation, mentoring case studies across three colleges, retention model. Met FEAs, identified next steps.

5C-4 1-DAY EVALUATOR VISIT (11/17/11)

- Discussed: FEA role, policy analysis, retention model, mentoring pilots, faculty search updates, retention model/institutional data, research study on grant submission/award.

5C-5 2-DAY EVALUATOR VISIT (2/20/11-2/21/11)

- Goals – Updates and Check-in on evaluation plan and tools. Meet with IAG and have meetings with College of Engineering Dean and FEA.

- Activities – Interview with College of Social Science, discuss mentoring pilot and FEA Role, discuss retention model, meet with GMT, discuss research project, review budget,
discuss mentoring and faculty search, discuss FEA responsibilities, discuss mentoring policy.

5C-6  1-DAY VISIT (3/2012)

- Sarah Woodruff met with both the IAG, and the Dean and FEA of Engineering. In the latter meeting, she presented our colleagues with the College of Engineering “boutique” report. During our 3rd YR site visit, NSF requested that the evaluation reports be made more “user-friendly”. Each report is for each deans’ “eyes only” and develops conclusions based up analysis of the W/E survey, and a comprehensive RP&T and Annual Review Policy Analysis.
6A. ADAPP-ADVANCE RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS IN PROGRESS

- Op-ed or pitch for article in either the *Chronicle of Higher Education* or *Inside Higher Education*.
  - Purpose: promote MSU’s strategy, approach, outcomes, and lessons learned related to addressing issues of inclusive excellence in the faculty workplace
  - Audience: opinion leaders, senior administrators
  - Author: Kim Wilcox (drafted by Roehling, Curry, McDaniels, Granberry Russell)
  - Collaborate with Cathy Burns and University Relations / Media Communications; talk to Elizabeth Simmons about contacts at Inside Higher Education (she is a blogger here)

- **Scholarly Article** (outlet TBA)
  - Working Title: Advancing Faculty Inclusion and Excellence: An Examination of Faculty Socialization Tactics toward and Perceptions of Institutional Embeddedness among Underrepresented Faculty of Color
  - Authors: Isis Settles, PhD, Associate Professor, Dept. of Psychology; Paulette Granberry Russell, J.D. Dir. Office for Inclusion; Gregory Larnell, PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Illinois, Chicago

- **Article for Change: The Magazine for Higher Learning**
  - Working Title: Ingress into leadership: The important role of disciplinary societies
  - Purpose: Utilize data from ADAPP-ADVANCE disciplinary leadership survey, focus groups with faculty leaders and literature to argue that assuming disciplinary leadership roles can be helpful to faculty interested in eventually pursuing titled roles on campuses.
Audience: Senior administrators, faculty, faculty developers, opinion leaders in disciplines

Author: Melissa McDaniels, Tamara Reid Bush, Karen Klomparens

Utilize this publication as a springboard for op-ed pieces in disciplinary outlets/websites like AAAS, others.

- Scholarly Article for *Human Resource Management Review*
  
  Working Title: Aligning employment policies and practices with the diversity and inclusivity values: A conceptual model and future research directions.
  
  Authors: Roehling, M.V., Ericksen, J., and McDaniels, M.

- Scholarly Article for *Group and Organization Management*
  
  Working Title: Gender differences in leadership self-efficacy and perceived support and their influence on the willingness to lead.
  
  Authors: Roehling, M.V., McDaniels, M., & Hmurovic, J.

- Scholarly article for *Academic Medicine, Family Medicine, Medical Education, or American Family Physician.*
  
  Working Title: Advancing Diversity and Inclusion in Academic Medicine
  
  Authors: Luz, C. and Bush, T.
6B. ADAPP-ADVANCE RESEARCH STUDIES IN PROGRESS

- Advancing Faculty Inclusion and Excellence: An Examination of Faculty Socialization Tactics toward and Perceptions of Institutional Embeddedness among Underrepresented Faculty of Color.
  
  o Investigators:
    - Isis Settles, PhD, Associate Professor, Dept. of Psychology; Paulette Granberry Russell, J.D. Dir. Office for Inclusion; Gregory Larnell, PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Illinois, Chicago
  
  o Purpose:
    - The purpose of this project is to empirically examine the academic career experiences of tenure-system faculty members at Michigan State University. The project represents a new (if not next) step among a sequence of institution-wide attempts to gauge the academic work environment for faculty and/or staff. In particular, those efforts include studies of academic human resource policies and practices, climate and culture, and the academic work experiences of women faculty members and faculty members from historically underrepresented racial/ethnic (or “ethnoracial”2) groups. The present study is subtly distinct from its predecessors, however, in that it instead aims to combine several foci of those previous studies. To that end, the project centers on faculty socialization (Austin, 2002; Gruman, Saks, & Zweig, 2006; Jones, 1986; Schrodt, Cawyer, & Sanders, 2003; Tierney, 1997; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994) together with perceptions of institutional and community embeddedness (Allen, 2006; Cable & Parsons, 2001; Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2008; Holtom, Mitchell, & Lee, 2006; Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez, 2001)—as they are experienced and reported by tenure-system faculty members from four historically and domestically underrepresented, ethnoracial groups in the United States: African Americans, Asian Americans, Latina/o Americans, and Native Americans.
  
  o Research Questions:
    - How do faculty members of color experience institutional socialization processes?
    - How do faculty members of color perceive embeddedness within the institution and community?
    - Do socialization experiences relate to perceptions of embeddedness among faculty of color?
- Do women of color, in particular, experience faculty socialization tactics and perceive embeddedness in ways that differ from men of color?

  o Status:

  - IRB approval of project completed in April 2012
  - Interview protocol completed
  - Interviewers identified and training to be completed by the end of April 2012.
  - Information describing the project discussed with faculty leaders within the URM community soliciting their endorsement and support of project.
  - URM informational email distributed to faculty that will be asked to participate in the study on April 20, 2012
  - URM consent form completed and approved by IRB (April 2012) and will be distributed to URM faculty invited to participate in the project.
  - Interviewer instructions finalized for IRB submission (include: how to schedule the interviews and procedures for the actual interview session)

- Impact of external funding on promotion of Assistant Professors at MSU and differential impact by gender and ethnicity

  o Investigators: Estelle McGroarty, Paulette Granberry Russell & Karen Patricia Williams

  o Research Questions:

    - Do women submit similar numbers of grants, are they as successful?
    - Are there differences in the retention and advancement of men and women. Is there a gender difference in correlation of grant success and retention/advancement?
    - Are any gender differences in grant submission and success seen at all ranks and years in rank?
    - Does participation on multi investigator impact success, is there a greater success rate for multi vs. single investigator grants, for single investigator grant by women vs. men.

  o Status:

    - IRB completed
    - Database being cleaned
    - Meeting with Contracts and Grants is scheduled
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 March 31 and estimated costs through August 31, 2012. 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 4**

**A. Senior Personnel**

- Kim Wilcox, Ph.D. is the PI of ADAPP-ADVANCE. As Provost & Vice President of Academic Affairs, his work on this grant is considered a part of his academic leadership at the institution. His effort on the project was paid for by MSU.

- 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 on the grant was paid for by MSU.

- 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 0.96 person months (AN 8%).

- Mark Roehling, Ph.D. is Associate Professor of Human Resources and Labor Relations (co-PI). His salary was equivalent to 1.74 person months, or 14.5% of his annualized salary. He received summer 2012 salary (AY, 58% effort over 3 months).

- Clare Luz, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor (tenure system), Department of Family Medicine (co-PI). August 16, 2011 she changed from AN to AY, however, her effort on the grant remains at the equivalent to 1.56 person months (AY, 13%).

- Tamara Reid Bush, Ph.D. is Assistant Professor (tenure system), Mechanical Engineering (co-PI). Her effort was equivalent to 1.68 person-months, or 14% of her annualized salary. She received summer 2012 salary (AY, 56% effort over 3 months).

**Summary – Senior Personnel (YR 4 Expenses: $68,025)**

- Our expenses for Senior Personnel were closely aligned with the budgeted amount.
B. Other Personnel

- Melissa McDaniels, Ph.D. serves as administrative director for the project and her effort was the equivalent of 12 person-months (AN, 100% effort).

- Mary Jane Robb served as the administrative assistant for the project. Her effort was paid by MSU (not the grant) and was 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 equivalent to 1.8 person-months (AN, 15%).

- Isis Settles, Associate Professor, Psychology is conducting research along with Paulette Granberry Russell, Director of Office of Inclusion, Intercultural Initiatives on faculty inclusion and embeddedness. The research will collect data on non-Asian faculty at MSU (180 faculty). Her effort was equivalent to 0.34 person-months of summer salary on the grant (AY 33.33% effort over 3 months)

- Faculty Excellence Advocates – College of Social Science (CSS)
  - Robert Caldwell, Professor of Psychology and Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, was the FEA team lead from July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2011 at 15% effort (1.8 person-months). As of January 1, 2012, he has accepted a new position as MSU ombudsperson.
  - Agbenyiga, Debrenna, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies and Inclusion changed her role during grant YR 4:
    - Her effort as an FEA team member and Assistant Professor, Social Work and Assistant Dean, Diversity & Inclusive Affairs continued at 5%, equivalent to .4 person months annualized salary)
    - In January 1, 2012, she was promoted to Associate Dean, Graduate Studies & Inclusion. She increased her effort on the grant as the sole FEA for the college (AN 25%, 3 person months). Pam Gray and R. Caldwell were removed from the grant as of January 1, 2012.
  - Pamela Gray, Chief of Staff, Budget, Human Resources and Technology and FEA team member. Her effort was equivalent to 0.60 person-months (AN 5%) from 9/1/11 – 12/31/11.
• Faculty Excellence Advocates – College of Natural Science
  o Susan Conrad, Professor of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics and FEA for the college. Her salary was distributed in two ways:
    ▪ She received salary equivalent to 2.66 person-months of her annualized salary (AY, 22.22%).
    ▪ In addition, her effort was equivalent to 0.34 person-months of summer salary (AY, 33.33% effort over 3 months).

• Faculty Excellence Advocates – College of Engineering
  o Manooch Koochesfahani, Professor of Mechanical Engineering & Associate Dean, is the FEA for the college. His effort was equivalent to 3 person-months (AN, 25%).

• Faculty Information Tool Development
  o Rochele Cotter, temporary on-call, a “Professional Aide” status finished the FIT project on the grant with her ending pay period of 9/10/11 in YR 4. Starting on 9/11/11 MSU assumed payment.

• Graduate Student and Hourly on ADAPP-ADVANCE project
  o Tiffeny Jimenez, doctoral candidate in Ecological-Community Psychology continued as a Graduate Assistant on a 50% basis (20 hours/week) for the full year. Her strengths were used on qualitative data analysis with interests in evaluation and change agent development.
  
o Jodi Linley started her doctoral program in Higher, Adult and Lifelong Education fall semester 2011. She also began a Graduate Assistant appointment with ADAPP-ADVANCE on a 50% basis (20 hours/week). She will focus effort toward communications and dissemination of grant activities as well as building capacity of the academic faculty at MSU.
  
o The project hired (hourly) the equivalent of one undergraduate student as a departmental aide, averaging 7-10 hours per week.

• Summary – Other Personnel (YR 4 Expenses: $268,116)
  o Our expenses for “Other Personnel” for YR4 exceeded the award budget (of $241,485) by $26,631. As we described in previous reports, “Other Personnel” was over the award amount due to changes in personnel structure that occurred between the award and YR4. Some of the changes that have taken place are:
    ▪ The salaries of both Melissa McDaniels and Jennifer Sweet were raised. The YR4 award budget for salaries of McDaniels and Sweet totaled $61,878. The actual
amount spent for these two individual’s pay on the grant is $82,322. The difference of $22,454 was over budget.

- The FEA salaries totaled $126,813. The total budgeted for three Equity Officers in the award budget was $38,244. This left the FEA’s expenditure over budget by $88,569.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Personnel</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries increased</td>
<td>McDaniels, Sweet.</td>
<td>$61,878</td>
<td>$84,322</td>
<td>$(22,444)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIT Development</td>
<td>Cotter</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>(2,715)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEA’s (Equity Officers)</td>
<td>3 Colleges</td>
<td>38,244</td>
<td>126,813</td>
<td>(88,569)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settles (Data Research)</td>
<td>Faculty Inclusion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,056</td>
<td>(9,056)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>Jimenez, Linley</td>
<td>24,154</td>
<td>42,629</td>
<td>(18,475)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Pay</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>(2,581)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Change Mgr.)</td>
<td>57,915</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>57,915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Programmer Sal)</td>
<td>32,782</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>32,782</td>
<td></td>
<td>117,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Internal Evaluator)</td>
<td>26,512</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>26,512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$241,485</td>
<td>$268,116</td>
<td>$26,631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Fringe Benefits (YR4 Expenses: $74,615)

Our fringe benefits for YR4 came under budget by $31,659. 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 YR 4.

D. Travel (YR4 Expenses: $18,472)

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 $17,216. Scholarly conferences, ASHE, $756, and Non-MSU consultant travel $500 for a presenter at MSU FOD workshop were expended. The overage was $4,522 from the award budget of $13,950.
E. Other Direct Costs

- **G1:** Materials and supplies: Office operations spent $2,525. The award budget of $37,000 left $34,475 under budget. This amount was redirected to **G3: Consultant Services** for subcontracting evaluator services.

- **G2:** Publication/Documentation/Dissemination: Printing of two toolkits used $6,227 of the award budget of $10,000. ADVANCE meeting materials, and ADAPP-ADVANCE promotional materials costs were minimal. The amount under budget,$3,523, is redirected to **G3: Consultant Services** for subcontracting evaluator services.

- **G3:** Consultant Services: YR4 expenditure of is as follows:
  
  o Ohio’s Evaluation and Assessment Center for Mathematics and Science Education (OEAC), Miami University, continues to be subcontracted with the grant for YR4 in the amount of $64,479. The award budget for external evaluator is $2,500. The overage was as planned.
  
  o Design fees for two toolkits as well as on-line versions of each totaled $6,435.
  
  o Consultants from the MSU University Outreach and Engagement office conducted a four men’s focus groups (for Women's Leadership Project), expenditure $6,795.
  
  o Copier services are now within this line item, with leased machine from MSU and billed monthly. This totaled $7,056.
  
  o Other independent contractors (Non-MSU) expended $1,500 for the speaker fee for a FOD workshop.

  o Consultant services (excluding subaward) total of $21,786. External evaluation for the grant year expended $64,479. The award budget for Consultant services was $7,964. With total expenditure of $86,265, the grant is over budget for G3 by $78,301.

- **G4:** Computer Services: ADAPP-ADVANCE continued computer maintenance and repair with the Division of Engineering Computer Services (DECS). DECS’s annual expense totaled $2,650. Academic Tech Services also charges minimal monthly listserv services. With the award amount of $20,000 for computer services, and total expenditures of $2,941,$17,059 was redirected to **G3: Consultant Services** for subcontracting evaluator services.

- **G6:** Other Direct Costs:

  o 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, $20,148, was over the award budget of $11,563 by $8,585.

- **Workshop/Meeting Expenses:** Meeting expenses significantly decreased as we focused on the research and evaluation goals during this year, as well as the majority of FEA consortium meeting costs supported by the Academic HR and Provost area. Programming was co-sponsored between FOD (Office of Faculty & Organizational Development), Office of the Provost, and The Graduate School.
  - Business meeting food and beverage and other expenses (room, AV, misc.) for FOD workshops totaled $5,353.
  - Business meeting food and beverage and other expenses (room, AV, misc.) for FIT development totaled $443.
  - The Graduate School co-sponsored a workshop “Train the Trainer” presented by Dr. Chris Pfund. Advance co-sponsored at $815.
  - Women in Engineering, CSE department hosted Dr. Jane Prey. Advance co-sponsored at $250.
  - OEAC Evaluation visits to campus, meeting food and beverage expenses totaled $261.00.
  - Dr. Ellen Kossek (FAC member) travel to APA-sponsored feminist psychology conference in San Antonio, TX. Advance co-sponsored at $755.
  - Advance will be supporting Sat Pal’s travel to a conference to support his professional development as a FIT project member ($629.50).
  - College functions, Women Network luncheons, 3 held, $1,862.
  - Faculty Advisory Committee meetings, $161.

- Meeting expenses totaled $9,631. The award budget of $17,700 left $8,069 under budget.

- **Summary – Other Direct Costs (YR4 Expenses: $127,987)**
  - The total spent for G: Other Direct Costs was over the awarded budget of $104,227 by $23,760.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Other Direct Costs</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Materials &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$2,525</td>
<td>$34,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Publications (Printing)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>6,477</td>
<td>3,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Consultant Services</td>
<td>7,964</td>
<td>21,786</td>
<td>(13,822)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Subaward Payments</td>
<td>64,479</td>
<td></td>
<td>(64,479)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>Computer Services</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>17,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant Tuition Waiver</td>
<td>11,563</td>
<td>20,148</td>
<td>(8,585)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6</td>
<td>Workshop/Meeting expenses</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>9,631</td>
<td>8,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$104,227</td>
<td>$127,987</td>
<td>(23,760)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF GRANT EXPENSES – YRS 3 AND 4

In YR4, total expenses were $802,961. We were under the award amount of $804,035 by $1,074. After applying the YR3 carry forward of $69,091 the ending balance is $70,165.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Award</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Award</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Senior Personnel</td>
<td>65,040 676,94</td>
<td>(2,654)</td>
<td></td>
<td>66,990 69,268</td>
<td>68,025</td>
<td>(1,035)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Other Personnel</td>
<td>234,452 342,629</td>
<td>(108,177)</td>
<td></td>
<td>241,485 258,985</td>
<td>268,116</td>
<td>(26,631)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>101,334 87,290</td>
<td>14,044</td>
<td></td>
<td>106,274 81,017</td>
<td>74,615</td>
<td>31,659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Travel</td>
<td>13,543 18,861</td>
<td>(5,318)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,950 18,850</td>
<td>18,472</td>
<td>(4,522)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>100,286 130,863</td>
<td>(30,577)</td>
<td></td>
<td>104,227 132,127</td>
<td>127,987</td>
<td>(23,760)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Total Direct Costs</td>
<td>514,655 647,337</td>
<td>(132,682)</td>
<td></td>
<td>532,926 560,247</td>
<td>557,215</td>
<td>(24,289)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Indirect Costs</td>
<td>262,053 296,570</td>
<td>(34,517)</td>
<td></td>
<td>271,109 247,332</td>
<td>245,746</td>
<td>25,363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>776,708 943,907</td>
<td>(167,199)</td>
<td></td>
<td>804,035 807,569</td>
<td>802,961</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry Forward</td>
<td>236,290 236,290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>236,290 69,091</td>
<td>69,091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>1,012,998 943,907</td>
<td>69,091</td>
<td></td>
<td>873,126 807,569</td>
<td>802,961</td>
<td>70,165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUMMARY OF MSU EXPENDITURES (other than ADVANCE grant)

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>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>958,804</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>30,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67,904</strong></td>
<td><strong>350,395</strong></td>
<td><strong>245,207</strong></td>
<td><strong>325,675</strong></td>
<td><strong>989,181</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grant period - YR 1: Sept. 15, 2008 - Aug. 31, 2009
Grant period - YR 2: Sept. 1, 2009 - Aug. 31, 2010
Grant period - YR 3: Sept. 1, 2010 - Aug. 31, 2011
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Eight members of the advisory board met in person on January 27, 2012 (another contributed by e-mail) to discuss topics related to women’s leadership in the academy. This document summarizes some of the main points.

1. **Contexts for leadership should be understood to include:**
   - structural roles in an academic unit (e.g., chair or dean),
   - elected or appointed offices in a disciplinary society,
   - heading a multi-person research team,
   - offices within academic governance at the department, college, or university level,
   - taking charge of an ad hoc committee or special initiative for the college or university

2. **Reasons for seeking or accepting a leadership role**
   - desire to serve, to help meet a perceived need or ensure a special initiative is completed
   - chance to meet and engage with a wider range of individuals
   - desire to experience a particular role (with or without a title)
   - disciplinary societies may seek women for committee roles (especially if federal agencies encourage this), which can create pressure to agree to serve
   - the visibility arising from service to disciplinary societies can help (at the margin) with getting grants, demonstrating value to one’s discipline, which all helps at RPT time
   - skills one learns from one leadership role are transferrable to other situations

3. **Reasons for not seeking or accepting a leadership role**
   - **lack of opportunity:**
     - At MSU, chairs tend to serve for very long periods, so the chance may not arise – or may not arise at a time when one is able to pursue it.
     - Many MSU faculty have partners who are also employed at MSU; if there are few structural leadership roles coming open at MSU, one would have to move to pursue a chair or dean position; but it is hard to move a dual-career couple.
     - Gender bias in some units or disciplines may limit opportunities.
     - Faculty do not know what roles exist and/or are appropriate to their career stage.
   - **timing:**
     - If an opportunity arises when one is a new faculty member, when one has just acquired additional family obligations, etc., it may not be feasible to pursue this.
     - A decision not to pursue a leadership role at one time may impact the course of one’s career and decrease the likelihood of ever doing so; this particularly applies to chair or dean roles [see above notes on low turnover at MSU]. There is a perceived “bifurcation” between those “on the leadership track” and those not on that track.
   - **cultural context within MSU**
     - The pervasive twin messages that “leadership is a form of service” and that “service is far less important than research” lead many faculty to conclude that their best chance for career success lies in pursuing a research-only trajectory. This may
especially be true of women, since they are often overburdened with non-research roles and yet very conscious that those roles are not really rewarded by the system.

- Similarly the pervasive perception that “leadership roles are filled with tedious busywork” discourages prospective new leaders.
- The pervasive perception that “academic governance is powerless” discourages faculty from contributing to many important decisions about the university.

4. Changing the Culture:
MSU needs to reframe the conversation about leadership to redefine what constitutes leadership, declare that leadership roles will be expressly valued in merit/promotion decisions, and welcome a broad swath of faculty to participate in university leadership.

- Stress that everyone should play leadership roles in some part of their research, teaching, or engagement activities. Leadership is not just for a few anointed “winners.”
- Convey that there are many models of a successful academic career, with varying emphases on teaching, research, engagement, and leadership – especially when one considers a career trajectory over many years. In particular, some studies have shown that the years of greatest research productivity for male scientists happen early while women’s trajectory includes early productivity, a plateau during the years of greatest family responsibility, and then a further climb in research productivity later on.
- Clarify the variety of contexts and roles in which leadership occurs. Make clear that the skills one acquires in one aspect of one’s work are transferrable and relevant for leadership roles.
- Educate faculty about the rewarding, creative, and challenging aspects of leadership roles, especially those in unit administration or academic governance.
- Help faculty understand the leadership aspects of what they are already doing (those who do not have a special title do not always recognize that others see them as leaders).
- Ensure that leadership is considered in all faculty evaluations and explicitly weighed as a factor in determining promotions and pay increases. Ensure that expectations for leadership participation are included in documents related to RPT.
- Support a culture of excitement about the accomplishments of all faculty [not just those usually featured in MSU press releases] as intrinsically interesting and important to MSU’s success.

5. Specific Actions to support that cultural change
We recommend that MSU take specific actions to create more varied leadership opportunities, recruit more women to leadership positions, and educate faculty about what leadership entails.

- Re-organize some “structured” leadership roles (e.g., chair, dean) so that one can still do research while in those roles. This would strengthen the research culture of MSU, since the leaders would have a detailed, ongoing understanding of research.
- Make more short-term leadership roles available, perhaps by encouraging units to have some Associate Chair/Dean roles be term-limited so that more people will try out such roles and gain experience. This would draw, for example, from the NSF concept of “rotator” program officers.
• Create leadership internship/fellow positions whereby faculty would shadow or work with a senior administrator or would take on a special administrative project for a specific length of time. This would be an internal version of the ACE Fellow program.

• Nominate women for leadership roles within MSU and outside. Take a close look at whether current processes by which individuals are put forward as future leaders are inclusive. The ALP cohorts are diverse, but the composition of department chairs is not.

• Provide greater transparency about administrative roles, administrator review, etc. within individual units and at the university level.

• Offer multiple on-campus opportunities for women to build leadership skills
  o Sponsor cross-disciplinary discussions about leadership.
  o Workshops or learning communities or reading groups on acquiring skills for leadership roles.
  o Make sure all feel welcome to attend (this isn’t just for people who are already chairs or want to be chairs in particular).
A GUIDE TO DEVELOPING THE FACULTY EXCELLENCE ADVOCATE DESCRIPTION

This document was developed to help college Faculty Excellence Advocates (FEAs) and Deans develop a position description for the college FEA that makes sense given each unit’s unique context and goals.

In the most straight forward explanation, the role of the Faculty Excellent Advocate is to help the college meet college expectations concerning faculty search and hiring, faculty retention, faculty advancement, and creating/sustaining a positive work climate. To ensure a shared understanding about what this means for each college and FEA, each FEA should prepare an FEA position description for review and agreement with the dean. For general guidance about what should be included in each description, utilize the attached “Performance Dimensions & Core Expectations” document that Michigan State University submitted to NSF in June, 2011. This document provides EXAMPLES of how the core expectations of the FEA could be met in each college. Do not feel that your description needs to include the degree of detail provided in the attached document – it is a guide for your consideration.

Regardless of college, each FEA will be expected to:

1. Acquire necessary core knowledge
2. Support and engage department chairpersons and school directors in the College’s efforts to achieve the desired College outcomes. Minimally, such activities should include:
   - Meeting with search committees
   - Supporting mentoring efforts
3. Support and engage faculty in the College’s efforts to achieve the desired College outcomes. Minimally, such activities should include:
   - Ensuring that faculty (especially those from underrepresented groups) are aware of the role and resources of the FEA and ADAPP program
   - Supporting mentoring efforts
   - Identifying and reporting why faculty leave the College
4. Participate in conducting diversity-related needs assessments
5. Assist in the integration and promotion of diversity and inclusion in the College’s strategic planning process
6. Assist in evaluation and efforts to promote accountability
7. Prepare a year-end report of activities for the Dean and Provost.

In your conversation with your dean, it will be important to understand your role, responsibility, and authority vis-à-vis others in the college, e.g. associate deans, department chairpersons/school directors, other administrators. If there are challenges that you face in doing so, contact the Terry Curry, Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources.
NOTE: There are core expectations for activities that do cut across all colleges to ensure consistent implementation leads to a high quality and diverse faculty and in which the FEs play a critical role. In May (prior to the request from NSF), the ADAPP-ADVANCE team developed a FIRST DRAFT of a document to provide Deans and FEs with guidance about the Provost’s vision for the roles, responsibilities and authority of the FEA in each college. This first draft was disseminated at a FEA Development Institute in May, and feedback is now informing the overall document, described in the previous response. We emphasize that this document is still under development and is a working draft.

ATTACHMENT A

FEA PERFORMANCE DIMENSIONS & CORE EXPECTATIONS
May 11, 2011

I. OVERVIEW

The role of FEAs, very generally stated, is to help their college achieve the following important outcomes:

- Increase the diversity of college faculty.
- Increase the level of retention for women faculty and faculty from underrepresented groups.
- Increase the rate of advancement for women faculty and faculty from underrepresented groups.
- Improve the work climate in the college.

We have received numerous requests for more specific guidance regarding what FEAs “should be doing,” or are “expected to do” in their role as an FEA. This document was prepared in response to those requests. It is a statement based on the collective judgment of Associate Provost Curry and the ADAPP team regarding what FEA’s should be doing in order to be effective in helping their college achieve the above identified outcomes (i.e., in order to be successful in their FEA role). Please note, while the expectations laid out below are believed to generalize widely across the colleges, we also recognize that the FEA role may need to vary somewhat across colleges. While each college has some flexibility in developing the FEA roles, it is expected that the Dean will do so in consultation with the Provost and that the Dean and his/her staff will document their specific FEA assignments as part of the comprehensive assessment of FEA roles throughout the project.

II. SUMMARY OF CORE FEA EXPECTATIONS

- Clarify Expectations with Your Dean
- Acquire Necessary Core Knowledge
- Engage Unit Heads and Faculty in the College’s Efforts to Achieve the Desired College Outcomes
- Participate in Conducting Diversity-Related Needs Assessments
- Integrate and Promote Diversity & Inclusion in the College’s Strategic Planning Process
- Assist in Evaluation and Efforts to Promote Accountability
- Meet Expectations Relating to the Following Specific Areas of Focus
  - Faculty Search
  - Faculty Retention
  - Faculty Advancement
  - Creating/Sustaining a Positive Work Climate
III. CORE FEA EXPECTATIONS

Clarify Expectations with Your Dean (if you have not already done so)

You should have a shared understanding with your Dean regarding:

- FEA role
- FEA “compensation”
- The Dean’s expectations for chairs and directors concerning the ADAPP goals
- FEA authority and accountability

Acquire Necessary Core Knowledge (if do not already possess the requisite knowledge)

All FEAs need to possess basic knowledge in the areas listed below in order to execute their role effectively. The core knowledge areas include:

- Knowledge of the key “drivers” of faculty quality and diversity and the associated issues [in general and those specific to your college].
- An understanding of the concept of “alignment” and the ability to explain it (in basic terms) to faculty.
- A basic understanding of MSU academic HR policies, practices, and resources and know how to obtain additional, more specific information when needed.
- Knowledge of available data that can be used to identify challenges/needs within their college (including academic human resource data).

If you do not currently possess that knowledge, you are expected to take steps to acquire that knowledge as soon as possible. Steps include such things as reviewing relevant policies and toolkits, and participating in available workshops and training programs.

Engage Unit Heads and Faculty in the College’s Efforts to Achieve the Desired College Outcomes

A critical aspect of the FEA role is engaging units and faculty in their college’s efforts to successfully achieve the outcomes identified above (e.g., increase the diversity of college faculty). Much of what you are expected to do in your FEA role (set forth below under various dimensions of FEA performance) should have a direct or indirect impact on engagement within your college. Here we emphasize key expectations related to engaging unit heads and faculty:

- Communicate regularly with unit heads, faculty, and Academic HR/ADAPP. FEAs are expected to facilitate communication between faculty and chairs and the college as well as Academic HR/ADAAP.
  - Proactively seek input on quality, diversity, and climate issues from faculty. Communicate their ideas and concerns to the Academic Human Resources and ADAPP team as appropriate.
  - Help create an “informed awareness” among college faculty regarding:
    - The grant/ADAPP
    - The FEA role and who their college’s FEA is.
    - General expectations for units with regard to faculty searches
- Resources and programs available through MSU ADAPP-ADVANCE, Academic Human Resources (AHR), or Office for Inclusion & Intercultural Initiatives (I3)
- MSU Academic Human Resources policy or practice changes.

- Solicit unit head and faculty involvement in needs assessment and planning activities (addressed further below).

**Participate in Conducting Diversity-Related Needs Assessments**

- Work with your Dean and other college personnel to assess specific areas of need, or gaps,” with regard to the recruiting, hiring, advancement, and retention of a diverse and high quality faculty.

- Assist units within your College in assessing the extent to which their academic HR policies, practices, and resources are aligned with those of MSU and the college, and are well integrated, readily accessible to faculty, and consistently applied.

**Integrate and Promote Diversity & Inclusion in the College’s Strategic Planning Process**

- Encourage your Dean and other college personnel to incorporate the following into the college planning efforts:
  - goals that address specific areas of need with regard to the recruiting, hiring, advancement, and retention of a diverse and high quality faculty; and
  - specific actions/steps to address the highest priority needs.

- Work with your Dean and other college personnel to implement the agreed upon action steps.

**Assist in Evaluation and Efforts to Promote Accountability**

- Work with your Dean and other College personnel to identify key metrics to be used by the College and units within the College in assessing the effectiveness of search, RP &T, annual review, faculty development (e.g., mentoring, leadership training), and work environment-related activities

- Assist your Dean, Academic HR, and/or I3 in collecting data that: a) tracks activities within your college aimed at promoting and retaining diverse and high quality faculty; or b) provides an assessment of the impact of those activities.

- Provide an annual FEA report of your performance as an FEA during the preceding year for submission to your Dean and the Provost. The report should include sections addressing: 1) relevant college goals, 2) activities, and 3) progress towards reaching goals to date (outcomes).
Meet FEA Expectations Relating to Specific MSU Goals

FACULTY SEARCH

Faculty Search Core Expectations:

- Meet with department chairs and school directors individually or collectively to review the unit’s search and hiring procedures and communicate faculty search best practices.
- Work with your Dean to establish a process that ensures the College’s FEA is informed of all new approved faculty searches.
- Upon learning of new faculty search within your College:
  - Contact the Unit chair/director and the chair of the faculty search committee and offer to meet with the chair of the search committee, or the committee as a whole, to help assure an effective and efficient search.
  - Provide the search committee chair a copy of the Faculty Search Toolkit and request that copies be distributed to all search committee members.

Other Highly Recommended FEA Actions:

In addition to the above core expectations, ideally, FEAs would:

- Meet with every new faculty search committee in their college before any formal posting is made and:
  - Assure that the job description/posting reflects both: a) the objective criteria that will be used in the screening and final selection decisions, and b) MSU’s inclusivity value.
  - Confirm that the Affirmative Action Advocate that is required of all search committees has been selected.
  - Remind all of the importance of minimizing bias in the process and emphasize the role of structure in the recruitment and hiring process in addressing bias and promoting quality.
  - Emphasize the critical importance of being proactive as a committee in taking steps to generate a diverse applicant pool.
• Make all committee members aware of the Faculty Search Toolkit (e.g., briefly review its contents and availability).
• Make committee members aware of other campus resources that support the search process (AHR and I3).
• Ensure that the spousal and partner accommodations process is understood.

• Check in with the search committee on their progress:
  o How is the applicant pool shaping up?
  o Do they need any additional support or resources to achieve a diverse applicant/candidate pool?
  o Do they need information on community resources to attract candidates to MSU/greater Lansing area?
  o Consult with the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives if the committee is facing significant challenges.

• Work with the dean and with unit chairs and directors to ensure that procedures are in place to assure consistency, fairness, and compliance with policy concerning salary and other terms and conditions of employment (e.g., start-up package). (In other words, when one looks at offer letters is there alignment with offers made to similarly ranked faculty at time of hire, unless there is an objective merit or market-based reason for doing so).

• Introduce yourself to new faculty, describe your role as FEA, and offer to be a resource to them.

ANNUAL REVIEW

Annual Review Core Expectations:

• Meet with new faculty individually or as a group with new faculty during their first year, introduce the Annual Review Tool kit, determine if mentors have been provided and to see how they are acclimating (within the department/college/greater community), if they have unanswered questions or concerns (e.g., quarterly intervals), and if they are clear on the criteria and process for evaluation;

• Meet with chair/director of new faculty to get their assessment of how new faculty are progressing, that they have been provided mentors, and that the annual evaluation of new faculty are consistent with criteria for job postings. Introduce the Annual Review Tool Kit, especially the section on resources for unit administrators.

• Meet with all pre-tenure faculty individually or as a group annually to monitor progress or concerns regarding the annual review process and unit and college evaluation processes.

• Report progress on or any concerns regarding the advancement of women/diverse faculty in the annual review process to the Chair/Director and Dean.
Other Highly Recommended FEA Actions related to Annual Review

- **Determine** if new faculty have been provided mentors in accordance with departmental or college procedures or practice.

- **On behalf of the Dean, work with Chairs to review** the formal annual evaluation of new faculty to assure the evaluation is consistent with objective criteria that were outlined at time of hire.

- **Serve as a resource** for faculty after receipt of evaluation to determine if they have any questions regarding process.

REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE (RP&T)

RP&T Core Expectations:

- Encourage attendance at the “Survive and Thrive” workshops and similar college and unit sessions.

- **Introduce** the RP&T Tool Kit to unit administrators for use by faculty members, promote the use of the College/Departmental Handbooks for RP&T, and be available to faculty to respond to questions regarding the process or timing of RPT events.

- Meet with faculty during the year preceding their reappointment review to ensure their understanding the department, college, and University processes.

- **Meet with pre-tenure faculty** after three-year review, but with less frequency if it appears that the faculty member is making good progress toward tenure (or promotion if already tenured).

- **Report** annually on progress or any concerns about the advancement of women/diverse faculty in the promotion and tenure process to the Dean and Provost.

Other Highly Recommended FEA Actions related to RPT:

- Work to ensure that College and Unit policies and procedures are aligned with University policies and that best practices are shared widely.

- **On behalf of the Dean, work with Chairs to review** the RPT packages of faculty to assure the evaluation is consistent with the annual evaluations and the objective criteria that were outlined at time of hire.
• **Serve as a resource** for faculty after receipt of evaluation to determine if they have any questions regarding process.

**CREATING/SUSTAINING A POSITIVE WORK ENVIRONMENT**

**Work Environment Core expectations:**

- Zealously advocate for your College, and departments within the College, to implement revisions in policies and procedures to advance the goals of ADAPP and the university.

- Review MSU Work Environment Survey data and “Inventory” findings with your Dean to help develop your understanding of how the work environment is perceived within your College (e.g., areas or dimensions reflecting notably positive or negative faculty perceptions).

- Work with your Dean to identify College strategies for promoting a positive work environment across all units within the college.

- Work with your Dean to establish procedures for tracking the application of new academic HR policies and practices at the College and unit level.

- Talk to all faculty who are leaving the College voluntarily (e.g. resign or retire). Determine why they are leaving, any concerns they might have that contributed to their decision to leave, and any suggestions for improving the work climate within their unit, college, and/or the University.

**Other Highly Recommended FEA Actions:**

- Contact unit heads and offer to assist them in reviewing MSU Work Environment Survey data and “Inventory” findings to help develop the unit’s understanding of how the work environment is perceived within the unit.

- Work with individual units to identify strategies for promoting a positive work environment across within their college.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>POLICY QUESTIONS (MM DRAFT)</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS (TC/CR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITION DESCRIPTION &amp; RESPONSIBILITIES</td>
<td>• How often does a college need to submit a position description? When?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Who will evaluate the description? Using what criteria?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relationship to college planning process?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELECTION</td>
<td>• By what date do FEA nominations need to be submitted to the provost?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What criteria should be used by deans in selecting individuals for this role?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relationship to college planning process?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can an Associate Dean hold the role? (Issue: part of already existing leadership responsibilities?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can an Associate Professor hold the role?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Who(m) will monitor policy implementation related to selection?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can a college have more than one FEA?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| APPOINTMENT | • For what length of time will FEAs be appointed?  
|            | • Will a renewal be possible?  
|            | • Within which unit will that appointment be made (e.g., College, Provost) |
| PERFORMANCE | • Who(m) will review FEA performance?  
|            | • Who(m) will have input into FEA performance?  
|            | • What will “trigger” this review? Relationship to academic planning process? |
| COLLEGE FUNDING | • What form will funding take? (e.g., college funding; faculty funding; flat rate; percentage of FEA salary?)  
|            | • Will each college receive the same amount of funds? (Differential based upon college size?)  
|            | • When and how will they be notified of this funding? Relationship to academic planning process? |
| COMPENSATION | • How will faculty members be compensated for their work as FEA? (course buy-out; travel; other)  
<p>|            | • How important is consistency across colleges? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• How will an individual FEA be evaluated? What criteria?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to annual performance review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who will do the evaluating?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What criteria will be used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What will be done in case of poor or ineffective performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues/Questions/Impediments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Security and Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Functional Relevance: Why is this Needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Functional Duplication, Redundancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 How to deal w/disciplinary uniqueness in Data and annual review and RPT processes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Recruit, Search, Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify applicants from public searches across institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture position details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture committee members and committee activity for search and select, and for diversity reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather applicant details, CV and profile instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record selected applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record letter of offer details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign and Record Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture Duties (% teaching, research service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Faculty Activity Report/Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide disambiguation and fingerprinting for activity profile instances (publications, contracts &amp; grants, awards &amp; honors, patents, etc.) from external sources (e.g., SCOPUS, Pub Med, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture activity profile instances (from external and internal sources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validate activity profile instances in source systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use workflow to validate and review MSU activity profile instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce Faculty Activity Profile Report (flexible formats, flexible inclusion options by type of accomplishment, date, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Annual Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validate activity profile instances in source systems (getting ready for annual review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce various annual review documents (e.g., Activity Report) based on flexible options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use workflow to validate and review MSU activity profile and other annual review documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate additional documents to annual review &quot;document&quot; or package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust Source System with results of annual review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX E
### 5.0 Review for Promotion & Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Validate activity profile instances in source systems (getting ready for RPT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce various RPT documents (e.g., Activity Report) based on flexible options</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use work flow to validate and review MSU activity profile and other RPT documents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate additional documents to RPT &quot;document&quot; or package</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust Source System with results of RPT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.0 Produce CV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produce CV from accomplishment/activity profile data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce CV in flexible formats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide export facility for web sites, NIH bio-sketch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.0 Provide Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide Management &amp; Operational Reports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Benchmarking, Analytical Reports (internal)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Benchmarking, Analytical Reports (comparing MSU and external institutions)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide replacement for current Administrators Assistant Reports</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.0 Strategic Uses (collaboration, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide public search for MSU expertise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide search for possible external collaborators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide search for internal collaborators and expertise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide search for funding opportunities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Information Tool (FIT)
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A Case for Implementing FIT

- FIT project goals
- Problems/opportunities
- Proposed solutions
- Urgency of initiating FIT
- Addressing earlier concerns
- Addressing other obstacles and risks
- Benefits and cost
- Proposed schedule
Project Goals

- Improve institutional processes for developing and recording faculty activities and accomplishments. Provide a single institutional system of record for faculty professional activities
- Facilitate the identification and connection of faculty expertise
- Discover relevant collaboration opportunities for faculty and researchers
- Facilitate the identification of funding opportunities
- Promote the accomplishments of faculty both internally and externally
- Comply with the demand by external reporting agencies (e.g., Star Metrics, SciENCV, VIVO) for shared researcher profiling
Problems and Opportunities

Currently some data related to faculty professional accomplishments, are produced and stored in a variety of applications, systems, and databases across the MSU campus. Thus, there is a very limited concerted ability to:

- Provide a system that collects professional accomplishment data not currently captured – to be the system of record for that data.
- Link new faculty professional accomplishments data (publications, grants, teaching, service, professional development certifications) with data currently maintained in central data bases (grants, teaching, IP) for reports, benchmarking, internal planning.
- Provide a system that documents faculty professional activities and could address federal funding agencies’ expectations for reporting.
- Provide aggregated data necessary for external agencies, accreditation, etc.
- Provide consistent and accurate data for internal processes: annual review, RPT, program evaluations.
Proposed Solution

- Provide mechanism for entry of new data elements not currently captured (FIT Toolbox, SciVal experts, commercial software)
- Provide and connect data from multiple internal sources with data from external sources (SciVal, FIT toolbox, Star Metrics tools)
- Facilitate functional processes requiring professional accomplishment data
- Facilitate the production of CVs
- Provide reports: operational, management states, dashboard metrics
- Produce data sets in formats that can be exported to (federal) external agencies
- Evaluate the commercial systems and tools that are being developed and used by other institutions which document faculty professional activities and could address the federal funding agencies’ expectations for reporting.
The Office of Science and Technology Policy is promoting the development of a shared researcher profiling system – the STAR METRICS initiative, Portfolio Explorer, will connect to SciENCV to identify expertise and present institutional overviews (http://readidata.nitrd.gov/star/home.html).

Development of a dashboard by STAR METRICS of showing input and output related to federal funding (http://rd-dashboard.nitrd.gov/topic_modeling.html).

Colleges at MSU are adopting different profiling systems, not connected to central data warehouses; they cannot serve as the system of record for professional accomplishment activities in these colleges, and cannot be aggregated and provide benchmarking and dashboard data for internal and external purposes.

The University Research Council is negotiating a license for SciVal experts which would linking the profiling systems from various Michigan Institutions.

Window of opportunity to access IT personnel at MSU to implement a software system in the time frame between EBS financial/HR implementation and development of SIS II is fairly short.
Addressing Earlier Concerns

- **System will create extra burden on faculty**
  - Software will be selected for ease of use.
  - Scival Experts and Funding require minimal input from faculty.
  - CV scraper and parser could allow input of CV from word document into a database, with minimal faculty effort.
  - Integration of data sources facilitates reporting.

- **Lack of trust in the implementation of an enterprise data system**
  - SciVal’s ease of use may yield faculty buy-in.
  - Other software system(s) selected for data collection and integration will focus on ease of use.

- **Gather input from faculty and administrators**
  - The FIT development team carried out 6 focus group discussions with faculty and administrators to *identify barriers* and issues and to *prioritize functionalities* of a Faculty Information Tool (FIT). The top three functions were: 1) providing a faculty profile or activity report; 2) providing support for annual review; 3) providing support for promotion and tenure. Additionally, the top priority (providing a profile or activity report) was universally agreed to by all of the external institutions with which we spoke.
Addressing Earlier Concerns

- Gather input from other institutions implementing faculty profiling systems.
  - Phone interviews with 10 institutions that have or are in the process of implementing faculty profiling systems.
  - Identified barriers and issues that may be anticipated.
  - Explored the various products currently being adopted by these institutions and problems encountered during implementation.

- Evaluate software vendors. The FIT development team:
  - Met with vendors of 6 different faculty profiling systems.
  - Has a good understanding of the functionalities of 4 others that are available.
  - Will evaluate the systems for their ease of use and ability to integrate data from across multiple internal and external systems of record.

- Insufficient resources – there is a cost for not initiating FIT as defined in the cost benefit slides.
Addressing Other Obstacles and Risks

- Initiative may be perceived as *top down*
- *Insufficient resources* for development and scope augmentation to maintain an effective timeline.
- Identification of *resources to maintain* the system.
- *Inaccurate or inconsistent data*
- *Integration of data and processes* from multiple systems to insure uniqueness, consistency and integrity of data across multiple internal and external systems of record.
- Providing *data streams to external systems* that are compatible, accurate and timely.
- Developing *explicit and accurate definitions for data categories* that can be agreed to across the various stakeholder groups to be used in integration, reporting and dashboards.
- Providing a system that can collect and benchmark the *diversity of faculty professional activities* and professional profiles across the diversity of disciplinary areas.
High Level Project Benefits

Project Benefits:
- Compliance/Regulatory
- Efficiency/Cost reduction
- Increase in revenues (grants, IP)

Difficult to measure/quantify these benefits – might be easier to consider possible losses of collaborations, rankings, grant opportunities
## Cost Estimate for Implementing FIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Categories</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Labor hours</strong></td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(with offsets for existing employees)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, hardware or software, travel &amp; training</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Project Estimate 2012-2014</strong></td>
<td>$2,400,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**On-going costs** = $686,000

* Includes funds for SciVal (already committed) and Academic Analytics (estimate) licenses
Proposed Schedule

PHASE I
- Functional Requirements & RFP Creation: 2/1/2012 – 5/1/2012
- RFP Out for Bid: 5/1/2012-6/1/2012
- Software Selection & Contract: 6/1/2012-7/1/2012
- Vendor Start Up: 7/1/2012-8/1/2012

PHASE II
- Functional Design Functional & Data Scope Phasing Determination: 8/1/2012 – 10/1/2012 (Assume, at minimum, SciVal integration and activity profile production deliverables for Phase I)

PHASE III
Questions?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>CRITICALITY FACTOR (3= must have; 2= nice to have; 1= perceived to be minimally required )</th>
<th>COMPONENT TYPE</th>
<th>Further Explanation Required? (If &quot;yes&quot; vendor must explain and/or provide a demo of HOW this is to be accomplished in their system)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Recruit, Search and Select Faculty</td>
<td>User interface to record and report the specific type of committee and level of participation (or role) by the faculty member.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>from source system; report</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Recruit, Search and Select Faculty</td>
<td>User interface to record and report the details of the composition of a &quot;search committee&quot;, and individual members for reporting to institutional entities. (e.g., racial ethnic, gender, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Direct entry or import from source system; report</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Recruit, Search and Select Faculty</td>
<td>Record position details (job, classification, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Recruit, Search and Select Faculty</td>
<td>Identify and report applicants from public searches across institutions (use of external systems like SciVa), Star Metrics, etc. to recruit faculty)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Search and report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Recruit, Search and Select Faculty</td>
<td>Identify and report applicants from internal searches across MSU (use of FIT to find expertise internally)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Search and report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Recruit, Search and Select Faculty</td>
<td>User interface to record and report applicant biographic data: Name (with possibility for multiples); address (with possibility for multiples); Racial/Ethnic Categor (y/yes);</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Direct entry or import from source system; report</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Recruit, Search and Select Faculty</td>
<td>Record educational background (all institutions; all degrees with possibility of recording a FIT value for use in CV’s, activity report, RPT, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Direct entry and/or import from source system; report</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Recruit, Search and Select Faculty</td>
<td>Facility to load existing professional accomplishment instances from CV documents (from applicants): licences/certificates; employment history; publications (all types); research; awards and honors; committees; service; courses taught; intellectual property and patents; etc. Interface should be by direct entry, and/or data upload. (See 3.0 for further details.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Import from source document</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Recruit, Search and Select Faculty</td>
<td>Facility to store and retrieve various applicant documents. Requires document management system.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>centrally stored applicant documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Recruit, Search and Select Faculty</td>
<td>Record and report applicant status (considered, interviewed, selected, offer made, etc.) through import and/or direct entry (user interface).</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Direct entry or import from source system; report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Hire Faculty</td>
<td>Facility to store and retrieve various types of documents (e.g., letter of offer) in document management system.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Document storage and retrieval facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Hire Faculty</td>
<td>User interface to record &amp; report offer conditions as structured data (job duties, salary, facilities &amp; other space, courses, etc.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Data entry, report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Hire Faculty</td>
<td>Record and report space assignment(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Direct entry or import from source system; report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Hire Faculty</td>
<td>User interface to record and report research, teaching, service percentages as structured data.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Hire Faculty</td>
<td>Provide ability to access &quot;Memo of Understanding of Duties&quot; stored in document management system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Document storage and retrieval facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Hire Faculty</td>
<td>User interface to record and report mentor/mentee relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Direct entry; report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Build Maintain and Produce Faculty Activity Report</td>
<td>Facility to search, disambiguate and load accomplishment data from external sources (publication sources, SciVal, Academic Analytics, COS, etc.).</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interface(s)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Output, process</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>Direct entry, process</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct entry, document management</td>
<td>Direct entry, document management</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>Direct entry</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.00 Conduct Annual Review**

- **Provide a facility to search, disambiguate and load data from internal sources (MSU data warehouse).**
- **Provide an electronic, automated way (with minimal user intervention) of capturing CV data (scrape/parse) into structured data categories and attributes.**
- **User interface to review, correct, augment externally obtained accomplishment instances.**
- **User interface to review, correct, augment educational background.**
- **User interface to review, correct, augment service instances.**
- **User interface to review, correct, augment presentations, creative works, publications.**
- **Provide a facility to produce Faculty Activity Profile Report (flexible formats, flexible inclusion options by type of accomplishment, date, key attributes).**
- **Route Activity Report for approval using work flow engine.**
- **User interface to assign a delegate for recording, validating and updating professional accomplishment instances.**

**5.00 Review for Promotion & Tenure**

- **Provide an electronic, automated way of capturing and updating CV data (scrape/parse) into structured data categories and attributes.**
- **Provide Faculty Activity Profile Report (flexible formats, flexible inclusion options by type of accomplishment, date, key attributes).**
- **Use Work Flow to route Activity Report for dept chair validation.**
- **Use Work Flow to route Activity Report for dept chair, college dean(s), Academic HR, etc. approval.**
- **Use Work Flow to route Activity Report for dept chair, college dean(s), Academic HR, etc. approval.**
- **Done in SAP, interface to FIT**
- **User interface to record and store faculty duties.**
- **User interface to record results of annual review as structured data.**
- **User interface to record and store space details (or, interface with system of record).**
- **User interface to record and store details or documents associated with other arrangements.**

**6.00 Produce CV**

- **Provide a CV output production tool that permits selection of formats based on college specific, departmental (discipline) specific, or personal preference templates.**
- **User interface to update accomplishment instances in FIT. Individual instances can be highlighted for inclusion (or exclusion) on CV.**
- **Facility through which various CV related documents can be exported.**
- **Facility through which various CV related documents can be exported. One such format is for faculty web pages.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.00</th>
<th>Use FIT for Reporting &amp; Analytics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>In addition to the online, FIT application and transactional database, a &quot;FIT Data Repository&quot; in the MSU EDW is required to support reporting and analytics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a reporting tool (like Cognos) with tactical management and operational reports can be constructed and with which units can manage the functions and processes in this taxonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a reporting tool (like Cognos) with strategic reports to facilitate unit planning and evaluation with comparisons across units and colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a reporting tool (like Cognos) with strategic reports to facilitate unit planning and evaluation with comparisons across institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data extraction programs with outputs provided in multiple formats according to prescribed requirements of external profilmng services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a reporting tool (like Cognos) that supports the institutional reporting needs of the Office of Planning and Budgets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.00</th>
<th>Use FIT for Strategic Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Facility that supports searching for current funding opportunities based on research and publication key words and concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility that supports searching for current funding opportunities and notification to faculty based on research and publication key words and concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility that supports searching for other faculty based on research and publication key words and concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility that supports searching for other faculty (internal to MSU) based on research and publication key words and concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility that supports searching for other faculty (external to MSU) based on research and publication key words and concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a public view of FIT that permits external constituents to search for MSU and other expertise based on research and publication key words and concepts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General, Overall System Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit</th>
<th>Capture and save before and after images of changed or deleted data (with user ID, change date and time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entries due to imported data may be edited with the original values [from source systems] left unmodified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capture and save images of newly added data (from on-line user interface, and/or data uploads). With user ID, change date and time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Role based security with ability to create and maintain templates for roles. (i.e., these are not prescribed by the vendor... we may create our own)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roles are to include the system component (screen, report, process) to which the given role template has access as well as the permission (view, add, change, delete) possible for a given component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access may also be controlled by various user (or other) attributes (e.g., the department or college for which one requires access, the type of employee-faculty vs. student etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User interface for establishing templates, roles, content controls, and connecting users with these componente.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reports for documenting templates, roles, and persons in roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authentication in keeping with institutional &quot;single sign-on&quot; (Shibboleth) requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX G</td>
<td>Permit users to assign a &quot;delegate role&quot; for purposes of updating, and validating professional accomplishment instances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Processes</td>
<td>Facility to upload various categories* of data. Must be accessed by individual users. Must provide error reporting and handling such that &quot;good&quot; cases load, and only non-conforming data does not. i.e., entire load does not fail, only exceptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some categories of data are: educational experience, past MSU employment history, publications (of varying types), awards and honors, service, committees, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Entry</td>
<td>Business rules for data entry and update in keeping with data definitions and institutional policy (CRUD rules are maintainable and flexible).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to update data that has been imported from another system of record with an element that is &quot;local&quot; to FIT (i.e., not changing the data from that of the system of record but recording a value more appropriate for FIT functions).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Processes</td>
<td>Facility to export data in formats usable by external systems INCLUDING VIVO ontology formats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data export facility permits selection of categories of data (i.e., is not &quot;all or nothing&quot;, is not a &quot;data dump&quot;) for export.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Transactional system reports track institutional processes for: reviewing applicant data, search and selection committees, activity report validation, annual review status, and RPT status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide API's to extract, transport and load data to MSU EDW for reporting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide flexible tool for selecting, sorting, filtering various categories of faculty in report formats.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document storage and retrieval</td>
<td>Facility to manage storing text documents that are a part of FIT related processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versioning of Records</td>
<td>See audit. It should always be possible to view the state of a given record for a given date and time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (MSU guidelines for accessible web sites)</td>
<td>See: <a href="http://www.msu.edu/accessibility.html">http://www.msu.edu/accessibility.html</a> for requirements that must be met by vendor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workflow</td>
<td>Facility to establish electronic routing of on-line and stored documents for various processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility to monitor specific routes of specific processes for a given individual (status).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to alter a route uniquely for a specific individual and/or process, waiving a signature or step.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to alter a route uniquely for a specific individual and/or process, adding a signature or step.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diversity Metrics Used by the Provost to Determine Progress on Diversity and Related Incentive Funding

1. Percentage of TS faculty of color from 2005-10 greater than average faculty of color TS availability for college (using availability data for 2002-05 and 2007-10);

2. Percentage of TS black, Hispanic, and Native American hires greater than average black, Hispanic, and Native American TS faculty availability for college (using availability data from 2002-05 and 2007-10);

3. Percentage of TS women hires greater than average women TS faculty availability for college (same periods for data availability);

4. Net gain (increase in # and/or %) in TS faculty of color representation from 2005 to 2010;

5. Net gain (increase in # and/or %) in black, Hispanic, and Native American TS faculty representation in college from 2005 to 2010;

6. Net gain (increase in # and/or %) in women TS faculty representation in college from 2005 to 2010.

Colleges were assigned to four tiers of progress (or lack thereof) based on how many of the 6 metrics they made positive progress on (i.e. 5/6; 4/6; 3/6 +; 3 or below ). None of the colleges got 6/6.
New Faculty Search/Recruitment Process in the College of Engineering

1. The Dean’s office informs the College Faculty Excellence Advocate (FEA) of all new approved searches.
2. FEA requests Department to nominate search committee members, including a Process Fairness Advocate (PFA).
3. FEA reviews nominations, recommends appropriate adjustments and approves search committee composition.
4. FEA and the Dean meet with the PFA to review the search process and expectations of fairness. The objective of the meeting is to stress the importance of diversity in the faculty ranks in the College and carrying out a faculty search process that is consistent with this goal.
5. Search Committee provides draft of the faculty search posting to the FEA
6. The FEA and the Dean’s office review the faculty search posting, and also solicit input from Terry Curry’s office, in advance of the actual posting.
7. The Department Chair and Chair of the Search Committee are required to attend the MSU LEAD workshop on “Success in the Academic Hiring Process From Start to Finish: Clarifying Purposes and Procedures, Avoiding Delays, and Increasing Faculty Quality and Diversity.”
8. The search committee meets with Paulette Granberry Russell and Terry Curry, along with the FEA to discuss issues related to carrying out an effective search and minimizing bias in the process. The Faculty Search Toolkit developed by ADAPP is shared with search committee members. Approaches for generating a diverse applicant pool are discussed and information about the various resources and data bases available through the Office for Inclusion & Intercultural Initiatives are shared with the group. The importance of being proactive in identifying candidates is emphasized.
9. The Dean and the FEA meet with the PFA after the completion of each search to assess the effectiveness of the process and identify any improvements that can be instituted in future searches.
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Men’s Leadership in STEM: Results from Four Focus Groups

BACKGROUND

This report summarizes data collected in four focus groups that were held at the request of Tamara Reid Bush, PhD, a Co-PI for the MSU ADAPP – ADVANCE grant. The four focus groups paralleled those conducted with women in 2010 and were composed of male administrators (Deans, Associate and Assistant Deans, Chairs and Directors) and leaders in their professional or disciplinary societies. All focus groups addressed the same basic questions and were conducted by Miles A. McNall, PhD and Celeste Sturdevant Reed, PhD.

In the sections below, we present themes that emerged throughout the focus groups as well as those that were specific to particular questions. We note where there was agreement by multiple groups, several people in the same group, or only one person.

CONTEXT

Since we held the focus groups with women leaders two years ago, the university context has changed dramatically. The men who participated in the chairs’ focus group gave us a sense of being under siege, having little support in their college and none at upper administrative levels as they pursued their work as unit administrators. That is in marked contrast from the sense we had of women chairs and directors, who hardly mentioned budgets or the expansion of class sizes. This may be due to the fact that they were more attuned to personal issues (including family care, men talking credit for their work, etc.).

The second striking change is the difference between how men who are leaders in their disciplinary/professional (disc/prof) societies talked about their experiences. Perhaps it is a difference in expectations, but the women we talked with two years ago mentioned personal and organizational benefits accruing from their participation while men could only talk about how indifferent the University generally is to their “volunteering” in this way.

Finally, ADAPP hiring policies are not welcomed universally. In the Chairs focus group, several men spoke at great length about how the approach being used in their college was (or was not) working and one said vehemently, “one size does not fit all.” They referred to it as a 25- or 28-step hiring process that was causing them great difficulty, particularly when pursuing scarce top-notch women candidates. In fact, one chair mentioned that the process was so cumbersome, that his unit lost the opportunity to hire an outstanding female candidate.
SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WOMEN’S AND MEN’S RESPONSES

There was very little difference in the ways titled leaders – men and women – talked about their careers. In terms of career paths, there was a mix of Deans and chairs promoted from inside and hired from the outside in both groups. Everyone that we talked with at the Associate/Assistant (Asst/Asst) Dean level had been asked by their Dean to take that position.

There was a difference in mentoring between men and women. Whereas mentoring was important to some women, we could find no men who admitted to having a peer or superior mentor. Both groups did talk about the importance of networking, primarily among peers.

Many of the leadership advantages were similar, although women were much more eloquent in describing them than the men were.
THE QUESTIONS

Q1a: What were the factors that led to your decision to take on your current titled position? (Deans, Associate/Assistant [Asst/Asst] Deans, Chairs/Directors)

Deans and Chairs were a mix of having been hired from the outside and rising through the ranks; no Assc/Asst Deans were hired from the outside. Only one Dean mentioned that he had an active research and teaching load; he said maintained his research activities to model that it could be done. However, all of the Assc/Asst Deans did have active research projects. The topic of maintaining a research portfolio did not come up in the Chairs group.

Three general reasons for taking administrative roles crossed all titled groups:
1. Wanting to make a positive difference in faculty and student lives
2. Seeing some change in the institution/organization/unit and thinking that they could do it.
3. They were asked to assume the position and again thought they could do the job well.

The phrase “it was the right time in my career…” came up solely in the Deans group from a Dean who said he had been pursued by headhunters for some time but never felt he could leave his former institution before now.

At the Assc/Asst Dean and Chair levels this request to take on a titled leadership position was sometimes accompanied by the statement that “if you don’t take it, someone (less qualified, less able, you don’t like) will…” take it.

There was general agreement in the Assc/Asst Deans group that their route into that position was being asked by the Dean. We followed up with “what made you take it?” One “Dean-let” said “frankly, my funding wasn’t on track so it was another avenue for me to pursue.” Several concurred with the statement that it was an opportunity for creativity and problem-solving and an intellectual challenge of a different kind. One person recounted another saying that being an Associate Dean was a part-time job; unfortunately it happened in 15 minute increments every hour!

Chairs came to their jobs in one of three ways: 1) they were hired in from the outside; 2) they were in that position because of an unsuccessful search for an outside candidate (and in at least two cases there would have been dire ramifications for the department had he not stepped forward); and 3) the job rotated through the senior faculty and it was his turn. One person commented that although he ran for the position, he was the only candidate; he has now been the chair for 11 years.

Q1b: Have you held a leadership position before this one?

All of the Deans had held a previous titled leadership (chair or associate/assistant dean) position, and one commented that he had held both the chair and an associate dean position at the same time. One of the Associate Deans said he had been an Assistant Dean before; one an Associate Dean for Research prior to

---

1. There was only one interdisciplinary Program Director in the Chairs/Directors group. Therefore this group is referred to as Chairs.
assuming his current broader Associate Dean position; several had held Chair positions. For the Chairs, their current position may have been: 1) their first leadership position; or 2) a move up from an Associate chair/director position; in the case of people hired in from the outside, they may have previously been a chair.

**Q1d: Did you have a mentor during your leadership role?**

Because mentoring had played such a key role for many of the women, we asked the men about the extent to which they had a mentor or mentored others. Several Deans reported being mentored by their staff who knew the ropes. None of them reported having a mentor who was a peer or at a higher organizational level, although one person in the Assc/Asst Dean group mentioned that his Dean had shown him what to do and said it was important to have someone off of which to bounce ideas. One Dean described how he meets with the chairs in his college once a month. For those chairs who are senior, experienced people, he just talks with them about how things are going; for those chairs who are less experienced, he tries to insert suggestions about dealing with faculty, etc. in the conversation. He didn’t characterize this as mentoring and we thought of it as supervision. Another Dean mentioned that there was a two-day University-sponsored training program for new chairs, but as far as he could tell they only covered how the University was run.

Several in each group reported getting together with others at their level. For example, the Assc/Asst Dean group concurred that the team of Assc/Asst Deans in the college made all the difference in their ability to work smoothly together. This same group characterized what was taking place as more networking than mentoring, for example getting support via email. One person in that group suggested having a lot of conversations with others as colleagues to draw on their expertise. They also acknowledged that it was important to listen to faculty, especially when they had no direct control over them, but often needed faculty to cooperate with something the Assc/Asst Deans were responsible for completing.

One person in the Chairs group mentioned that he had been to a CIC training program for new chairs that he did not find particularly helpful, but it was a network of other people in the same position that he could now contact. Another person mentioned that all the chairs in his field in the CIC get together periodically.

**Q2: What are the challenges of being in a leadership role?**

There were no responses to this question that could be generalized across the three titled groups. These responses are organized by rank (Dean plus Assc/Asst Dean, Dean plus Chair, etc.)

The first response is the most obvious response: relationships with colleagues change, and that change may not be comfortable. In the Assc/Asst Dean group they acknowledged that they had no direct reporting relationship with faculty but nonetheless needed them to cooperate in order to get their own tasks accomplished.

One dean mentioned, and others concurred, that not all the directions the institution is moving in will meet with their approval but it is important not to disagree publically. Another said it was important to balance being a team player with constructive disagreement – and how difficult it was to know where to
draw the line. Another dean described this as balancing the “here and now” versus the strategic. The Assc/Asst Deans used different language: one said you don’t always get to choose your battles. Another cautioned the group to make sure they were working on the right thing. Finally, one said he tried to determine whether this task has to be done versus this task will eventually go away if I ignore it.

Both Deans and Assc/Asst Deans recognized the unpredictability of their jobs. The Deans were more philosophical, accepting that they had to be willing to turn their lives over to a trusted assistant and surrender what they thought they were going to do at any given time. “Both the job and other people have a call on our time” was how one Dean phrased it.

Deans acknowledged that budgets were getting cut and with that the emphasis has now changed: it is more important to get grants. (We think this has been the case for several years and thus is not a recent change.) One Dean characterized this as “we’re all capitalists; we’re all in competition with each other.” The Chairs focus group members said the only way to get more (recurring?) money now is to come up with an initiative that the University (the Provost) would accept. But getting an internal grant was a mixed blessing because it only made their unit budget larger, which resulted in having to give more money back in the next round of budget cutting. The University’s goal of growing the student body also created more difficulties for the departments because having more students did not necessarily translate into getting more funds to service those students. One chair said they had 100 students in an introductory course in their major, but not enough funds to support graduate students to handle all the sections needed.

A Dean said the nature of the faculty job is one of privilege, while the administrative jobs are much more difficult with increases in regulation and initially stagnation but now reduction of resources. Chairs acknowledged that they were being asked to do more with less. One said, “If I had to get tenure now, I don’t think I would be able to do it.”

Both the Deans and Chairs also agreed that MSU is far more complicated than it needs to be. The Deans described the situation as organizational chaos with many units’ missions not as well articulated as they might be. The chairs saw the situation slightly differently: that it was too top down. One chair described himself as a “shit umbrella”, trying to keep bad things in the University from falling on his faculty.

Assc/Asst Deans noted that the personality of their Dean made a big difference in their jobs. When we mentioned in the Chairs focus group that the Deans had recognized that the job of chair was more difficult than theirs – since they as Deans were able to keep an emotional distance and Chairs were much more involved in the daily life of their faculty – one skeptic in the Chairs group commented that perhaps that Dean didn’t realize his own contribution to the difficulty his Chairs had.

Both the Assc/Asst Deans and the chairs agreed that all problems are people problems. Several Chairs expanded on this by saying that it only took 1-2 unhappy people to disrupt things in their unit.

Only Assc/Asst Deans complained about the lack of time. We hypothesize that this may be a result of all of them continuing their research projects. They were also the only group to mention that their job might be temporary and thus they didn’t want to alienate others too badly.

The male leaders in prof/disc societies had several unique challenges. First, there is no money for travel costs to attend these meetings. In prior years professional/disciplinary societies often had funds to support their leaders attending meetings (most often from lucrative publications) but those funds have disappeared. Second, all attendance at prof/disciplinary meetings is voluntary. Some were adamant that the University does not value such service AT ALL, unless it leads to grants/publications. One person mentioned that MSU is extraordinarily incestuous and that connections to the outside do make a
difference in getting grants.

In no group did we ask the Q2b: **How could barriers for leadership positions be reduced or how could the position be made more attractive?**

**Q3: In your experience, if you have offered a leadership position to a woman, what were the reasons she shared about why she did or didn’t take it?**

The Deans group gave four responses:

1. Never had a woman turn down a position I offered; in the Chairs group one said he offered an administrative position to a woman and she took it because it was a clear interest of hers.
2. Had a woman who did not go through the five year review because this (faculty position) was not what she wanted to do with her life.
3. Was a “star in her field” or had a 9-month endowed chair and (reasonably) didn’t want to exchange that status for a 12-month administrative position.
4. Had young children (the “star”)

One of the Assc/Asst Deans said there were so few women in his (science) field and administration was seen as less desirable than research and teaching.

The male leaders felt that MSU needed to reconsider what role professional/disciplinary society leadership plays in the life of faculty. If this voluntary service is viewed as extraneous, no one – male or female – is going to do it.

**Q4: What are the advantages of being in a leadership role?**

All three titled groups of leaders agreed that being a leader gave them a greater understanding of the University, helped them learn things they would not have otherwise known, and introduced them to other leaders. Both the Deans and Assc/Asst Deans talked about advantages in terms of students, including getting students back on track in their programs, turning out students who could ask probing questions, and seeing graduating students (a dad with tears in his eyes as his daughter received an award). Assc/Asst Deans mentioned intervening successfully in the University bureaucracy, enjoying a greater variety of tasks, and that they were never bored. Chairs saw their roles as necessary for anyone wanting to move up in the University bureaucracy and also that they could advocate for their departments.

Leaders in prof/disc societies were asked if their roles were preparation for titled roles. They responded that some of the skills they used, like running meetings, were transferable and also weakly aligned with department needs. The only tangible value that the group could see for prof/disc society participation was having outside people to name when going through the promotion/tenure process.
Faculty Mentoring Toolkit

A Resource for Faculty and Administrators at Michigan State University
The Michigan State University Mentoring Toolkit was edited by Clare Luz, with assistance from Tiffeny Jimenez. Other contributors include: Deborah DeZure, Paulette Granberry Russell, Elizabeth Simmons, Melissa McDaniels and Theodore Curry. Special assistance was received from Amy Blair, Copyright Librarian at Michigan State University.

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under grant number 0811205. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of ADAPP-ADVANCE and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

The Michigan State University Faculty Mentoring Toolkit was developed by conducting both a comprehensive search of the mentoring literature, as well as a review of existing mentoring resources at other postsecondary institutions. A numerical endnote format, as well as an alphabetical footnote format, is utilized throughout this document. A list of sources and resources can be found in the back of this toolkit. Every attempt has been made to properly cite sources for documents used in original or adapted form. Several sections in this toolkit can be found as independent documents on the ADAPP-ADVANCE website (www.adapp-advance.msu.edu). Please direct any questions and feedback to adapp@msu.edu.
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Welcome to the Michigan State University
FACULTY MENTORING TOOLKIT

This toolkit is designed to provide basic information on formal mentoring and the University Mentoring Policy, as well as resources to help units establish mentoring programs, relationships, or networks.

Why is mentoring important? It is important to ensure that all faculty, particularly women and persons of color, have access to all of the information and support they need to be successful. This is especially critical at a moment in time when we most need to achieve faculty stability and excellence, provide high quality teaching to a diverse student body, and to compete globally.

Mentoring is not new. It has been in existence for centuries, in many forms and called by many names. It has historically been inherent in most cultures as an important way of passing on cultural heritage and traditions. More recently, the corporate world has accepted the business case for mentoring, recognizing its value to improving work productivity, satisfaction and retention. There is now a growing body of literature and empirical evidence in support of formal mentoring in the Academy to mitigate bias and promote career development and success.

MSU has a rich array of resources to assist with career development and aims to build on this foundation and provide faculty with tools to succeed both personally and professionally. The University policy and this toolkit focus initially on early career faculty. However, formal mentoring can make a critical difference at all stages of academic careers and the University is committed to developing and supporting mentoring resources for all faculty. Many of the tools in this kit can be modified for use at any stage of an academic career.

For more information on any of the toolkit contents or other mentoring resources, please contact ADAPP-ADVANCE at adapp@msu.edu, 517-353-8818, or www.adapp-advance.msu.edu.
RESOURCES FOR UNIT ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY

1.1 Michigan State University Faculty Mentoring Policy

This policy was issued by the Office of the Provost on March 1, 2011 (to be effective fall semester 2011); it reflects advice by the Faculty Council and the University Committee on Faculty Affairs.

Each college shall implement a formal mentoring program by August 16, 2011. As a part of the college program, colleges may also require that each department or school develop its own unit level-mentoring program. Effective mentoring is important to enhancing academic excellence and building a progressively stronger faculty composed of members who meet continuously higher standards and are competitive nationally and internationally. Mentoring programs will help the University achieve its goals for a high-quality faculty, diversity, inclusive excellence, and a respectful, positive work environment in which all members of the University community can thrive. While the responsibility for career development and success is ultimately that of the individual faculty member, opportunity, mentoring and the degree of environmental support that is available can affect success. There are many forms of mentoring programs and no single model will meet the needs of all units or individuals. Each college (and/or unit) should develop a program that is most relevant to its needs based upon evidence based best practices. The practices and procedures in colleges may vary; however, all college mentoring programs must incorporate, at a minimum, the principles included below.

PRINCIPLES

1. For faculty members with joint appointments, there should be one mentoring plan for the faculty member, coordinated among the units, with leadership from the faculty member’s lead unit.

2. Faculty members need different kinds of mentoring at different stages of their career. Initially, at minimum, colleges are expected to provide a program for mentoring pre-tenure, tenure system faculty, and build upon the program as capacity allows. This might include, for example, the addition of associate professors, HP faculty, or fixed term faculty for whom there is a long-term commitment.

3. Colleges, units and mentors should demonstrate sensitivity to potentially different challenges faced by diverse faculty including women, persons of color, and other facets of identity.

4. Conflicts of interest should be minimized, confidentiality protected, and all faculty members provided an environment in which they can address concerns without fear of retribution.
6. Mentoring policies should be clearly communicated to all faculty members, and efforts must be made to ensure that there is clarity of both expectations and roles for all parties.

7. Mentoring excellence will be considered in the annual review of faculty.

8. Formative evaluation shall be incorporated into the design of the mentoring program to maximize benefit to each individual being mentored.

9. Colleges shall assess the effectiveness of their mentoring program on a cycle not to exceed five years.

Endorsed by:
University Committee on Faculty Affairs, November 23, 2010; Faculty Council, January 18, 2011.
1.2 Frequently Asked Questions About The MSU Mentoring Policy

The following questions and answers are offered to help clarify the Michigan State University Faculty Mentoring Policy. For more information or to submit additional questions, please contact ADAPP-ADVANCE at adapp@msu.edu, 517-353-8818, or www.adapp-advance.msu.edu.

Q: Why does MSU have a university-wide faculty mentoring policy?
Evidence shows that formal mentoring based on best practices makes a positive difference in achieving career success. This policy sends a clear message that Michigan State University is committed to every tenure system faculty member having access to formal mentoring as a tool to advance their academic career.

Q: When was the university mentor policy effective?
Every college was required to have a formal faculty mentoring program by 8/16/2011.

Q: What constitutes a formal, college-level mentoring “program”? 
A formal mentoring program intentionally ensures that every faculty member has access to formal mentoring relationships and resources. It is developed, based on best practices, incorporates the principles of the MSU policy, and is explicitly communicated to all faculty. In addition to formal mentoring relationships, the college “program” can include an array of college led resources such as workshops, speakers, mentor recognition, mentor/mentee social events, and evaluation. Check the ADAPP-ADVANCE website for resources on best practices at college/unit level and designing effective mentoring programs.

Q: Will every department be required to have a formal policy and/or program?
This is up to the individual college. Colleges may opt to administer formal mentoring relationships at the college-level or require that each department or school develop a program, with college oversight.

Q: What is formal mentoring?
Formal mentoring is when one or more mentors are intentionally assigned to a mentee and assume responsibility for facilitating the professional development of the mentee through activities such as providing information, advice, encouragement, and connections to other mentors, colleagues and professional networks. It is voluntary and can result in a two-way, mutually beneficial relationship. No one mentor can fulfill all of a mentee’s needs. Mentees have a responsibility to maximize and build on the mentor/mentee relationship with other mentors and career development activities. Check the ADAPP-ADVANCE website for handouts on mentor models, the role of mentors and a sample of typical mentor behaviors.
Q: Will every faculty member be required to have a mentor?
The policy explicitly states that a faculty member may choose not to participate in the formal mentoring program. College programs should, therefore, include language specifying that faculty members can opt out with no penalties. The unit policy should also specify that faculty members who opt out can join/rejoin the mentoring program at a later date upon request. It is recommended that there be a process in place by which faculty members designate in writing their decision to opt out. Related to this, the policy should allow the mentee to change mentors without penalty.

Q: Will specific mentoring models be mandated for colleges, units, or individuals?
On the contrary, beyond the nine principles outlined in the policy, the policy intentionally provides flexibility for colleges/units to choose mentoring program models that best meet the needs of their faculty, and faculty are encouraged to build on these models for maximum benefit. Many mentoring models now exist in addition to the traditional single mentor/mentee dyad. The intent is that colleges and departments should choose models that provide the highest likelihood for individual career development. Check the ADAPP-ADVANCE website for a list of mentor models.

Q: What is the best model of mentoring to use?
The traditional model is the mentor/mentee dyad with the mentor being either from within or outside the unit. However, current research suggests that it is much more productive to have multiple mentors. Mentors and mentees are both encouraged to build on and supplement a primary mentoring relationship with other mentors [formal and/or informal] and career development activities. The model chosen depends on the needs and resources of the individual faculty member, unit and college. The first step is to conduct an assessment of existing needs, resources, and challenges at the unit or mentor/mentee level. The ADAPP-ADVANCE team and Michigan State University’s Office of Faculty & Organizational Development (F&OD) can provide guidance and tools on how to go through this process. In addition, each college has a college-appointed Faculty Excellence Advocate (FEA). The FEAs are available as a resource for information related to the ADAPP-ADVANCE goals including mentoring. Check the ADAPP-ADVANCE website for needs assessment instruments.
Q: How should mentoring programs address faculty members with joint appointments?
For faculty members with joint appointments, there should be one mentoring plan for the faculty member, coordinated among the units, with leadership from the faculty member’s lead unit. Each unit should address joint appointments in their respective mentoring policies. For example, the policy may state that unit leaders from participating departments will determine, in consultation with the faculty member, a mentoring plan that best meets the faculty member’s needs. The plan may follow the model of one department or the other, be a hybrid, or be highly individualized. It should be written, and include clear expectations for all parties and leadership.

Q: Are colleges expected to provide a mentoring program for all faculty members or only for pre-tenure, tenure system faculty members?
Faculty members need different kinds of mentoring at different stages of their career. Initially, at minimum, colleges are expected to provide a mentoring program for pre-tenure, tenure system faculty, and build upon the program as capacity allows. Ideally, mentoring programs should be available for mid-level and senior faculty members, HP faculty, and fixed term faculty for whom there is a long-term commitment.

Q: How can colleges and units demonstrate sensitivity to potentially different challenges faced by diverse faculty including women, persons of color, and other facets of identity?
Administrators and mentors first need to have appreciation for the potential, unique challenges faced by diverse faculty and of their own biases, both conscious and unconscious. Michigan State University provides programs on bias to raise awareness and understanding. Second, the college/unit should proactively build a culture of appreciation for diversity. For example, ensure that the pool of people being considered for hiring, promotions and key assignments is diverse and reflects the diversity in the unit. Careful consideration should be given to the choice of a mentor to be someone who understands the potential challenges and can serve in a developmental role. The mentor can help overcome challenges by being willing to openly discuss them to avoid “protective hesitation”; encouraging assignments that build competence, trust, and confidence; acknowledging achievements, publicly when possible; proactively helping the mentee build a large, heterogeneous professional and mentor network that reflects diversity in demographics, expertise, and roles; observing for signs of unfair criticism, scrutiny, assignments or other harmful treatment, both explicit and subtle undertones of bias; be willing to challenge it; and help focus discussions on actual performance.
Q: Should mentors also serve on their mentees’ review committees?
Ideally, mentors would not serve on their mentee’s review committee. However, in cases where this is unavoidable, the mentee should be clearly informed of the mentor’s dual role. The extent to which the mentor will be reporting to the committee should be discussed and clarified at the first mentor/mentee meeting. This will guide the nature of the mentor’s and mentee’s roles within their relationship. Check ADAPP-ADVANCE website for handouts on alternate mentor models, confidentiality, and negotiating mutual expectations and roles.

Q: How can conflicts of interest be minimized, confidentiality protected, and all faculty members provided an environment in which they can feel safe and address concerns without fear of retribution?
It is important that mentor’s/mentee’s roles are agreed upon and clearly stated at the outset of the relationship. Conflicts of interest and confidentiality should be openly discussed. If possible, it is recommended that a mentee have multiple formal mentors for different roles, with at least one that doesn’t serve on the review committee. Many mentoring models now exist in addition to a traditional single mentor/mentee dyad. One mentor may be external to the department, college, even university and would therefore not have a conflict of interest. One may be assigned to help advance teaching skills, another for research skills. Mentees should build upon their formal mentor(s), establish a “mentoring network” and draw upon the different strengths of each. In addition, a procedure should be in place by which a mentee can change mentors without penalty. Check ADAPP-ADVANCE website for handouts on alternate mentor models, confidentiality, and negotiating mutual expectations and roles.

Q: What incentives are there for senior faculty members to serve as mentors?
Mentoring early career faculty is expected as an important role for all tenure system faculty members. In recognition of the significant time required to provide good, formal mentoring, the University Mentoring Policy clearly states that, at minimum, mentoring excellence will be considered in the annual review of faculty. In addition, colleges/units are encouraged to provide other incentives for excellence such as mentoring awards, special events, release time, and news write-ups. The ADAPP-ADVANCE website provides additional incentive ideas.
Q: Do formal mentors need to be trained?
It is recommended that formal mentors, even experienced ones, participate in an initial orientation which can be provided at the unit, college, or university level. The Office of Faculty Organization & Development (F&OD) offers seminars related to best mentoring practices. Formal mentors should be encouraged to attend additional workshops to improve mentoring skills and network with other mentors.

Q: How will mentoring programs be evaluated or assessed for effectiveness?
As the policy states, formative evaluation should be incorporated into the design of college and/or unit-level programs so that performance, quality and outcomes can be tracked. More broadly, colleges should rigorously assess the mentoring program(s) in five-year cycles, at minimum. Evaluations should map to the college/unit mentoring plan and goals. There will be administration level goals such as establishing a program and measures of academic productivity as well as mentor/mentee level goals such as the perceived value of the relationship. Specific evaluation strategies and tools should be chosen based on the level of evaluation, set of goals, and mentoring model. ADAPP-ADVANCE team members and the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development (F&OD) are available to help colleges/units decide on assessment strategies that are relevant to their program.

Q: Will colleges be held accountable at the university level for their mentoring programs and if so, how?
Colleges will be asked to report on their mentoring programs to the Office of the Provost. Other ways in which the University can help track the existence and quality of mentoring programs in all colleges are currently under discussion.

Q: How can colleges ensure that mentoring policies, expectations and roles are clearly communicated to all faculty members?
Multiple communication strategies should be used on an ongoing basis and should emanate from the dean, chairs, directors, and mentors. In addition, each college has a college-appointed Faculty Excellence Advocate (FEA). One of the FEA’s roles is to communicate with administration and faculty on a regular basis and serve as a conduit and resource for information related to ADAPP-ADVANCE goals. FEAs and their contact information should be clearly identified. They will be proactively engaged in working with units and faculty. The college policy/program should be clearly stated in the college handbook. Regularly scheduled meetings, faculty orientation, special events, newsletters, television monitors, annual reports, and news publications are all good venues for disseminating information.
Q: What resources exist to assist colleges/units in developing formal mentoring programs?
Mentoring workshops have already been presented, and will continue to be offered. An online Faculty Mentor Resource Center has been launched where tools can be found to help colleges as they establish programs and mentors/mentees as they build relationships. Many more resources will be added to the site, including a Mentor Toolkit, so please check it regularly for updates ([http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/faculty-mentoring-resource-center](http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/faculty-mentoring-resource-center)). College-appointed Faculty Excellence Advocates (FEA) are available to answer questions and assist colleges and faculty. The ADAPP grant team can provide consultations. The Office of Faculty and Organizational Development also provides consulting and has comprehensive resources to support mentoring ([http://fod.msu.edu](http://fod.msu.edu) and [http://fod.msu.edu/Leadership Resources/mentoring/index.asp](http://fod.msu.edu/Leadership Resources/mentoring/index.asp)).
1.3 Mentor Models

The following briefly addresses common questions on formal mentoring, describes existing mentor models, and provides suggestions for choosing a model to use.

**Q: What is formal mentoring?**

Formal mentoring is when one or more mentors are intentionally assigned to a mentee and assume responsibility for facilitating the professional development of the mentee through activities such as providing information, advice, encouragement, and connections to other mentors, colleagues and professional networks. It is voluntary and can lead to a two-way, mutually beneficial relationship. No one mentor can fulfill all of a mentee’s needs. Mentees have a responsibility to maximize, build on and supplement the mentor/mentee relationship with other mentors and career development activities. Check the ADAPP-ADVANCE website for handouts on typical mentor roles and behaviors, and negotiating mutual expectations.

**Q: Isn’t having a robust informal mentor network sufficient?**

Informal mentoring is critically important to career satisfaction and success. Formal mentoring is not meant to replace informal mentoring but to supplement and strengthen it. Evidence clearly indicates that formal mentoring makes a positive difference in achieving career success. It differs from informal mentoring in several important ways: it is intentional; participants are held accountable; it is based on best practices to promote a high-quality, productive relationship; and it is available to all faculty so that bias and unequal access, whether intended or unintended, is minimized.

**Q: What is the best model of mentoring to use?**

The traditional model is the mentor/mentee dyad with the mentor being either from within or outside the unit. However, current wisdom suggests that it is much more productive to have multiple mentors. Even if there is one primary formal mentor, mentors and mentees are both encouraged to build on and supplement this relationship with other mentors and career development activities. The model chosen depends on the needs and resources of the individual faculty member, unit and college. The first step is to conduct an assessment of existing needs, resources, and challenges at the unit or mentor/mentee level. The ADAPP-ADVANCE team and the Office of Faculty & Organizational Development (F&OD) can provide guidance and tools on how to go through this process. In addition, each college has a college-appointed Faculty Excellence Advocate (FEA). The FEAs are available as a resource for information related to the ADAPP-ADVANCE goals including mentoring.
EXAMPLES OF FORMAL MENTOR MODELS

A mentor model should be chosen or developed that meets the needs of a specific unit or individual. The list below includes traditional approaches as well as models developed by other institutions that pulled strategies from multiple sources to create a model appropriate to their needs and context. Some models use different terms such as protégée versus mentee and may distinguish mentoring from specific roles such as advising. However, all of these models share the goal of facilitating the professional development of mentees.

**Intentional Informal Mentoring**

Intentional informal mentoring involves overtly recognizing and supporting ways in which colleagues within a unit or professional network can serve as unassigned mentors [individually or collectively] and facilitate personal and professional development of its members. It recognizes that mentors are important and play different, critical roles at different times including that of communicator, advisor, coach, broker, advocate, and often a combination of each of these.

**Mentor/Mentee Dyad**

The traditional mentor/mentee dyad mentoring model is a top-down model that involves assigning a single senior faculty member to mentor an early career faculty member. The mentor may be from within or outside the unit. If the mentor is from within, serious attention should be paid to the issue of confidentiality and potential for conflict of interest. Ideally, mentors would not serve on a mentee’s review committee. If it is unavoidable, the mentee should be clearly informed of the mentor’s dual role. The extent to which the mentor will be reporting to the committee should be explicitly stated at the first meeting. This will guide the nature of the mentor/mentee relationship.

As multiple mentors are now recommended, both mentors and mentees should proactively promote supplementing the dyad with additional career development activities and by establishing a “mentor network” of other mentors [formal and informal] and drawing upon the different strengths of each.

**One-to-One Mentoring**

This one-to-one model differs slightly from the one-on-one mentor/mentee dyad. It links new tenure system faculty with tenured faculty mentors from within the same division/area but outside the mentee’s department. This approach of cross departmental matches was developed specifically to avoid potential conflicts of interest and allows early career faculty to speak more candidly with advisors who are not directly involved in their tenure review process. For more information, visit [http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Provost/Advance/mentoring_guide.pdf](http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Provost/Advance/mentoring_guide.pdf).
Multiple Mentors

If possible, it is recommended that a mentee have multiple formal mentors for different roles, with at least one that doesn’t serve on the review committee. One mentor may be external to the department, college, even university and would therefore not have a conflict of interest. One may be assigned to help advance teaching skills, another for research skills. Mentees should build upon their formal mentor(s), establish a “mentoring network” and draw upon the different strengths of each.

Mentoring Networks

The concept of mentoring networks is similar to multiple mentors but implies that consideration is given to strategically establishing a diverse network of mentors (formal and informal) who may be drawn from many places (internal and external) and who serve in different roles so that multiple needs are met. It is sometimes referred to as a “constellation of mentors.”

Mutual Mentoring

The mutual mentoring model is distinct in that it encourages the development of a broader, more flexible network of support to meet the needs of early- and mid-career faculty. It is based on the belief that all members of the academic community have something to teach and learn from each other. Faculty are encouraged to build a network of support consisting of a variety of mentoring “partners” including peers, near-peers, tenured faculty, chairs, administrators, external mentors, librarians, writing coaches and so forth. It is faculty driven with each faculty member mapping out their own individual plan that accommodates personal needs and preferences for types of contacts [one-on-one, small group, team or several types to meet different needs]. The faculty member is the primary agent of his/her own career development. Mentor networks are supplemented by campus wide programs and workshops, networking events, and micro and team grants. Examples of different types of networks that faculty members have developed as well as guidelines, to-do lists, and other resources are available at [http://www.umass.edu/ctfd/mentoring/downloads/Mutual%20Mentoring%20Guide%20Final%2011_20.pdf](http://www.umass.edu/ctfd/mentoring/downloads/Mutual%20Mentoring%20Guide%20Final%2011_20.pdf).
Career Advising

The term “career advising” is used instead of mentoring to avoid confusion with the mentoring model used in graduate school that typically involves a one-on-one advisor/advisee relationship. However, the goals and strategies are consistent with the concept of faculty mentoring. Career advising focuses on facilitating career success: obtaining tenure and career advancement and promotion through achievements in scholarship, external funding, teaching, and/or service. It rests on the premise that no one advisor can meet all of a faculty member’s needs and advising can take many different forms and involve many kinds of interactions and relationships including with peers. It should be geared to the developmental needs of the individual faculty member.

Peer Mentoring

Peer mentoring is generally done across departments, units and disciplines. The value of this strategy includes building relationships among diverse faculty members, creating opportunities for collaboration on research projects, and developing camaraderie among members that might not otherwise exist. It can be done one-on-one between experienced and new faculty, within groups, or through electronic communication. The following link is to a student peer mentoring program but the structure and strategies are equally relevant to faculty: http://www.csun.edu/eop/htdocs/peermentoring.pdf. Another resource is at http://www.ubc.ca/okanagan/ctl/support/peermentoring.html.

Virtual Mentoring or E-Mentoring

Virtual mentoring relationships are developed and/or maintained through online media. Such relationships may be developed in person and then maintained through email as in the case of meeting a national expert at a conference who agrees to provide continued advising via email. Others may begin with email or Facebook exchanges that eventually lead to meeting in person. The mentoring may exist entirely through electronic communication. Advantages to e-mentoring include the possibility of connecting with nationally and internationally recognized experts, senior faculty, and peers. It multiplies the number and diversity of mentors available to the mentee. A major online service for locating mentors and developing one-on-one guided mentoring relationships is the MentorNet (http://mentornet.net), a free, membership network for women in Engineering and Science that matches students, post-docs, and early-career researchers across universities and within industry. Another e-network to consider is Peer Resources - http://www.peer.ca/peer.html.
It is a fee-based membership network but if joining is not an option, significant information is still available to non-members from their home page. Tele-Mentoring over the Net is an e-network that is sponsored by the International Education and Resource Network (http://www.lear.org/circles/mentors.html). Although this site is aimed at students, teachers, and pre-service teachers in K-12 schools, many links and examples of tele-mentoring projects have applications in higher education. The Society for the Teaching of Psychology Mentoring Service (http://teachpsych.org/otrp/mentoring/index.php) is an e-mentorship site with names, schools, telephone numbers, and email addresses of several dozen psychology faculty willing to communicate with colleagues over topics, methods, issues, and specific courses in Psychology.

Create Your Own Model and Call It What You Want
Consider the different strategies used in existing models. Pull out those that are most relevant to a specific unit or individual. Create a hybrid model that is a good fit with identified needs, challenges, and available resources. Pilot it and evaluate its impact on agreed upon measures of productivity and satisfaction.

Peer Resources: A Comprehensive List of Mentoring Programs
The following link provides a list of thousands of mentoring programs with brief descriptions of the models (http://www.mentors.ca/mentorprograms.html). Scanning the list can provide an understanding of the range of mentor models that exist and ideas for models that may be a good fit with a unit’s needs. The list is available to non-members and is continually updated. Specific contact information is available only to members but may be found through internet research. The listings are organized by setting and can be searched by geographic location or key words. There is a college/university section but programs in other categories may be useful as well.

---

1.4 Confidentiality in Mentoring Relationships

No matter what mentor model is used, it is critically important to establish how issues of confidentiality will be handled. All faculty members need to work in an environment in which they can feel safe and able to address concerns without fear of retribution. A breach of confidentiality, or misunderstandings about confidentiality, can be harmful to the mentor-mentee relationship and potentially to the faculty member’s career. Below are strategies for minimizing conflict of interest and protecting confidentiality that should be considered at the outset of the relationship.

Clarify Confidentiality - Clarify how each party defines confidentiality. Do not assume all communications are private and confidential. Be clear with each other about what is to be held in confidence. Be realistic - total confidentiality may not always be possible, such as when the mentor also serves on the mentee’s review panel. Questions to facilitate this discussion include:

- What topics or issues are most in need of protection?
- Are there individuals with whom information may or may not be shared, including spouses/partners, with or without names? Both parties should disclose if a partner is a faculty member at MSU and in which department.
- In what situations might the mentor or mentee need to disclose information, what information and to whom?

Identify Conflicts of Interest – Conflicts of interest should be openly discussed. Ideally, mentors would not serve on a mentee’s review committee. However, in cases where this is unavoidable, the mentee should be clearly informed of the mentor’s dual role. The extent to which the mentor will be reporting to the committee should be discussed and clarified at the first mentor/mentee meeting.

Utilize Multiple Mentors – If possible, it is recommended that a mentee have multiple formal mentors for different roles, with at least one that doesn’t serve on the review committee. Many mentoring models now exist in addition to a traditional single mentor/mentee dyad. One mentor may be external to the department, college, even university and would therefore not have a conflict of interest. One may be assigned to help advance teaching skills, another for research skills. Mentees should establish a “mentoring network” and draw upon the different strengths of each mentor.

Create a Written Agreement - Address confidentiality within a written mentor/mentee agreement. It may be as simple as stating, in writing, what sensitive issues are off-limits for discussion or those which will be held in confidence. Both parties should stay true to whatever agreement is made, written or not. Over time, this will build trust. Agreements may need to be revisited periodically.
Have a No-Fault Exit Plan\textsuperscript{11} - If the match is not working or worthwhile, for whatever reason, neither party should feel pressure to maintain the match. Discuss the situation as openly as possible, including being clear about reasons for requesting a change. Both parties can then agree to a “no-fault conclusion,” without penalty. The chair should be notified and requests made for a new match.

2.1 Best Mentoring Program Practices for College/Unit Leaders

The “best” formal mentoring program is one that is designed to meet the needs of an individual college or unit. Different models exist and deciding which model is best requires aligning the unit’s particular needs, goals and available resources. However, there is general agreement in the literature that successful formal mentoring programs share the following key attributes:

- Top-level sponsorship.
- College expectations for mentoring and leadership are clearly reflected in the college’s strategic plan, allocation of resources, and communications.
- College-level person is appointed to oversee and facilitate mentor related programming.
- College-level support is available in the form of centralized services for efficiency, e.g. arrange orientations, organize workshops that all units can utilize, locate mentors.
- Chair/director support and leadership for mentoring is clearly reflected in the unit-level strategic plan, budget, resources, communications, and time allowed for participation.
- Unit-level person is appointed to oversee and champion program as part of job description.
- Formal programs are designed by each college/unit based on their individual needs, strengths and constraints, and that comply with the university mentor policy.
- Expectations for annual review and promotion are clearly stated and match disciplinary norms.
- Mentoring program policies, goals, and expectations that clarify role of mentors/mentees are clearly identified and communicated.

Examples:

- Role of mentor in reappointment, promotion and tenure (can affect trust; need for “safe” place)
- Duration of match (e.g., one year, renewable, opportunity for reassignment)
- Expectation for meetings (mentoring won’t happen if people aren’t meeting)
- Confidentiality
• Clear and effective process for identifying and matching mentors and mentees exists.
• Program addresses diversity with an inclusive process vs. singling out groups by identity.
• Orientation/training is provided for mentors/mentees to clarify program goals, expectations and policies, review best practices, and provide tips and resources.
• Recognition is given to active participants, both mentors and mentees (recognition for mentors is included in annual review, e.g. service to the department; awards, special events and other forms of recognition are given regularly).
• An evaluation plan, consisting of both formative and summative strategies, exists to regularly assess attainment of goals, effectiveness of processes, and measurable outcomes.

2.2 Other Tips and Best Practice Documents

TWELVE TIPS FOR DEVELOPING EFFECTIVE MENTORS

MENTORING NEW FACULTY: ADVICE TO DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

TOP 10 LIST FOR MENTORING JUNIOR FACULTY

2.3 Checklist: Developing a Faculty Mentoring Program

PHASE 1: UNIT ASSESSMENT
The most effective mentoring programs are grounded in the needs of the unit and can be supported by available resources. Therefore, it is critical to conduct a systematic needs/resources assessment versus making decisions based on limited perspectives and assumptions. An assessment uncovers what is most important to faculty members, current resources to address mentoring needs, and gaps in resources. Assessments can be conducted in multiple ways such as interviews, public forums, online/hard-copy surveys, review of archival records/data, and observations. Check “How to carry out a needs assessment survey.” Use the following checklist to guide the whole process. It will help assure your program is aligned with University policy.

- First Things First: A Planning Meeting
  The first step is having a mentoring program planning meeting with major stakeholders who have an interest in, can inform and make decisions about a mentoring program (e.g. FAC chair, administrators, faculty representing different career stages). Appoint someone to oversee the design/planning phase.
Assess Existing Programming and Alignment with University Mentor Policy

Does a unit mentoring program exist? If yes, use the following checklist to determine if it addresses all principles in the university mentor policy. If no, use the checklist for planning purposes. What processes already exist that can serve as a program foundation?

- At minimum, every pre-tenure faculty member has access to a formal mentor.
- Mentoring needs at different career stages are taken into consideration.
- Faculty members with joint appointments are ensured one plan, coordinated between units, led by primary unit.
- Potentially different challenges faced by diverse faculty including women, persons of color and other facets of identity are addressed.
- Policies/procedures are in place to minimize conflicts of interest and protect confidentiality.
- Faculty members can choose whether or not to have a mentor.
- Mentoring policies, expectations and roles are clearly communicated to all faculty.
- Formal mentoring is considered in the annual review of mentors.
- A plan exists to evaluate the mentoring program on an ongoing basis.
- Long-term evaluation plans exist, to track outcomes (e.g., every year internally and every 5th year minimum at the college and university-level).

Collect Additional Data

- Assess the mentoring needs of faculty members and resources in the unit using interviews, focus groups, surveys, and observation. What do people want and need?
- Determine what resources exist that can support a mentoring program.
- Learn about the range of mentoring models - See Mentor Models handout.

Create a Timeline for Program Development Planning

- Take into account planning meetings, needs assessment, data collection/analyses, implementation, and evaluation.
- Program plan accounts for time to gain the buy-in of faculty.
- Consider summer schedules.
PHASE 2: Designing Your Program

The following are examples of key program elements and decisions you might make for each element.

- **Determine Program Goals (both unit- and mentor/mentee-level)**
  
  **Examples:**
  
  - To provide support for new faculty
  - Clarify expectations for promotion and tenure
  - Increase retention
  - Increase productivity (e.g., number of publications, grants submitted/funded, etc.)
  - Tenure for early career faculty
  - Sustain vitality and productivity of senior faculty
  - Build community, collegiality, positive climate
  - Promote acculturation to values and needs of the department, college and institution
  - Assist faculty in balancing teaching, research, service, department politics
  - Provide a “safe” venue in which to discuss concerns

- **Determine Specific Measurable Outcomes for Each Program Goal**
  
  **Examples:**
  
  - All tenure track faculty will obtain tenure
  - Unit publications will double
  - Mentee satisfaction surveys will be completed by all mentees
  - Mentoring is provided by senior faculty from different departments

- **Determine Desired Program Design Elements that Meet Needs and Goals**
  
  - For whom (e.g., pre-tenure only, all faculty, mid-career faculty, etc.)
  - By whom (e.g., internal or external mentors)
  - Mentor criteria
    (e.g., expertise in research and/or teaching, grant funded, etc.)
  - Opt in/out policy
    (e.g., written, clear, form used for faculty to opt out)
  - Selection/assignment process
    (e.g., by chair, mentor coordinator, mentor, committee)
  - Mentor model (See Section 1.3)
    (e.g., mentor/mentee dyad, committee)
  - Role of mentor in review process
    (e.g., should mentors be tenure champions? Should they recuse themselves from tenure decisions about their mentee?)
Confidentiality guidelines (See Section 1.4)
Duration of relationships (e.g., one year, until tenure is earned, etc.)
Termination policies
Training/orientation
(e.g., for mentors/mentees, initial/ongoing)
Rewards/recognition (See Section 2.5)
Evaluation plans
(e.g., needs assessment, ongoing monitoring to determine if mentoring is taking place [performance measures], and outcome measures
Overview/oversight plan

Determine Budget and Resources
Program Coordinator
Clerical support
Honoraria for Mentors
Other incentives/rewards
Training materials
Food and events
Guest speakers
Supplies/copying
External Evaluator

Determine Evaluation Plan and Protocols
Evaluation is meant to help measure success at both formative and summative stages. Formative evaluation assists in creating the best possible program by assessing components of structure and process throughout the life of the program for continuous quality improvement. Summative evaluation assesses the impact of the program on desired goals. Below are some basic steps to guide evaluation planning and delivery.

Identify WHY you would be most interested in evaluating your program. WHY is it important for you to know whether your mentoring program works or not? For example:

- We need to do a better job of retaining women faculty.
- We need faculty to be more successful at obtaining funding.
- We want faculty to be satisfied with their job in this unit/department.

Use your program goals and objectives to guide your evaluation.
Identify measurable indicators of change for each program objective. How will you know whether your program is working? What are indications of program success? (See Section 2.6)

Examples:

- If *short-term* goals are focused on mentee satisfaction, then mentee level of satisfaction with the program would be an indicator of success and would need to be tracked.

- If a *long-term* goal is to have every new faculty member obtain tenure status in the next 5 years, then an indicator would be overall success rates. A short-term goal of progress toward tenure could be measured by identifying benchmarks that need to be completed within an agreed upon timeframe. These indicators could be assessed each year through the annual review process.

Collect data on each indicator. It may be that needed data are already being collected such as in annual review letters and committee meeting minutes. Using existing records will reduce workload and increase the chances of evaluation becoming embedded in standard practice. Otherwise, ways in which to collect data will need to be determined. For example, if you determine that the length of the mentor/mentee relationship indicates program success, then track pairs, the length of time they work together, and reasons for ending the relationship. If mentee satisfaction indicates success then conduct mentor satisfaction surveys regularly. Anonymous, open-ended surveys may be most informative. Data can also be collected through focus groups, interviews, reports, etc.

Use results to adjust the program as necessary to meet goals. Findings of data analyses will help identify strengths and weaknesses and where to target improvements. For example, if mentee satisfaction surveys indicate that mentees feel they can’t switch mentors without negative personal or professional consequences, consider establishing a process by which “no fault“ changes can be made. For more immediate feedback, consider a confidential, anonymous way for faculty to provide feedback (e.g., a suggestion box, feedback to FEAs).

For more ideas about how to use results to adjust programs to meet goals, see:

PHASE 3: Program Implementation
The following is a general framework for implementation and evaluation:

- Inform administrators and faculty about the program
- Identify mentors
- Train mentors
- Invite mentees to participate
- Provide orientation program for mentors and mentees
- Provide venues for mentor-mentee relationships to develop
- Provide ongoing support and communication with mentors and mentees
- Provide events for mentors and mentees based on the program model
- Evaluate and report outcomes to key constituencies
- Modify model as appropriate

PHASE 4: Evaluation
Evaluation is important because it helps you understand whether your mentoring program is working. Good practice involves continuous formative and summative evaluation. Follow the evaluation plan that was established during the program planning phase (Phase 2). The Michigan State University Faculty Mentoring Policy requires that colleges assess the effectiveness of their mentoring programs on a cycle not to exceed five years.

2.4 Examples Of College Level Expectations, Policies and Programs at Michigan State University

LYMAN BRIGGS COLLEGE

Lyman Briggs College (LBC) views mentoring as an important aid to the professional development of faculty. The College sponsors a formal mentoring program to (a) ensure that all tenure-stream faculty below the rank of full professor have mentors, (b) help communicate expectations about progress and evaluations to faculty, (c) strengthen the evaluation process by having senior faculty stay informed about the accomplishments of junior colleagues, and (d) support mentoring as a value of the College.

At the same time, because a formal mentoring program linked to the evaluation process cannot meet the full range of mentoring needs, LBC also strongly encourages faculty to avail themselves of informal, peer, and external mentors; distinctions among these categories are briefly indicated below.

Formal Mentors

- Are assigned within the LBC mentoring program.
- Are more senior members of LBC or the joint appointment unit of the faculty member.
- Help communicate college (and joint appointment unit) expectations to mentees.
- Provide guidance about ways for the mentee to advance his/her career objectives.
- Help the mentee with “networking,” e.g., through introductions to other colleagues.
- Participate in the evaluation of mentees. Because LBC is highly interdisciplinary, it is important that each assistant or associate professor have colleagues from both the HPS1 and STEM1 sides of the College who are deeply familiar with their work.

Informal Mentors

- Are colleagues of any rank or discipline to whom a faculty member might regularly turn for advice on matters related to teaching, scholarship, or service.
- May provide guidance on one topic or many.
- May help with networking and integration into the unit and university.
- A faculty member may have multiple informal mentors for multiple topics.
Peer Mentors
• Informal mentors who are close in rank to the faculty member and may therefore have recently gone through similar career stages.
• Often a source of general guidance about unit culture and processes.

External Mentors
• Colleagues who are not appointed either in LBC or the faculty member’s joint appointment unit. May be appointed elsewhere within MSU or at another university or institution entirely.
• Often a senior scholar in the faculty member’s discipline(s) who can offer advice about disciplinary norms and engagement with the broader professional community.
• By mutual (and explicit) agreement with the mentee, can potentially serve as a “safe” mentor, someone with whom a mentee can share concerns or issues.

Formal Mentoring Committees in Lyman Briggs College

Membership
Each tenure-stream faculty member hired after 2003 is assigned a mentoring committee with at least three members; they continue to have a mentoring committee until attaining the rank of full professor. The initial assignment is made by the Dean, in consultation with the faculty of the Briggs Advisory Council. Assignments are reviewed at the mentee’s annual evaluation meeting with the Dean and the mentoring committee membership may be readily changed or augmented to meet the evolving needs of the mentee.

Each mentoring committee includes two tenure-stream faculty from LBC, at least one from the HPS disciplines and one from the STEM disciplines. For faculty with joint appointments, there will also be at least one member from the joint-appointment department, chosen in consultation with the department chair. The members of the mentoring committee should be of higher academic rank than the mentee whenever possible.
**Charge**

Members of the mentoring committee actively offer the mentee professional advice on teaching, scholarship, engagement, and other faculty duties. The classroom of the mentee should be visited two to three times each academic year by members of the committee (not necessarily the entire committee on each visit) and the mentee should receive specific, constructive feedback based on the visits. The committee as a whole should meet formally with the mentee once each term; the person responsible for arranging the formal meetings with an HPS (STEM) mentee is their LBC-HPS (LBC-STEM) mentor. Frequent informal meetings between committee members and mentees are also encouraged. On first meeting, the mentoring committee and the mentee should agree on mutual expectations for the mentoring relationship. These expectations should be periodically revisited and updated. Examples of topics the mentoring committee might address, as needed, include:

- Resources available to help with teaching (e.g., *pedagogical technology or methods being used in LBC, Lilly Seminars and Fellowships, Spring Institute on Teaching and Learning, Office of Faculty & Organizational Development*).
- Resources related to scholarship (e.g., *professorial assistants, internal MSU grants, external granting agencies, proposal-preparation services, LBC and ISP travel grants*).
- Opportunities for engagement and leadership within LBC and MSU or in the discipline.
- Introductions to colleagues with similar interests in LBC, in the joint appointment department or elsewhere.
- Campus networks for personal support such as issues regarding gender, race, sexual orientation and ethnicity.
- General expectations for teaching, scholarship and engagement within LBC and MSU.

**Role in Evaluation**

The formal mentoring committee is explicitly linked to the annual and Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RP&T) processes of LBC. Members of the mentee’s annual two-member LBC evaluation committee (called the 2PC) are usually drawn from the mentoring committee to provide continuity over time. Members of the mentee’s LBC faculty R/P/T committee are usually drawn from the mentoring committee to ensure that the R/P/T committee is familiar with the candidate’s work and progress.
The College of Human Medicine began a Faculty Mentoring Program in Fall 2005, based upon a recommendation from the Faculty Excellence Task Force. The overall goal of this program is to supplement existing departmental mentoring activities and to assist junior faculty in achieving the award of tenure. Six senior faculty members have been selected and trained as mentors. They meet with junior faculty on a periodic basis to: review academic progress to date, establish future academic goals, and provide assistance in achieving those goals. Once a year, the junior faculty receive written feedback from the CHM Mentors on their progress toward achieving tenure. Mentors and protégés meet periodically during the academic year, and at least twice a year, the entire group of CHM Mentors and Protégés meet to participate in professional development seminars. This program is available to all tenure system faculty.

In 2009 and 2010 the mentoring program provided the following faculty development opportunities:

- **Preparing Your Curriculum Vitae and Academic Portfolio**
  With William Anderson and Brian Mavis from the Office of Medical Education Research and Development.

- **Career Planning and Development**
  With Stephen Bogdewic, Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Professional Development at Indiana University School of Medicine, June 2009.

- **Expectations and Strategies for Achieving Tenure at MSU**
  With panelist, Terry Curry, Associate Provost and Vice President for Academic Human Resources, Marsha Rappley, CHM Dean, David Weismantel, CHM RPT Chair, William Spielman, Chair of Physiology, November 2009.

- **Write Winning Grants**
  With David C. Morrison, Grant Writer’s Seminars & Workshops LLC, January 2010.

- **Work Life Balance**
  With Ellen Kossek, University Distinguished Professor, Human Resources and Labor Relations, May 2010.
The College of Engineering believes that effective mentoring is important to the professional development and advancement of new faculty members. Traditionally, departmental chairpersons have provided mentoring through articulation of expectations and performance reviews. However, other responsibilities inherent in the faculty chairperson relationship may interfere with the open and frequent communication needed for effective mentoring.

The College of Engineering therefore recommends that each department develop a formal process by which new tenure-track faculty will be mentored by one or more senior faculty members, other than the chairperson. The mentor(s) should provide independent advice, active support, and timely information across all areas of professional activity - research, teaching, and service.

The College of Engineering recommends that each department explicitly document its mentoring program, indicating how mentors will be assigned and what their responsibilities will be. A mentor should be familiar with both the new faculty member’s professional sphere and the performance standards likely to yield favorable action from evaluation committees. Mentors are expected to commit at least two years to the effort, which should be reported annually as a service activity and appropriately recognized by the department and college. Formal assignment of a mentor to a faculty member should not discourage other faculty members from also offering professional advice. However, all mentoring discussions should be considered privileged.

Conversation regarding suitable mentors should begin at the time of hire, and the mentoring process should begin soon thereafter. While mentoring activities are expected to vary, mentors should be available to meet frequently with the candidate and assist in the following ways:

- Serve as a collegial confidant and, upon request, as a liaison to administrators.
- Clarify department and college expectations for promotion and tenure, and discuss strategies for success in evaluation processes.
- Encourage submission of proposals and papers, and help critique drafts.
- Advise on development of new research collaborations.
- Advise on recruitment and retention of graduate students.
- Assist with procedural details of laboratory and infrastructure development.
- Offer suggestions on course preparation, classroom delivery, examinations, TAs, and grading.
- Help identify appropriate service activities and other professional opportunities.
- Provide periodic, off-the-record reviews of professional progress.
- Advise on optimal time allocation across research, teaching, and service missions.
2.5 Incentives and Recognition

Incentives, both formal and informal, recognize faculty contributions and excellence and build morale, motivation, and a positive work environment. The University Mentor Policy specifies that, at minimum, mentoring excellence will be considered in the annual review of faculty. There are a number of ways to recognize faculty. The following is a list of possible rewards that can be given formally or informally; one time or regularly; planned or spontaneously. Be consistently clear that good mentoring efforts are valued. Most of these rewards require little or no funding.

Why are incentives and recognition important?

When done correctly, they can result in:

• Improved performance and productivity
• Improved morale and motivation
• Increased sense of self-respect and confidence
• Increased retention
• Enhanced relationships
• Open channels of communication
• Reinforcement of university/unit values, policies and culture
• Mutual commitment

Incentive Principles

• If-Then: If a performance meets or exceeds expectations, then reward it.
• ASAP: Give the reward as soon as possible after the performance has occurred.
• Tradition and Variety: Although there is value in tradition and receiving a time-honored reward shared by prior luminaries, there are times when change should be considered. Changing the reward may help maintain its effect.
• Spontaneity: Unexpected rewards convey that good work is continuously noticed and valued.

Keys to Selecting the Right Reward

• Find out what faculty members will find rewarding.
• Watch - Pay attention to how faculty members spend free time or what their hobbies are.
• Listen - By listening, you learn about faculty members interests or work place concerns.
• Ask - If you’re unsure, ask.
Ideas for Incentives and Recognition

- Praise, “thank you” in person and/or in front of others
- Email thank you
- Letter of appreciation with copies to the faculty member’s file and top administrators
- Publicity - mention in newsletter
- Electronic message boards recognizing accomplishments
- “Behind the scenes” Award - for those not normally in the lime light
- Recognize anniversary of start-date or other milestones
- Opportunity for advanced training/attendance at seminars or conferences
- More frequent assignment of responsibilities the faculty member enjoys
- Reassign work that faculty member does not enjoy
- Release time from teaching or some other responsibility
- More autonomy to determine how a project is completed
- Additional staff for project development
- Upgrade of computer
- Certificate of accomplishment
- A plaque at awards banquet
- A medal to be worn with formal academic robes
- March first at graduation

2.6 Evaluation Resources For Mentoring Programs

EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS FOR MENTOR/MENTEE RELATIONSHIP

This article introduces (and provides samples of) both the “Mentorship Profile Questionnaire” and the “Mentorship Effectiveness Scale,” both developed by John Hopkins University, School of Nursing, Ad Hoc Faculty Mentoring Committee.

EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MENTORING PROGRAMS

This is an evaluation report presented to the University of Pennsylvania about its faculty mentoring program. Includes: recommended components of program evaluation AND evaluation strategies to assess process and outcomes.
3.1 Best Practices For Mentors And Mentees In Academic Settings

The “best” faculty mentoring happens when mentors and mentees are prepared and strong relationships develop. Although there are many formal mentoring models, they all share the goal of facilitating the professional development of mentees. Although there are many purposes for mentoring, there is general agreement in the literature that the following practices contribute to successful mentoring.

**Identify your strengths, weaknesses, and biases**
Mentors and mentees experience mentoring relationships through their own personal lenses which include facets of identity such as disability, race, gender, class and sexual orientation; particularly when they are related to marginalization and privilege within a broader society. Before engaging in a mentor/mentee relationship, identify your strengths, weaknesses, and biases. Mentors need to be sensitive to the mentee’s perspective. Mentees need to be clear about their needs and goals and be active participants in the relationship. Consider the assumptions you have about mentoring, how it should work, and whether or not these assumptions best serve the mentee’s needs. Think of mentors you have had - Why were/are they great or troublesome? How can you address your weaknesses/biases and be the best mentor or mentee possible?

**Assess and build your communication and listening skills**
A major skill that cuts across all mentor relationships is the ability to communicate and listen. This is required in order to build trust and a productive relationship. Good communication skills involve the following at minimum:

- The ability to give full attention when communicating.
- Engaging in good listening skills.
- Mentors should give constructive feedback that includes both criticism and praise.
- Mentees should ask for feedback early in the relationship.
- Clarifying mutual expectations for the relationship. (e.g., refer to Tips for Constructive Feedback - Section 3.11)
- Be complete yet succinct in comments and explanations.
Every mentoring relationship is unique and should be grounded in the mentor’s strengths and the mentee’s needs. No one mentor can meet all of a mentee’s needs. The following steps are therefore recommended:

- Clarify the mentee’s expectations for the mentor/mentee relationship and his/her needs related to career development.
- Establish clear, shared expectations for the relationship including time commitment, meeting schedule, and ground rules.
- Discuss confidentiality and the extent to which confidentiality can and will be secured.
- Negotiate and document short-term & long-term goals and outcomes.
- Mentors should refer mentees to colleagues for expertise outside their purview. Recommend and facilitate ways in which to build on the mentor/mentee relationship with other career development resources. This requires knowing what resources exist or how to find out and developing a “mindset” or awareness of opportunities for the mentee. Develop a mentoring plan that includes multiple “mentors.” Follow-up regularly to help mentee keep on track.
- Both mentor and mentee should provide feedback and modify the relationship, expectations, and strategies as needed.

For mentors: Assess and address concerns about mentoring

Common mentor concerns include not having enough time for good mentoring; uncertainty about how to be a good mentor; how to work with “difficult” mentees; and lack of compensation or rewards. Many concerns can be addressed through mentor orientations, workshops and networking. Opportunities for mentors to meet and exchange challenges and ideas are valuable. The following time-saver tips can help make mentoring manageable and therefore less stressful, more productive and more rewarding.

- Set specific goals and timelines with benchmarks/dates.
- Schedule regular time together – even if brief, over coffee, a walk around the building, and during a recreational activity.
- Have agenda items in mind - clear to both in advance
- Use email for news of events, grant opportunities; deadline reminders; sending articles; encouragement and e-mentoring.
- Attend events together - workshops, lectures, and conferences.
- Share the load: refer mentee to other colleagues, peer groups, and networks.
Promoting career advancement includes advising the mentee on ways in which to manage and excel at academic job responsibilities such as teaching, research, service, and administrative requirements. This can be achieved through the following activities:

- Advise on tenure and promotion requirements and processes.
- Advise on time allocation for research, teaching and service.
- Advise on committee choices and load.
- Advise on University and College policies and practices.
- Advise on strategies for effective teaching.
- Observe classroom instruction and provide constructive feedback.
- Review draft proposals and manuscripts and encourage submissions.
- Provide targeted expertise on methodology or theory.
- Direct mentee to relevant funding opportunities and appropriate journals.
- Learn about resources and opportunities and communicate these to mentee.

It also involves nurturing the mentee’s career through assisting him/her in identifying and choosing career development opportunities and linking to colleagues and professional networks. The following are examples of ways in which to do this:

- Collaborate on research projects, manuscripts, and presentations.
- Advise on key relationships to cultivate and facilitate introductions.
- Invite mentee to present at workshops or conferences.
- Include mentee in organized sessions.
- Advise about key conferences your mentee should consider attending.
- Assist mentee in developing a career trajectory.

For mentees: Fostering own career advancement

- Be proactive in developing your own professional career.
- See the mentor/mentee relationship as an important resource for career development and establishing a life-long colleague.
- Be open to mentor suggestions and actively practice what you learn.
- Recognize that one mentor can’t meet all needs. Mentees should take responsibility for identifying gaps and building a network of multiple mentors with needed strengths.
- Provide honest, constructive feedback during evaluation process.


Reproduced with permission of the authors.
3.2 What Mentors Do

- Make sure regular contacts (preferably face-to-face meetings) are maintained, such as monthly.
- Help relocated mentees make the transition to the area.
- Introduce the mentee to the larger academic community and culture.
- Advise the mentee on how to deal with the pressures and crises of professional life.
- Suggest strategies for effective teaching.
- Propose effective ways of interacting with students and colleagues.
- Read and critique research proposals and papers.
- Advise on submission of papers for publication.
- Encourage submission of papers for presentation at professional conferences.
- Advise on tenure and promotion requirements and processes.
- Advise on time allocation for research, teaching and service.
- Provide advice on University and College policies.
- Refer the mentee to other mentoring resources when needed.
- Let the mentee and Program Coordinator know when a relationship needs to be modified, amplified, diminished or terminated.
- Participate in as many program functions as possible that are relevant.
- Learn what mentees are doing. You needn’t become an expert in their area, but you have to be able to give their “elevator pitch” on what they are doing and why. It will allow you to promote them to colleagues, funding agencies, industrial groups, etc.
- Find out what awards the mentee is eligible for and consider if he/she is a legitimate candidate. (If you can’t tell, find out.) It’s critical not to nominate candidates who aren’t ready since you’re developing credibility for your entire department. Who can endorse their nominations? Who is on selection committee?
- Read and comment, in detail, on mentee’s early proposals; make sure they get copies of successful proposals to the same programs.
- For promotions, prepare their dossier with deep thought and care; know it better than they do when you have to defend it.
• Help them plan, a year or two in advance. Be a guide, not a gatekeeper.
• Protect mentees from harmful interactions.
• Provide challenging assignments.
• Provide sponsorship and exposure.
• Provide honest and constructive feedback.
• Try to be compassionate, caring and mindful that these are tough times for junior faculty members ("You can’t learn from tenured arrogance").
• Encourage other mentoring relationships.
# 3.3 Mentoring Skills Inventory

This inventory can be used to conduct a personal assessment for mentors. The 12 mentoring skills in the following inventory are some core mentoring skills. The purpose of this assessment is to gauge your comfort with each skill and identify what skills you need to improve upon. Rank your comfort level/abilities on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being uncomfortable and 5 being very comfortable.

1. **Building and maintaining relationships**  
   *patience and persistence in developing meaningful relationships*  
   ![scale](1 2 3 4 5)

2. **Communicating**  
   *open communication, listening effectively, communicating clearly and unambiguously, recognizing nonverbal cues*  
   ![scale](1 2 3 4 5)

3. **Coaching**  
   *helping an individual learn and refine new skills*  
   ![scale](1 2 3 4 5)

4. **Encouraging**  
   *cheerleading, confidence building, motivating, inspiring*  
   ![scale](1 2 3 4 5)

5. **Facilitating**  
   *promoting and enabling self-directed learning*  
   ![scale](1 2 3 4 5)

6. **Goal setting**  
   *setting specific, realistic, and quantifiable goals*  
   ![scale](1 2 3 4 5)

7. **Guiding**  
   *help maintain focus and set boundaries*  
   ![scale](1 2 3 4 5)

8. **Brokering relationships**  
   *making the right contacts and laying the groundwork for protégés connect with other people who can be resources to them*  
   ![scale](1 2 3 4 5)

9. **Managing conflict**  
   *inviting conversation about differing points of view*  
   ![scale](1 2 3 4 5)

10. **Problem solving**  
    *providing assistance in the problem-solving process, not solving problems for protégé*  
    ![scale](1 2 3 4 5)

11. **Providing and receiving feedback**  
    *challenging, providing constructive feedback*  
    ![scale](1 2 3 4 5)

12. **Reflecting**  
    *ability to step back, evaluate, process and consider the implications for future action*  
    ![scale](1 2 3 4 5)

---

Mentoring Skills Inventory reproduced with permission from the authors.
### 3.4 Stages and Steps of the Mentoring Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUILDING RELATIONSHIP</strong></td>
<td>• Mentor and mentee become acquainted and informally clarify their common interests, shared values, and professional goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentoring interaction fosters mutual interest and enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentor and mentee establish rapport &amp; trust with each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentee understands ways in which mentor will support him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentor begins to visualize mentee as learning, enjoyable, someone with potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEVELOPING COMMON EXPECTATIONS</strong></td>
<td>• Mentor and mentee communicate and agree upon initial expectations and common procedures as a starting point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Goals and expected outcomes of the relationship are developed together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEVELOPING MENTEE</strong></td>
<td>• Gradually, needs are fulfilled. Objectives are met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional growth takes place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New challenges are presented and achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Both parties serve their maximum range of functions in their roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expectations are reinforced/modified through discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the value of the relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Satisfaction and mutual exchange are at their peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mutual confidence develops between the mentor and mentee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENDING FORMAL RELATIONSHIP</strong></td>
<td>• The relationship changes due to personal or organizational shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a sense of loss, combined with excitement about new directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contact frequency decreases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developmental tasks have changed; the relationship evolves to new form or dissolves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The individuals redefine their relationship as colleagues, peers, and/or friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STEPS IN THE MENTORING PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MENTOR</th>
<th>MENTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call or email mentee to set up first meeting</td>
<td>Respond to mentor’s request to meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share information about background and professional experiences including previous mentoring experiences, either as a mentor or mentee.</td>
<td>Share information about your background, your needs and values, and your aspirations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informally clarify common interests &amp; work values</td>
<td>Informally clarify common interests and work values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help mentee clarify goals.</td>
<td>Discuss goals to achieve your needs &amp; aspirations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up a schedule with your mentee for regular meetings and feedback sessions. Be sure to agree on frequency and times, and stick to them.</td>
<td>Set goals for yourself, and follow through on them. Don’t be afraid to raise your expectations or redefine your goals as part of the ongoing process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile a list of activities with mentee which meet mutual goals.</td>
<td>With your mentor, decide what steps will need to be taken to achieve your goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remember to both talk and listen</td>
<td>Remember to both listen and talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brush up on your communication and other skills &amp; always remember to take the mentee seriously. Be sensitive to gender and cross-cultural differences.</td>
<td>Be receptive to feedback and coaching which should be thought of as opportunity for growth. Pay attention to changes in your life that may call for updating your goals and expected outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be prepared to discuss any concerns regarding cultural insensitivities if they occur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Mentoring Needs and Goal Setting Worksheet

Mentor: __________________________________________________________________________________

Mentee: __________________________________________________________________________________

Date of Meeting: ___________________________________________________________________________

Goal: Teaching
Goal met: ¨ Making Progress ¨ No Progress
Accomplishments: ___________________________
Obstacles: ________________________________
New goal or strategy to overcome obstacles (if needed): ________________________________

Goal: Clinical Care
Goal met: ¨ Making Progress ¨ No Progress
Accomplishments: __________________________
Obstacles: ________________________________
New goal or strategy to overcome obstacles (if needed): ________________________________

Goal: Research
Goal met: ¨ Making Progress ¨ No Progress
Accomplishments: __________________________
Obstacles: ________________________________
New goal or strategy to overcome obstacles (if needed): ________________________________

Goal: Service
Goal met: ¨ Making Progress ¨ No Progress
Accomplishments: __________________________
Obstacles: ________________________________
New goal or strategy to overcome obstacles (if needed): ________________________________

Goal: Self Development
Goal met: ¨ Making Progress ¨ No Progress
Accomplishments: __________________________
Obstacles: ________________________________
New goal or strategy to overcome obstacles (if needed): ________________________________

Goal: Networking
Goal met: ¨ Making Progress ¨ No Progress
Accomplishments: __________________________
Obstacles: ________________________________
New goal or strategy to overcome obstacles (if needed): ________________________________

Goal: Work/Life Balance
Goal met: ¨ Making Progress ¨ No Progress
Accomplishments: __________________________
Obstacles: ________________________________
New goal or strategy to overcome obstacles (if needed): ________________________________

Goal: Additional Mentors
Goal met: ¨ Making Progress ¨ No Progress
Accomplishments: __________________________
Obstacles: ________________________________
New goal or strategy to overcome obstacles (if needed): ________________________________
3.6 Mentee Needs and Goal Setting Worksheet

Prior to your first meeting, think about what you may want from your mentor. It may be useful to share a summary of your responses to this worksheet with your mentor at your initial meeting.

- Information about tenure and promotion at the University
- Help with career aspirations and goal-setting
- Advice about courses of action to address a specific problem
- Information about family friendly policies and supports
- Someone with whom you can share experiences based on identity markers e.g. gender, race, class, sexual orientation
- Help with time-management
- Perceptions of how you come across
- Information about how to advance into academic leadership positions
- Help identifying people at the University who can be helpful to you, and how to approach them
- Help identifying people external to the University who can be helpful, and how to approach them
- Thinking through or role-playing difficult situations that you need to negotiate
- Relative importance of teaching, publishing, and service for faculty members at the University
- Tenure and promotion processes and procedures
- Advice about participation in professional organizations and conferences
- Formulation of career goals and timelines
- Balancing personal interests and family time
- Help acquiring or improving skills, such as how to give a talk, how to supervise research assistants, managing classroom dynamics, etc.
- Other:

Use the following form to record career goals. Be realistic and specific. Set goals in the suggested areas for your first year, and each subsequent year prior to tenure. Then, identify which of your specific career goals your mentor can assist with. Ask your mentor to help identify other people and resources that can facilitate achieving your specific goals. During the first three years in the tenure and promotion process, it may be helpful to review your goals with mentors at least every quarter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Today's Date:</th>
<th>Review Dates (every 3 months):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AREA/GOALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>WHO MIGHT PROVIDE ASSISTANCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Productivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.7 Mentee Needs Assessment for Additional Support

Mentoring includes many types of support. Rarely can one person fulfill them all. Use this form periodically (e.g., once a quarter) to assess where your needs are being met, and what other ways you might gain the additional support you need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Things I Could Do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get guidance on conducting research and scholarship</td>
<td>I’m getting what I need from my mentor or from another source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get guidance on publications</td>
<td>I don’t have a need for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get guidance on tenure and promotion process</td>
<td>I should ask my mentor for guidance with this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get guidance on teaching</td>
<td>Other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get advice on service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get advice and information on university/department policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek out needed resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get assistance establishing professional relationships within unit/college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get assistance in establishing professional relationships external to unit/college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get advice on work-life issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and maintain regular communication with mentor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get advice on department politics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get advice on adapting to university/department culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8 Discussion Starters for Mentors

Instructions: As you begin to think about your role as a mentor, it may assist you to identify topics about which you would be willing to be the primary mentor during the next year and activities that might support that topic. Take the next five minutes to fill out this form then share results with your mentee(s).

Topics I am willing and able to discuss with a Mentee *(Check whatever applies)*

- Expectations for reappointment, promotion and tenure
- Early career – Ways to maximize my chances of getting tenure at MSU
- Issues in classroom teaching: Specify
- Issues in laboratory instruction: Specify
- Issues in clinical teaching: Specify
- Issues in online Instruction and hybrid courses: Specify
- Issues in teaching one-on-one instruction: Specify
- Issues in teaching graduate students: Specify
- Issues in supervising doctoral students: Specify
- Issues in teaching undergraduate students: Specify
- Issues in research: Specify
- Issues in creative endeavor or performance: Specify
- Issues in leadership: Specify
- Issues in outreach and engagement: Specify
- Issues relevant to the discipline or sub-discipline: Specify
- Supervising teaching assistants: Specify
- Supervising research assistants: Specify
- Using your start up package fully and wisely
- Setting up a lab: Specify
- Managing a lab: Specify
- Developing productive collaborations
- Understanding the university: Specify
- Understanding the College: Specify
- Understanding the Department/School: Specify
- Understanding the program
- Navigating a joint appointment (Indicate which units are involved): Specify
- Career planning: Specify
- Balancing work and life beyond work, including family: Specify
- Living in the surrounding area: Specify
- Networking with others: Specify
- Other:
Activities I am Willing and Able to Pursue with a Mentee

- Meet at regular intervals (bi-weekly, monthly, bi-monthly, once a semester)
- Review syllabi, assignments, and assessments
- Review websites or other uses of instructional technology
- Observe me teaching in a classroom, lab, clinical, field or other setting. Specify
- Review a grant proposal or request for funding
- Review a manuscript for publication
- Review a book proposal or book or performance contract
- Review a reappointment, promotion or tenure dossier
- Provide feedback on a run-through of a conference presentation
- Observe mentee at a professional meeting or conference
- Collaborate on a project or research
- Introduce mentee to colleagues with relevant expertise: Specify
- Attend national meetings with the mentee
- Attend cultural events or social gatherings together
- Other:

Topics I Would Like to Learn More About

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

3.9 Discussion Starters for Mentees

**Instructions:** As you begin to think about your role as a mentee, it may assist you to identify areas about which you would like to learn more or to discuss with a colleague during the next year. For each of the topics below, indicate areas you would like to discuss and/or activities that might support you. Take the next five minutes to fill out this form and then share the results with your mentor.

**Topics of Interest I Would Like to Discuss with a Mentor**
*(Check whatever applies)*

- [ ] Expectations for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure
- [ ] Early Career – Ways to maximize my chances of getting tenure at MSU
- [ ] Issues in Classroom Teaching: Specify
- [ ] Issues in Laboratory Instruction: Specify
- [ ] Issues in Clinical Teaching: Specify
- [ ] Issues in Online Instruction and Hybrid Courses: Specify
- [ ] Issues in Teaching One-On-One Instruction: Specify
- [ ] Issues in Teaching Graduate Students: Specify
- [ ] Issues in Supervising Doctoral Students: Specify
- [ ] Issues in Teaching Undergraduate Students: Specify
- [ ] Issues in Research: Specify
- [ ] Issues in Creative Endeavor or Performance: Specify
- [ ] Issues in Leadership: Specify
- [ ] Issues in Outreach and Engagement: Specify
- [ ] Issues Relevant to My Discipline or Sub-Discipline: Specify
- [ ] Supervising Teaching Assistants: Specify
- [ ] Supervising Research Assistants: Specify
- [ ] Using a Start Up Package Fully and Wisely
- [ ] Setting Up and/or Managing a Lab: Specify
- [ ] Developing Productive Collaborations
- [ ] Understanding the University: Specify
- [ ] Understanding the College: Specify
- [ ] Understanding the Department/School: Specify
- [ ] Understanding the Program
- [ ] Navigating a Joint Appointment (Indicate which units are involved):
- [ ] Career Planning: Specify
- [ ] Balancing Work and Life Beyond Work, including Family: Specify
- [ ] Living in the Greater E. Lansing Area: Specify
- [ ] Networking with Others: Specify
- [ ] Other:
Activities I Would Like to Pursue with a Mentor (Check Whatever Applies)

- Meet at regular intervals (bi-weekly, monthly, bi-monthly, once a semester)
- Review my syllabi, assignments and assessments
- Review my website or other uses of instructional technology
- Observe me teach in a class, lab, clinical, field, or one on one setting: Specify
- Review a grant proposal
- Review a manuscript for publication
- Review a book proposal or book contract
- Review my reappointment, promotion or tenure dossier
- Provide feedback on a run-through of a conference presentation
- Observe me at a professional meeting or conference (Review conference proceedings)
- Collaborate on a project or research
- Introduce me to colleagues with the following expertise: Specify
- Attend national meetings with me
- Attend cultural events or social gatherings to expand my network of people
- Other:

Topics I am Willing to Discuss with My New Colleagues and Mentors

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3.10 Sample Mentor/Mentee Agreement

MENTOR AND MENTEE AGREEMENT
We are voluntarily entering into a mentoring relationship from which we both expect to benefit. We want this to be a rich, rewarding experience with most of our time together spent in career development activities. To this end, we have mutually agreed upon the terms and conditions of our relationships as outlined in this agreement.

Objectives

We hope to achieve

To accomplish this we will do

Confidentiality

Any sensitive issues that we discuss will be held in confidence. Issues that are off-limits in this relationship will include:

Frequency of Meetings

We will attempt to meet at least _______ (fill in amount) times each month. If we cannot attend a scheduled meeting, we agree to be responsible and notify our partner.

Duration

We have determined that our mentoring relationship will continue as long as we both feel comfortable or until:

Graceful Exit Clause

If one of us needs to terminate the relationship for any reason, we agree to abide by the decision of our partner.

Mentor

Mentee

Date

Date

3.11 Characteristics of Constructive Feedback

- It is descriptive rather than evaluative. By describing one’s own reactions, it leaves the individual free to use it or not to use it as they see fit. By avoiding evaluative language, it reduces the need for the individual to respond defensively.

- It is specific rather than general. To be told one is “dominating” will probably not be as useful as to be told that “in the conversation that just took place, you did not appear to be listening to what others were saying, and I felt forced to accept your arguments.”

- It is focused on behavior rather than on the person. It is important that we refer to what a person does rather than what we think or imagine he is. Thus we might say that a person “talked more than anyone else at the meeting” rather than to say that he/she is a “loud mouth.” The former allows for the possibility of a personality change. The latter implies a fixed personality trait.

- It takes into account the needs of both the receiver and the giver of feedback. Feedback can be destructive when it serves only our own needs and fails to consider the needs of the person on the receiving end. It should be given to help, not to hurt. We too often give feedback because it makes us feel better or gives us a psychological advantage.

- It is directed toward behavior which the receiver can do something about. Frustration is only increased when a person is reminded of some shortcoming over which he/she has no control.

- It is solicited rather than imposed. Feedback is most useful when the receiver has formulated the kind of question which those observing can answer.

- It is well-timed. In general, feedback is most useful at the earliest opportunity after the given behavior. The reception and use of feedback involves many possible emotional reactions. Excellent feedback presented at the appropriate time may do more harm than good.

- It involves sharing of information rather than giving advice. By sharing information, we leave a person free to decide for himself or herself, in accordance with his own goals and needs. When we give advice, we are telling them what to do, and to some degree we take away his/her freedom to decide for themselves.
• It involves the *amount of information the receiver can use* rather than the amount we would like to give. To overload a person with feedback is to reduce the possibility that he/she may be able to use what he receives effectively. When we give more than can be used, we are more often than not satisfying some need of our own rather than helping the other person.

• It concerns *what* is said and done or how, not why. The “why” takes us from the observable to the inferred and involves assumptions regarding motive or intent. If we are uncertain of motives or intent, this uncertainty is itself feedback, however, and should be revealed.

• It is *checked to insure clear communication*. One way of doing this is to have the receiver try to rephrase the feedback to see if it corresponds to what the sender had in mind. No matter what the intent, feedback is often threatening and subject to considerable distortion or misinterpretation.

• It is *checked to determine degree of agreement from others*. Is this one person’s impression or an impression shared by others?

• It is followed by *attention to the consequences of the feedback*. The person who is giving the feedback can greatly improve by becoming aware of the effects of the feedback.

• It is an important step toward *authenticity*. Constructive feedback opens the way to a relationship that is built on trust, honesty, and genuine concern.

---

3.12 Time Savers

- Set specific goals and timelines with benchmarks/dates.
- Schedule regular time together – even if brief, over coffee, a walk around the building, during a recreational activity.
- Have agenda items in mind - clear to both in advance.
- Use email for news of events; grant opportunities; deadline reminders; sending articles; encouragement; e-mentoring.
- Attend events together - workshops, lectures, conferences.
- Share the load - refer mentee to other colleagues, peer groups, and networks.

3.13 Additional Tips for Mentors and Mentees

CAREER ADVISING GUIDE – UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
http://www.advance.rackham.umich.edu/career%20advising.pdf

TOP 10 TIPS FOR MENTORS
http://sciencecareers.sciencemag.org/career_magazine/previous_issues/articles/2010_10_08/caredit.a1000098

TOP 10 TIPS TO MAXIMIZE YOUR MENTORING
http://sciencecareers.sciencemag.org/career_magazine/previous_issues/articles/2009_08_14/caredit.a0900101

NATURE’S GUIDE FOR MENTORS
http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v447/n7146/full/447791a.html

TOP 10 TIPS ON HOW TO BE MENTORED
http://www.aeaweb.org/committees/cswep/PDFs/top10_list_How_to_be_Mentored.pdf

TIPS FOR MENTEES
http://health.usf.edu/publichealth/clphp/fphtc/mentorship/becoming_a_mentee.htm#tips
OTHER RESOURCES

4.1 Mentor Toolkits from Other Institutions
UNIVERSITY OF OTTOWA

BROWN UNIVERSITY
http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Provost/Advance/mentoring_guide.pdf

THE CENTER FOR WOMEN & INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
MENTORING TOOL KIT
http://www.umbc.edu/cwit/pdf/CWIT_Mentoring_Tool_Kit.pdf

JUNIOR FACULTY MENTORING PROGRAMS AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS
http://www.yale.edu/wff/pdf/ExemplaryJuniory%20Faculty%20Mentoring%20Programs.pdf

4.2 Comprehensive List of Mentoring Program Examples
http://www.mentors.ca/mentorlinks.html

4.3 Advancing Diversity through the Alignment of Policies & Practices
In the Fall of 2008, Michigan State University was awarded a $3.98 million Institutional Transformation grant by the National Science Foundation (NSF) ADVANCE Program (Kim Wilcox, Provost and Principal Investigator). The resulting initiative, Advancing Diversity through the Alignment of Policies and Practices (ADAPP), is providing support for MSU colleges in a sweeping effort to align our values of diversity and quality with academic human resource policies and practices at the department- (or unit-) level. We recognize that departments are critical sites in which recruiting, evaluation, and promotion decisions are initiated--and where climate is most directly experienced by MSU faculty members.

ADAPP is being implemented by applying six guiding principles: quality, inclusiveness, transparency, objectivity, consistency, and alignment. Focus is on the structure of and associated policies and practices related to: faculty performance review, faculty search & selection, faculty mentoring, and women’s leadership. Research has shown that by developing objective, transparent criteria and practices in these four areas and consistently applying them across individuals and units, the potential for intended and unintended bias is reduced. In relation to extant research, a central goal of NSF is to strengthen the scientific workforce through increased inclusion of women in careers involving science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). ADAPP-ADVANCE expands this goal by grounding its focus on women in the STEM disciplines in strategies designed to attract, retain and promote the highest quality faculty possible across all disciplines. The NSF grant has focused on the College of Engineering, the College of Social Science and the College of Natural Science. However, Provost Wilcox chose to use the ADVANCE grant as a catalyst for change across the University. Beginning in Fall 2010, the initiative was expanded to thirteen additional colleges (http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu).
4.4 MSU Faculty & Organizational Development
The Office of Faculty and Organizational Development (F&OD) supports MSU faculty, academic staff and administrators in their ongoing quest for excellence in teaching, research, outreach, and leadership. To accomplish this goal, a broad range of seminars and programs, services, and resources in two programmatic strands are offered: (a) Faculty and Instructional Development, and (b) Organizational and Leadership Development. The Office is directed by Deborah DeZure, Assistant Provost for Faculty and Organizational Development, and is part of Academic Human Resources in the Office of the Provost. The F&OD site hosts an extensive section of resources related to mentoring (http://fod.msu.edu).

4.5 MSU Family Resource Center
The Family Resource Center [FRC] is committed to family sensitive employment and academic policies, practices and programs that support faculty, staff and students as they balance their responsibilities of work and family. The Center provides a wide range of vital services including dissemination of resource information, advocacy for personal and family issues regardless of family constellation, and collaboration with other administrative units to develop and coordinate initiatives that address both current and future needs of families (www.frc.msu.edu).

4.6 MSU Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives
The Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives (i3) serves as the institutional focal point for promoting inclusion and diversity at Michigan State University. In addition to providing leadership and support for university-wide initiatives on inclusive excellence, staff of the office provide support to the campus community in four primary areas: Institutional Equity which includes ensuring compliance with state and federal non-discrimination laws and the University’s Anti-Discrimination Policy; Intercultural Education and Programs for faculty, staff, and students; Community Outreach to promote MSU’s core value of inclusivity within and beyond the borders of the campus; and advancing an inclusive community through the Creating Inclusive Excellence Grants and research (http://inclusion.msu.edu).

4.7 MSU Women’s Resource Center
The Women’s Resource Center (WRC) vision is for “Engaging ALL in Providing Access to Resources for the Advancement of Women.” Staff provide vital information to MSU departments, offices, and academic disciplines on women’s issues and resources. The WRC serves as a catalyst for collaboration, operates from a women-led agenda, and focuses on issues that matter most to women in the areas of leadership, social justice, and personal development. It is committed to creating and implementing strategies that promote the status of women by providing a supportive climate that enables all to become full and active participants in the development of policy, decision making, and the achievement of equity (http://www.wrc.msu.edu/).
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Welcome to the Michigan State University
FACULTY SEARCH TOOLKIT

This toolkit is designed to assist units within Michigan State University (colleges, departments, schools) in conducting successful faculty searches. It provides guidance that supplements, but does not replace, the MSU Academic Hiring Manual.

It is essential that unit heads and all search committee chairs be thoroughly familiar with the policies and procedures described in the MSU faculty search requirements identified in the MSU Academic Hiring Manual (www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/academichiring/index.htm).

The practical guidance and resources provided in this toolkit will help ensure that your unit’s faculty searches:

• Comply with all MSU requirements relating to searches;
• Comply with all federal and state laws;
• Reflect the MSU core value of inclusiveness;
• Are perceived as fair by candidates and faculty within the unit; and
• Result in the hiring of high quality faculty members (as defined by the stated requirements/qualifications for the position).

Whereas the MSU Academic Hiring Manual includes a number of requirements that must be followed when conducting faculty searches, it is expected that you modify or adapt the recommendations and tools provided in this toolkit in accordance with relevant circumstances in your unit or discipline(s).

Additional Information or Assistance

Academic Human Resources, the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives (I3) and ADAPP-ADVANCE are prepared to assist in the recruitment and selection process. For more information, or to seek assistance with developing search strategies, tools, etc., please contact:

• Academic Human Resources (517-353-5300)
• Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives (517-353-3922); and/or
• ADAPP-ADVANCE (517-353-8818 or adapp@msu.edu); and/or
• Your college’s Faculty Excellence Advocate (FEA)
PREPARING FOR A SUCCESSFUL FACULTY SEARCH

1.1 The Importance of a Scientific or Structured Approach to Faculty Searches

A large body of research\(^1\) demonstrates that traditional faculty searches often fail to adequately focus decision makers on position relevant criteria, involve low levels of reliability (e.g., candidates treated differently in the process, interviewers assessing the same candidates very differently), and are susceptible to the influence of various biases (e.g., similarity bias, stereotypes). Fortunately, research also demonstrates that relatively modest efforts to increase the structure of the faculty search process can produce significant benefits in terms of focusing decision makers on job relevant information, increasing the diversity of applicant pools, and reducing the influence of conscious and unconscious biases. In short, adopting a scientific or structured approach is the key to conducting successful faculty searches. This toolkit provides you guidance and tools that will assist you in developing and implementing such an approach.

1.2 MSU’s Continuing Commitment to Inclusiveness and Diversity

Faculty search activities within units are expected to reflect MSU values, including the values of quality and inclusiveness. Search activities must also, of course, comply with all relevant federal and state laws, including non-discrimination laws.

MSU remains committed to attracting and retaining a diverse faculty, and the University’s Anti-Discrimination Policy remains in full force and effect. The policy prohibits acts of discrimination and harassment against any university community member(s) by inappropriately limiting employment opportunities, access to university residential facilities, or participating in educational, athletic, social, cultural, or other university activities on the basis of age, color, gender, gender identity, disability, height, marital status, national origin, political persuasion, race, religion, sexual orientation, veteran status or weight.

Federal and state laws that prohibit discrimination in employment or educational settings (e.g., Civil Rights Act of 1991, Americans with Disabilities Act) remain in effect. As a recipient of federal funds, MSU must adhere to the requirements of Executive Order 11246\(^2\), which includes taking affirmative steps to ensure our employment process is fair, equitable, and offers equal opportunity.

The University’s affirmative action recruitment efforts will continue.

For further information regarding MSU’s obligation to provide equal employment opportunity, nondiscrimination, or affirmative action, contact the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives (www.inclusion.msu.edu or 517-353-3922).
1.3 What is a Successful Faculty Search?

Given that the broader context for faculty searches includes University values, legal requirements, and ongoing faculty relations within units, success is not defined by the outcome of a search alone. Rather, a successful faculty search is one that:

- Complies with all MSU requirements relating to searches;
- Complies with all applicable federal and state laws;
- Reflects the MSU commitment to diversity and core value of inclusiveness;
- Is perceived as fair by candidates and faculty within the unit; AND
- Results in the hiring of a high quality faculty member (as defined by the stated requirements/qualifications for the position).

1.4 Summary of the Keys to a Successful Faculty Search

The following list identifies the search characteristics and strategies that play a key role in ensuring a successful faculty search. Subsequent sections of this toolkit elaborate on these key factors, and discuss other search characteristics or strategies that, although perhaps less critical, also increase the likelihood of a successful search. The keys to achieving a successful faculty search are:

- Carefully selecting the search committee and getting it off to a good start.
- Search committee knowledge of and adherence to MSU hiring procedures.
- Structuring the recruitment and selection processes.
  - Carefully planned.
  - Explicitly identifies all job and organizationally relevant criteria to be used in screening and selecting candidates (and communicates the criteria to all participants in the recruitment and selection processes).
  - Focus on identified criteria in recruiting applicants, screening candidates, interview questions, discussions of candidates, and selection decisions.
  - Systematic and consistently followed from start to finish.
- Proactive recruiting to generate a reasonably large and diverse pool of qualified applicants.
- A timely and well managed process that results in an excellent faculty hire and good experience for applicants and finalists.
### 1.5 Flowchart Overview of the Search Process

This flowchart provides an overview of the primary stages in the faculty search process in which the search committee will be involved. The primary stages are identified in the left column. To the right of each stage is a description that:

- Briefly discusses the stage, highlighting particularly important tasks;
- Identifies sections of the MSU *Academic Hiring Manual* that specify MSU requirements that directly pertain to that stage of the search; and
- Identifies sections of this toolkit that address the stage in question.

#### Overview of the Search Committee Role in the Faculty Search Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Relevant Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare the Search Committee</td>
<td>Establish a diverse search committee and ensure that they understand the purpose of the search, the general search process, and their respective roles. An “affirmative action advocate” must be designated.</td>
<td>MSU <em>Academic Hiring Manual</em>: 2.1, 2.2, Faculty Search Toolkit: 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the Position &amp; Identify Selection Criteria</td>
<td>Analyze the position needs and identify the selection criteria that will be used to evaluate the applicants. An Academic Position Request must be submitted to the Dean for approval before the search begins.</td>
<td>MSU <em>Academic Hiring Manual</em>: 2.1, 2.2, Faculty Search Toolkit: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit High Quality &amp; Diverse Applicant Pool</td>
<td>A thoughtful recruiting plan that proactively seeks to promote a diverse applicant pool must be developed. The Academic Hiring Availability Data &amp; Recruitment Activities Form and the Academic Position Request must be approved before recruiting begins. I3 may require additional efforts to promote a diverse pool.</td>
<td>MSU <em>Academic Hiring Manual</em>: 2.2, 2.3, Faculty Search Toolkit: 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Screening</td>
<td>Applying the identified criteria, the pool is narrowed to a small group in whom the committee is seriously interested. The Chairperson, Dean, and I3 approve the applicant pool list, that includes an identification of the final (on-campus interview) candidates BEFORE on campus interviews.</td>
<td>MSU <em>Academic Hiring Manual</em>: 2.3, Faculty Search Toolkit: 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Visits and On-Site Interviews</td>
<td>After the narrowed list of final candidates is approved, the final candidates are invited for campus visits. The visits, including interviews, should be carefully planned to ensure that all candidates receive the same treatment and are evaluated in the same manner.</td>
<td>MSU <em>Academic Hiring Manual</em>: 2.4, 2.6, Faculty Search Toolkit: 5.6, 5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Finalists and Recommend</td>
<td>Using the agreed upon decision making process and selection criteria, the final candidates are evaluated and the committee’s final recommendation(s) is/are submitted to the Chair for review and forwarding to the Dean.</td>
<td>MSU <em>Academic Hiring Manual</em>: 2.4, 2.6, Faculty Search Toolkit: 5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOURCES FOR SEARCH COMMITTEES

2.1 Master Checklist for Conducting MSU Academic Faculty Searches

The following checklist is intended to provide search committees and department chairs a single-source, easy to track, chronological listing of the things they are required to do when conducting an academic faculty search, integrated with best practices they should very seriously consider adopting - even though not formally required. Required elements of searches are in **bold**, and section numbers are provided to relevant sections of the MSU Academic Hiring Manual. In addition, references are provided to more specific checklists, or other tools included in this Faculty Search Toolkit that will assist units in effectively accomplishing these items.

**Preliminary Preparation and Formation of the Search Committee**

___ Unit administrator (chair or director) gets Dean’s informal permission to go forward with the formal process of search plan and position request.

___ Unit administrator reviews the *Academic Hiring Manual*, with special attention initially paid to sections pertaining to the formation of the search committee and its charge. (*Sections 2.1, 2.2*)

___ **Unit administrator appoints the search committee.**
   (*Academic Hiring Manual, Section 2.2A.1*)

___ Unit administrator meets with search committee and conducts an affirmative action review session. This session must occur prior to the initiation of the posting and recruitment process.
   (*Academic Hiring Manual, Section 2.2A.2*)

___ A member of the search committee must be designated to serve in the role of **Affirmative Action Advocate**.
   (*Academic Hiring Manual, Section 2.2A.1b*)

**Initial Search Committee Tasks/Activities**

___ Discuss and agree upon the role of search committee members and the procedures the committee will follow.
   (*Faculty Search Toolkit, 2.2*)

___ The *Faculty Search Toolkit* should be reviewed by all members of the search committee.

___ Draft and agree upon a position description following the guidance provided in the *Faculty Search Toolkit, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3*.

___ Identify and record the position-related criteria that will be used in screening applicants, evaluating candidates, and making selection recommendations (derived directly from the position description).

___ Establish a search plan that is intended to attract a high quality and diverse pool of applicants. (*Faculty Search Toolkit, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4*)
Write the position advertisement utilizing the directions on the Academic Position Request Form (http://www.hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty_forms/FormInfoAPRC.htm) and taking into account guidance for generating a high quality and diverse applicant pool. (Faculty Search Toolkit, 4.4)

Complete the Academic Position Request including the position advertisement.

Complete parts A (Availability Data), and B (Search and Recruitment Activities) of the Academic Hiring Availability Data & Recruitment Activities Form (https://facacadplacementgoals.hr.msu.edu/application/AcademicHiringReport.jsf).

Get the unit administrator’s approval of the Academic Position Request and parts A and B of the Academic Hiring Availability & Recruitment Activities Form.

After the unit administrator has approved the Academic Position Request and parts A and B of the Academic Hiring Availability Data & Recruitment Activities Form, the unit administrator sends the documents to the Dean for approval. (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.2.B)

If approved, the Dean forwards the documents to the Provost and the Office of Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives (I3) for approval. (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.2.C)

If I3 indicates there is a need for a more extensive search than was indicated on the Academic Hiring Availability Data & Recruitment Activities Form, revise the search strategies in accordance with I3 comments, and redo Part B of the Academic Hiring Availability Data & Recruitment Activities Form. (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.2.F) The unit administrator will again submit the form for I3 approval. This process is repeated until I3 approves the form. Consultation with I3 at the start of the search process for resources or strategies to attract a diverse applicant pool is recommended.

Provost approves Academic Position Request. (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.2.D)

After Position is Approved: Recruiting Applicants

Set timeline for close of applications, screenings, interviews, and final selection.

Set a schedule of search committee meeting times and places.

Advertise the position and conduct all the other search and recruiting activities indicated on the Academic Hiring Availability Data & Recruitment Activities Form. All academic vacancies must be posted locally; tenure stream positions must be advertised nationally. (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.3.1)

Chair of search committee acknowledges all communication from applicants and from others who suggest candidates. (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.3.3)
As applications are received, in addition to acknowledging receipt of the applications, send all applicants a general description of the search process and timeline.

After applications have been received, the chair of the search committee should check the diversity of the pool against the availability data shown in part A of the Academic Hiring Report. If underutilized groups are not represented in the applicant pool in proportion to their labor market availability, revisit the search plan and make additional efforts to create a diverse pool.

Obtain your unit administrator’s approval of the pool of applicants. *(Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.3.F)* If approval is not given, reassess the search strategies to find ways to correct deficiencies.

If your unit administrator approves the pool of applicants, he/she must then obtain Dean’s approval. *(Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.3.6)*

### Screening and Selection of Finalists

Screen applicants based on agreed upon selection criteria and following the screening procedures established previously by the committee. *(Faculty Search Toolkit, section 5.3)*

After each screening, give your unit administrator a list of those to be dropped from further screening. Provide numerical summaries of the gender/ethnicity of 1) all those who will be off the list, and 2) those remaining on the list. Maintain documentation of reasons for dropping applicants from further screening.

Obtain your unit administrator’s approval of the list of applicants to be eliminated from further consideration after each screening.

Select final (on-campus interview) candidates and maintain documentation supporting the selection.

In the Human Resources COMPASS system, change the status of applicants who are final candidates to be invited to interview.

Obtain your unit administrator’s approval of the finalists. *(Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.3.6)*

Your unit administrator then submits the Interview List to the Dean and to I3 for approval. *(Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.3.6)* If there is disapproval at any point, take the necessary steps to correct the problem and revise the interview list accordingly. Once I3 has approved the initial applicant and interview list, approval is conveyed to the Dean and search committee chair.

### After Approval of the Final Candidate Pool

Send letters to candidates who do not meet minimal criteria.

Finalize plans for the campus visits. *(Faculty Search Toolkit, 5.7)*

Conduct structured interviews for all final candidates. *(Faculty Search Toolkit, 5.5)*
Search committee interviews all candidates on the final list, makes its recommendation to the unit administrator, and submits the following to its unit administrator (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.4A):

- Interview dates for final candidates (entered in COMPASS);
- Documentation of special efforts to include women and minorities in all phases of the selection process, in addition to efforts already listed on the Academic Hiring Availability Data & Recruitment Activities form;
- The search committee's evaluation of final candidates;
- For each applicant who is not on the final candidate list, specific position-related reason(s) along with supporting documentation;
- Any applicant materials not available in COMPASS system;
- A file of the search committee's procedures, including copies of sample letters, screening criteria, core questions asked in the interview, meeting minutes if kept, etc.

Dean reviews the final selection for convincing evidence of affirmative action, equal opportunity, and non-discrimination in all decisions. (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.4.B)

The unit administrator and the Dean approve a final selection and the appointment terms. (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.4.B)

Prior approval must be obtained from the Provost and President to make an offer of Associate Professor with tenure. (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.4.C)

Unit administrator sends letter of offer, reflecting the guidelines established by the Office of the Provost, and secures a letter from the selected candidate that he or she accepts the position. (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.4.D)

If the preferred candidate rejects the offer, the unit administrator may offer the position to the next final candidate and so on. (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.4.E)

If none of the final candidates accept the job, the search committee goes back to the applicants who met the minimum criteria and determines whether a new list of final candidates can be selected. If so, the interview list must again be approved by the Dean and I3 and the process continues from there. If not, the unit may declare a failed search and start the process all over again.

After a candidate has accepted the position:

- Notify the remaining applicants who were not on the final candidate list.
- Notify the final candidates who were not selected.
- Maintain records of the search process for three years after the date of appointment. (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.6)
2.2 Checklist for Preparing the Search Committee

Composition of the Committee

___ Search committee includes members with different perspectives and expertise, and a demonstrated commitment to MSU core values (e.g., quality, inclusiveness, connectivity).

___ Women and faculty of color are fairly represented on the committee, or if not, the potential need to add more members, including individuals from outside of the unit, is considered.

MSU Values and Commitment

___ The unit administrator conducts an affirmative action session with the search committee at which:

   ___ The charge to the search committee is delivered;
   ___ The role of the Affirmative Action Advocate is discussed *(Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.2)*; and
   ___ The fact that quality and inclusivity are MSU core values and that the University is committed to pursuing both simultaneously in faculty searches is discussed.

Operation of the Committee

___ Discuss and establish ground rules for the committee’s operation, addressing such items as:

   ___ *Attendance:* Due to the cumulative nature of the search committee’s work it is a good idea to require all members to attend all search committee meetings and activities.

   ___ *Decision-making:* How will your committee make decisions? By consensus? By voting? Robert’s Rules of Order? It is important to determine this at the outset.

   ___ *Confidentiality:* Search committee members must commit to the confidentiality expectations of the search. Ground rules should clarify such issues as the need to maintain confidentiality in casual and private conversations about the search, and the imperative to honor the confidentiality request of candidates in perpetuity (not just until the search is over).

___ Record (i.e., write down) agreed upon ground rules and distribute to committee members.
Roles and Other Expectations

___ Designate an Affirmative Action Advocate of any gender or race/ethnicity. *(Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.2)*

___ Discuss other roles that committee members may be expected to fulfill, including the extent to which they are expected to help with: a) developing applicant screening criteria and candidate evaluation criteria, b) recruiting candidates, c) developing interview questions, d) interviewing candidates, e) hosting candidates who interview on campus, or f) assuring that the search process is fair and equitable.

___ The search committee members should be informed of the influence of bias in the selection process.

___ All search committee members should review a copy of this *Faculty Search Toolkit*. 
DESCRIBING THE POSITION AND DETERMINING CANDIDATE QUALIFICATIONS

A clear understanding and explicit specification of the qualifications that the search committee will be looking for in candidates provides the necessary foundation for all aspects of the search process. Essential qualifications must be identified in the MSU Academic Position Request to be completed by the unit. In addition, a statement of essential and preferred qualifications:

- Informs the search committee regarding the pool of applicants that should be targeted;
- Identifies the qualifications that are communicated to potential applicants in job postings so that they may evaluate their interest in and qualifications for the position; and
- Provides the criteria to be applied in the screening of applicants, interview questions, and the final selection decision.

Identifying the desired qualifications for the position involves a two-step process:

**STEP 1:** Determine what the primary responsibilities and other expectations will be for the person hired to fill the position. (What is the job?)

**STEP 2:** Answer the question “Given the duties and other expectations for the person in this position, what knowledge, skills, abilities, experiences, traits, or other characteristics should the successful candidate possess?” (What does it take to do the job?)

3.1 General Guidelines for Developing Position Descriptions & Specifying Qualifications

- **Consult key stakeholders.** Consulting key stakeholders (e.g., unit faculty not on the search committee, your chair, your dean) incorporates multiple perspectives that help ensure important aspects of the job are not overlooked, and builds buy-in.

- **Consider the possibility that the needs of the position have changed, or will be changing in the foreseeable future.** In today’s dynamic academic environments, it is simply unreasonable to assume that faculty positions have remained, and will remain, static.
• **Distinguish between “essential” and “preferred or valued” responsibilities and qualifications.** The Americans with Disabilities Act prohibits employers from excluding disabled individuals because of their inability to perform non-essential responsibilities of a job. Explicitly acknowledging that some qualifications are merely “preferred or valued,” but not required, also helps ensure that the information about candidates is properly weighted in the decision making process, and has the tendency to promote a more diverse applicant pool.

• **Consider whether the description of responsibilities and specification of qualifications reflect MSU values.** The sections that follow provide specific guidance for drafting position descriptions and statements of qualifications that reflect MSU’s commitment to inclusivity and a diverse faculty.
3.2 Position Descriptions: Basic Characteristics, Duties, and Other Expectations

Basic characteristics of the position. The position description should include the following basic information about the position:

- Rank and/or title. You may wish to remain flexible on the rank; e.g., “associate or full professor.” A position request for a tenure system position at the rank of associate or full professor requires special justification.
- Department of the position, including the identification of any other department if a joint appointment is intended.
- Appointment basis (academic year or annual year).
- Appointment status (e.g., tenure system, fixed term, continuing appointment system, fixed term but potentially tenure system).
- Percent employment, if less than 100%.

Common duty categories. Specific duties vary by position, but common duty categories for faculty positions include:

TEACHING
- Is the new hire expected to teach in specific area(s)?
- At what level(s) is the new hire expected to teach: undergraduate, masters, doctoral?

RESEARCH
- Is the new hire expected to conduct research in specific area(s)?
- What are expectations in terms of publishing?

OBTAINING GRANTS OR OTHER EXTERNAL FUNDING
- Is obtaining external funding required? Or, if not required, how is it valued?
- Will the new hire be expected to obtain certain types of grants, or grants exceeding a specified dollar value?

SERVICE
- Specific areas of service expected?
- Is the new hire expected to take a leadership role in a service area?
- Is service to the discipline expected (e.g., serving on editorial boards, active in professional associations)?

ADMINISTRATIVE, MANAGERIAL, OR LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES

Diversity considerations. Narrower position descriptions tend to differentially exclude women and minorities because of pipeline issues. Conversely, a broader or more general description of the responsibilities of the position increases the likelihood of obtaining a diverse pool of qualified candidates. In addition to avoiding narrow position descriptions, consideration should be given to including specific responsibilities that more directly reflect MSU's inclusivity value and commitment to diversity. Examples of such responsibilities include working with diverse students, or working with diverse colleagues.
3.3 Identifying the Necessary and Preferred (or Valued) Qualifications

Once the responsibilities and expectations for the position have been identified and agreed upon, the search committee must then address the question, “Given the required duties and other expectations for the person in this position, what knowledge, skills, abilities, experiences, traits, or other characteristics should the successful candidate possess?” The search committee should answer that question with the following in mind:

- Each identified qualification must be clearly linked to one or more of the identified responsibilities or expectations for the position.

- Examples of qualifications that may be relevant to academic positions, including qualifications that reflect values of inclusivity and diversity:
  - The ability or demonstrated ability to conduct scholarly research in a specific area, or at a specific level;
  - Degree requirements;
  - License requirements;
  - Experience requirements;
  - Demonstrated ability to work in diverse teams;
  - Teaching interests, experiences, or ability;
  - Ability to manage a laboratory;
  - Ability to mentor diverse doctoral students or junior faculty;
  - Experience working with diverse groups;
  - Experience working with diverse students;
  - Experience with a variety of teaching methods and curricular perspectives (studies suggest that many women and faculty of color use a variety of pedagogical techniques, and this kind of flexibility in pedagogy can be especially effective in addressing the varying learning styles of increasingly diverse student bodies);
  - Research, teaching, or service that has prepared the candidate to contribute to MSU’s/unit’s commitment to inclusion and diversity;
  - The ability to add intellectual diversity and cultural richness to a unit.
4.1 General Principles of Effective Recruiting

• A systematic, highly structured approach is the key to effective recruiting. Such an approach promotes the consistent treatment of all applicants during the recruiting process, increases the organizational relevance of the criteria used to identify a target applicant pool, and reduces the likelihood of recruiting delays (discussed further below).

• Search committees should not attempt to make fine distinctions among applicants/candidates during the recruiting process. In most situations, the risk of casting too narrow of a recruiting net (missing qualified applicants, less diverse applicant pool, increase likelihood of a failed search) is much greater than the administrative inconvenience potentially associated with casting too broad of a recruiting net.

• Adopt a realistic job preview approach (i.e., provide information that allows candidates to make an informed judgment as to their fit within the unit and university).

• With very rare exceptions, you will not be able to generate a highly diverse applicant pool without proactively taking steps to generate a diverse applicant pool.

• Candidates want to feel welcomed and valued. Beyond what might be expected based on rational models of decision making, the feeling of being welcomed and valued (or not welcome and not valued) exerts a significant influence on candidates’ willingness to accept a job offer.

• To the extent possible, avoid delays in the search process. Try to schedule campus visits as closely together as practical, and if there are unavoidable delays in the search process, keep candidates informed. Long, unexplained delays in the search process lead candidates to infer that the unit is not interested in them (they are not valued), or that the unit is disorganized and lacks administrative competence.
4.2 Additional Considerations When Recruiting Women and Faculty of Color

There are also some additional considerations with regard to the recruitment of women and faculty of color that search committees should recognize and attempt to address at the various stages of the recruitment process (e.g., when writing advertisements, planning campus visits):

- In many academic disciplines, there is a relative scarcity of women and/or faculty of color. As a result, search committees need to be proactive and engage in creative outreach efforts to recruit for diversity.
- Although women and persons of color are attracted to an academic position for many of the same reasons as white male candidates, there are some factors that have been identified as particularly salient for many women and persons of color. Search committees should consider providing information regarding the following:
  - Campus and community demographics;
  - Special research opportunities with specific groups or in specific situations, e.g., migrant farmers, urban or rural communities, special library collections, community based research opportunities, partnerships with minority serving institutions, industrial plants;
  - Presence of women faculty and staff and faculty and staff of color;
  - Administrative support for people of color and women to assume leadership positions;
  - Possibility of achieving tenure and being promoted in rank;
  - Faculty development opportunities and mentors;
  - Infusion of multicultural issues into the curriculum;
  - Social support network in the community;
  - Community resources that include various faith based organizations, specialty food stores, restaurants, diverse businesses for a wide range of personal services (e.g., hair stylists), and women professionals and professionals of color to provide medical, dental, and legal services; and
  - Availability of a large metropolitan area within a short traveling distance when institutions are located in small communities.
- All candidates want to feel welcomed and valued. However, women and faculty of color may have greater reason to be concerned about whether they will be truly welcomed and valued at the institutions recruiting them. As a result, efforts to make the recruiting process very welcoming to all candidates are likely to have a differentially positive benefit on the attraction of women and faculty of color. Examples of ways to make candidates feel welcomed and valued include: arranging for candidates to meet with deans and/or other high level administrators, inquiring about the candidates’ interest in meeting with people outside of the unit during their campus visit and arrange for the meetings to take place, and prompt follow-up communications following the campus visits.
4.3 Writing the Position Advertisement

The position advertisement, or job posting, is the document that communicates the position opening to potential applicants. While it incorporates information from the position description and specification of qualifications, the position advertisement:

- Typically includes less detail regarding responsibilities of the position;
- May provide more information regarding the organization (e.g., MSU) and the broader community (e.g., the East Lansing area);
- Must include an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Statement.

In addition to the qualifications for the position that have been identified (required and preferred), and some description of the primary responsibilities, the following information **must** be included in the job posting used to advertise the position:

- Deadline for receipt of application. The stated deadline for the receipt of applications must be strictly followed. Usually, the postmark of the applicant’s letter of application must precede or be the same as the deadline in the advertisement. Flexibility in posting can be achieved by referencing “preferably by” before the closing date. This provides for posting deadline flexibility while giving applicants a reasonably precise closing date; or the statement “Late submissions will be considered if suitable candidates are not identified by the deadline.”
- Name, address, and telephone number of contact person at Michigan State University (usually the search committee chairperson).
- An affirmative action/EEO statement (described further below).

The following information **may** be included in the job posting used to advertise the position:

- Position start date.
- Salary range. Salary information may be omitted, or phrases such as; salary is “competitive,” “commensurate with qualifications,” or “commensurate with degree and experience” can be used.
- A brief description of Michigan State University, with emphasis on the diversity among faculty, students and surrounding community.
- The credentials which each applicant is expected to submit (e.g., curriculum vitae, publications, number and types of references) may be included in the position description or in a letter to be sent to applicants who apply for the position or who have been nominated.
- Request for references.
- The statement, “Applicants who are not U.S. citizens or permanent residents must provide documentation evidencing employment authorization in the United States.”
- A statement regarding the availability of a large metropolitan area within a short traveling distance of MSU.
Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Statement. As a recipient of federal funds, MSU is required to take affirmative steps in the employment process in order to be in compliance with the equal employment opportunity and affirmative action provisions of Executive Order 11246. Encouraging women and persons of color to apply for positions at MSU is considered an affirmative step in the employment process. All ads, position announcements, job listings and mailings must include the following equal opportunity statements:

MSU is an affirmative action, equal opportunity employer. MSU is committed to achieving excellence through cultural diversity. The university actively encourages applications and/or nominations of women, persons of color, veterans and persons with disabilities.

Deviation from the statements above may be approved through consultation with the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives. Other optional statements that reflect institutional or unit commitment to diversity are:

- MSU “seeks to recruit and retain a diverse workforce as a reflection of our commitment to maintain the excellence of the University, and to offer our students richly varied disciplines, perspectives and ways of knowing and learning”;
- “The department is particularly interested in candidates who have experience working with students from a diverse background and demonstrated commitment to improving access to higher education for [all] students”;
- The department is particularly interested in individuals with a history of promoting diversity in their research, teaching, and service;
- Experience in mentoring women, persons of color, and persons with disabilities in STEM fields is desired.

Required approval before posting. The position advertisement, along with the MSU Position Request Form and a plan for generating a diverse set of candidates, must be submitted to the unit administrator for approval. After the unit administrator approves the documents, he/she sends the documents to the Dean for approval, and then to the Provost and the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives for approval. The position must not be advertised by a unit until the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives has reviewed the position advertisement and the Provost has formally approved the position.

Required posting. All academic vacancies must be posted locally; tenure stream positions must be advertised nationally. (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.3.1)
4.4 Generating a Diverse Applicant Pool

As a result of MSU’s commitment to inclusivity and diversity, and its status as a recipient of federal funds that must adhere to the requirements of Executive Order 11246, it is important that units seeking to fill a faculty opening create a recruitment plan that is proactive in its efforts to generate a diverse applicant pool. Accordingly, the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives will review a unit’s recruitment plan for evidence that the identified recruitment sources and strategies can be expected to attract a pool of candidates that is both qualified and diverse. If the plan is determined to be deficient in that regard, the unit will be required to revise and resubmit the plan before proceeding with the search. Recruitment sources and strategies that have been found to promote a diverse applicant pool, and therefore should be considered in formulating a recruiting plan, include:

**Advertising with organizations and publications that are likely to yield a diverse applicant pool.** Examples include historically Black colleges and universities, tribal colleges, Hispanic-serving institutions, and professional associations for women or minorities and associated publications. These are just a few of the many types of potential advertising outlets that are likely to contribute to a diverse applicant pool. Identifying the many other potential outlets could be a daunting task for a search committee. Fortunately, the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives’ website ([www.inclusion.msu.edu](http://www.inclusion.msu.edu)) provides access to the Recruitment Resources Directory, what is believed to be the most comprehensive directory for recruiting and advertising of faculty and academic staff positions. The Directory may be searched for resources by keyword (academic discipline) or target audience, and contains contact information for special interest groups, divisions, or committees for women, minorities, persons with disabilities, and lesbian/gay/bisexual or transgender individuals within professional organizations. The database currently contains over 1,600 links, and is expanded and updated on a regular basis. I3 frequently assists units by identifying diverse individuals at other institutions or organizations who may meet unit-established criteria for senior level faculty and administrative positions. For additional information or assistance, please contact I3 at 517-353-3922.

**Internal Advertising**

Contact your MSU colleagues involved in the following organizations:

- EAGLE American Indian Faculty & Staff Association
- Asian and Pacific American Faculty and Staff Association
- Black Faculty, Staff and Administrators Association ([www.msu.edu/~bfsaa/mission.htm](http://www.msu.edu/~bfsaa/mission.htm))
- Chicano/Latino Association ([www.msu.edu/~chila/](http://www.msu.edu/~chila/))
- Women’s Advisory Committee to the Provost ([provost.msu.edu/planning/WACP.html](http://provost.msu.edu/planning/WACP.html))
- Faculty & Professional Women’s Association ([www.msu.edu/~fpwa/](http://www.msu.edu/~fpwa/))
- Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender Faculty, Staff & Graduate Student Association ([www.msu.edu/~glfsa/](http://www.msu.edu/~glfsa/))
External Advertising

The University of Washington maintains a list of discipline-based organizations and publications/websites that are appropriate for faculty recruitment\(^\text{10}\).

**Individual recruitment contacts.** It is common for search committee members, or other faculty within a unit, to make contact (calls, emails, letters) with individuals who may either be personally interested in the position, or able to identify other individuals who might be interested. Such individual contacts can be effective in identifying qualified candidates. However, a well-documented limitation of the use of individual recruiting contacts is that relying on individual contacts tends to yield applicants demographically similar to those making the contacts\(^\text{11}\). Thus, unless a diverse group of people are involved in making individual recruiting contacts, or a special effort is made to use individual contacts to identify a diverse group of potential applicants, the use of individual recruiting contacts to increase the applicant pool *may negatively impact the diversity of the applicant pool*. To use individual recruiting contacts to help generate a diverse applicant pool it is suggested that search committees:

- Identify contacts who have diverse backgrounds and experiences. Such contacts may be more likely to help you identify highly qualified women and minority candidates.
- Specifically ask for recommendations of candidates from groups that are underrepresented in your department (in addition to other recommendations) when contacting colleagues and other professional associates.
- Consider contacting:
  - Persons of color and women one year prior to their completion of a terminal degree program to inform them of upcoming job openings.
  - Women and persons of color who have performed successfully as lecturers, instructors, or research associates in the department and at other institutions.
  - Senior scholars who may be employed outside of academe but who, through cutbacks or simply the desire for a career change, may be well suited to a faculty position.
  - Women and minorities who have received significant grants or professional recognition and ask for the names of promising women and minority scholars.
- Telephone individuals who decline a nomination or do not respond to your letter of inquiry to determine if their reason for declining is based on accurate information, or otherwise can be addressed and resolved. A telephone call will help demonstrate to a potential candidate that Michigan State University is serious about its efforts to have a diverse faculty.
Encourage your Dean to contact potential candidates to ask them to apply. This is an effective practice for recruiting any potential candidate. However, given the challenges of recruiting women or faculty of color in some disciplines, the practice of having your Dean call to encourage potential candidates to apply is especially important when attempting to generate a diverse pool of applicants.

Seek expert advice and assistance. The Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives offers a number of specialized services to assist departments in expanding applicant pools for faculty and is eager to work with search committees to identify the most effective strategies for recruiting a diverse pool of high quality candidates in their respective units. The Faculty Excellence Advocates in your college and Academic Human Resources are also sources of assistance to the search committee in its efforts to attract women and minority candidates.

There are also a number of longer term recruiting strategies that will help develop a unit’s ability to attract a diverse pool of applicants in the future. They include:

- Using a visiting scholar program to create opportunities for women and minorities, and build ties with a diverse group of potential future faculty.
- Initiating a faculty exchange program with a minority serving institution, i.e., Historically Black, Hispanic or tribal college.
- Maintaining contact with women and minorities whom your unit has unsuccessfully attempted to recruit for graduate study at MSU. As they complete their graduate studies at other universities, they may become candidates for a faculty position at MSU. They may also have women and persons of color among their colleagues who are potential candidates for open positions.

It should be emphasized that all efforts to generate a diverse applicant pool, including individual recruiting contacts (calls, emails, letters), should be documented.
5.1 Principles of Effective Selection

- All criteria used in making selection decisions (screening CVs, determining who will be invited for campus visits, final recommendations) should be manifestly linked to the formally identified job qualifications.

- The same criteria and standards must be consistently applied to all candidates.

- The basis for decisions should be documented.

- No applicant should be screened out based on a review conducted by a single person (i.e., each selection decision should be based on the review of multiple search committee members).

- General or global assessments of a candidate’s fit should not be allowed to influence decisions (e.g., “Although her record looks good, I just don’t think she would be a good fit for the department”). Individuals making such assessments should be required to identify the basis for their assessment. If they are unable to do so, or if the factor(s) they identify are not directly linked to the stated qualifications for the position, then their assessment of “lack of fit” should be disregarded.

5.2 Other Recommended Selection Practices

- Input from search committee members and other faculty who have interacted with the candidates should be obtained using a candidate evaluation form to help ensure consistency in the criteria that are applied in evaluating applicants. See section 5.8 for an example of a candidate evaluation form.

- Avoid ranking candidates early in the process, when information remains to be collected (to help avoid the influence of confirmation bias).

- Anonymous or otherwise unsupported statements about applicants should not be given any weight in the selection process. Information relied on must be evidence based (i.e., documented by materials in the file).

- The search committee members should be informed on the influence of bias in the selection process\textsuperscript{14}. 
5.3 Screening Applicants

There is more than one appropriate approach to screening applicants, and it may be useful for search committees to conduct multiple screenings. Typically the first screening will be for minimal, objective qualifications (e.g., highest degree). Thereafter, screening interviews may be conducted (via phone, or at a professional conference) to further assess candidates before determining which candidates will be invited for on-campus interviews. Whatever approach is adopted, the following guidelines should be adhered to:

- The screening process should not begin until the qualifications for the position have been explicitly identified and agreed upon.
- The search committee should determine the number of screenings that will be performed (e.g., screening criteria applied to applicants at association conference interviews, telephone, or on-campus interviews) and the level of each screening (what specific criteria will be applied) before applications are accepted.
- A screening rubric or other form that charts each applicant’s qualifications vis-à-vis the specific screening criteria should be used in the screening process.
- At each screening, documentation of reasons for dropping applicants from further consideration should be maintained.

5.4 Letters of Reference

Significant concerns have been raised regarding the reliability and validity of letters of reference\(^1\). However, a search committee can significantly enhance the reliability and validity of letters of reference by applying the following guidelines (based on the principles outlined in section 5.1):

- Letter writers should be advised of the criteria you would like them to address.
- Discussions of the content of a letter should be limited to those sections of the letter that address the identified criteria. Personal information revealed about the candidate, or comments addressing characteristics or qualities that are not directly related to the agreed upon qualifications for the position should be disregarded.
- The search committee should be consistent in the number of letters of reference it requires, and actually reviews, for each candidate.
- Never reject a candidate based solely on the information provided in a single letter of reference. If a single letter of reference raises a significant issue relating to an agreed upon qualification for the position, then further steps should be taken to investigate and resolve the issue that has been raised (corroborate or refute it).
5.5 Conducting Interviews

A large body of research demonstrates that the effectiveness and fairness of job interviews depends on how the interview process is constructed and implemented. Informal, unstructured interviews that leave it to individual search committee members (or other faculty participating in the search) to determine what questions they ask, and what constitutes a “good” or “bad” answer, have low reliability and low validity in terms of predicting successful on the job performance. Of additional concern, informal interviews are susceptible to the operation of systematic biases, conscious and unconscious, that tend to operate to the disadvantage of women and candidates of color. The reliability and validity of interview assessments can be substantially enhanced, and their susceptibility to bias significantly reduced, by a carefully structured interview process that focuses interviewers on position relevant information and promotes consistency in how interviews are conducted. The basic elements of a structured interview process are set forth below.

- All questions should be based on the position description, required qualifications, or preferred qualifications.
- The search committee should agree in advance on what constitutes “good,” “acceptable,” and “unacceptable” answers to proposed questions. If the search committee cannot agree on the characterization of answers to a question, then the question should not be asked.
- All candidates should be asked the same initial questions, with follow-up questions as needed to clarify the applicant’s experience or qualifications as related to the initial question.
- Interviewers’ assessments of the interviewee’s response to the questions should be recorded in writing.

Search committees are strongly encouraged to develop a written interview protocol that incorporates the above basic elements of interview structure, and further promotes the reliability and validity of the interview process by:

- Helping ensure that introductory and closing comments intended to make the candidate feel comfortable did not touch on topics or inquiries that might be inappropriate or unlawful in an interview context.
- Providing all candidates the same information about the process, the unit’s schedule for filling the position, and when the candidate could expect to hear from the unit again.
- Facilitating the recording of interviewee responses and interviewer assessments (for example, by providing common response categories that could be circled or checked for some questions).

Finally, everyone participating in the interview process should be made aware of interview questions that are either illegal to ask, or otherwise raise a risk of creating a legal claim. Section 5.10 provides a summary of legally appropriate and inappropriate interview questions.
5.6 Campus Visits

After the short list of candidates (those to be interviewed on campus) has been approved by the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives, the candidates on the list may be invited to visit the campus. Campus visits should be carefully and consistently planned so that candidates’ on-campus experiences are, if not identical, equivalent. The Checklist for a Successful Campus Visit (section 5.7) is intended to assist units in planning and executing campus visits by candidates.

Companies in the private sector have long recognized a key to success in recruiting candidates who are in high demand is to move quickly to avoid long delays between the time of candidate interviews and the time an offer is made\(^\text{17}\). In academic settings, this requires that candidates’ campus visits be scheduled as closely together as is practical.

5.7 Checklist for Successful Campus Visits\(^\text{18}\)

- Identify primary staff support to coordinate all necessary documentation, travel arrangements and reimbursements.
  - Offer to pre-purchase airline tickets for candidate
  - Offer accommodations for length of stay
  - Travel advances may be available

- Develop an agenda for the visit that includes (when relevant) the names of individuals who will be helping the candidate move from one location to another, and provide the cell phone numbers of those individuals.

- If a job talk is expected, notify each candidate and give them clear guidance about what is expected. For example, indicate the anticipated length of the talk, and clarify whether the unit is interested in a specific research topic or a broad overview of the candidate’s research program and future research plans.

- Schedule candidate’s interview with the unit administrator (chair or director).

- Schedule interviews with search committee and faculty; consider group or panel interviews to improve the reliability and efficiency of the interview process.

- Determine if the candidate will have individuals accompanying them during the campus visit; if so, prepare an agenda for the spouse, partner, or guest.
Determine if the candidate has an interest in developing interdisciplinary collaborations on campus, and if so, offer information and access to faculty outside of your unit who might offer opportunities for interdisciplinary collaborations.

If the candidate is from a group underrepresented in the unit, make an effort to include a broad cross-section of the campus community in the visit.

Send the agenda to the candidate ahead of time.

Send the candidate: department and school brochures, campus map, University publications, resource guide and faculty handbook (and/or provide them with links to relevant websites, including the I3 Community Resources Directory to assist in identifying community resources for diverse candidates).

Meet any special needs of the candidate (physical, dietary, etc.).

Be sure that faculty are aware of the criteria to be used in evaluating candidates before the candidates are brought to campus.

If general faculty input about the candidates is to be solicited (beyond the faculty serving on the search committee), provide faculty a candidate evaluation prior to the campus visit (see section 5.8 for an example evaluation).

Arrange to have the candidates traveling by plane picked up at the airport.

Prepare the escort who will be going to the airport to pick up the candidate. The escort should, for example, know how to pronounce the candidate’s name, review the candidate’s vitae and have a sense of the candidate’s academic interests. Also, instead of filling the time from the airport to the University with idle chatter that may lead to the discussion of inappropriate topics, the escort may wish to inform the candidate about cultural events and entertainment facilities in central Michigan, as well as provide a brief overview of the University.

Ensure that each candidate receives the same welcome and introduction to the department, and comparable (if not the same) opportunities to interact socially with department members. For example, if one candidate is taken out to dinner, then all candidates should be taken out to dinner.

Before candidates leave campus the search committee should let them know when a decision is expected and how they will be notified.
5.8 Example of a Candidate Evaluation Form – Including Diversity Competency^{20}

*(Candidate Evaluation Form for Assistant Professor of Human Resource Mgt.)*

Candidate’s name: ________________________________

Rater’s name *(person completing the evaluation): ____________________*

Please indicate which of the following are true for you (check all that apply):

- [ ] Read candidate’s CV
- [ ] Met with candidate
- [ ] Read candidate’s scholarship
- [ ] Attended lunch or dinner with candidate
- [ ] Read candidate’s letters of recommendation
- [ ] Attended candidate’s job talk
- [ ] Other (please explain): ________________________________

PLEASE RATE THE CANDIDATE ON EACH OF THE FOLLOWING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability to conduct scholarly research as <em>reflected in the job talk</em>.</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>UNABLE TO JUDGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Ability to conduct scholarly research as *reflected in the candidate’s current publication record* (e.g., quality publications). |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

| Potential for scholarly impact (all things considered). |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

| Record of obtaining external research funding. |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

| Potential for obtaining external research funding (willing and able). |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

| Ability to teach as *reflected in the job talk*. |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

| Ability to teach as *reflected in candidate’s past experiences* (e.g., student ratings, awards, course materials that may be provided). |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

| Fit with department priorities as reflected in the job posting (ability to teach HR finance or international HRM). |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

| The ability to work with diverse students and diverse groups, and contribute to a climate of inclusion. |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

OVERALL RATING:  □ ACCEPTABLE  □ ACCEPTABLE WITH CONDITIONS  □ UNACCEPTABLE
5.9 Sample Diversity-Related Interview Questions\(^{21}\)

- **Candidate’s background:** What has been your previous experience in mentoring?
- **About candidate & college:** MSU is committed to building a culturally diverse environment. How would you further this goal? How have multicultural issues influenced and/or been a part of your teaching, research and outreach/service?
- **Teaching:** Describe strategies (that you’ve used or considered) for creating an inclusive learning environment for your students? Provide us with examples of how you managed diversity in your classroom setting? Has diversity played a role in shaping your teaching and advising styles?
- **Research/Service:** As a faculty member, have you done any research in the area of diversity? Describe any experience you’ve had to advance diversity among graduate students. As a higher education professional, have you done any work in the area of diversity in the community?
- **General:** What do you see as the most challenging aspects of an increasingly diverse academic community? Follow-up question: What initiatives have you taken in your previous capacities to meet such challenges?

5.10 Questions You May and May Not Ask of a Candidate

All aspects of the search process, including discussions at search committee meetings, conversations with referees and interview questions, must be job-related and should flow from the elements of the position description. Questions should focus on a candidate’s abilities and professional experiences related to the responsibilities of the open position. Questions about any of the following may only be asked when these factors are bona fide occupational qualifications (BFOQ), consistent with state and federal equal employment opportunity law. That is, the employer must be able to show that the factor relates to a qualification that a job applicant must possess in order to successfully perform essential duties of the job in question. For example, an applicant’s age should generally not be the subject of inquiry, but it may be asked about in an interview if it can be shown that age is a BFOQ for the job in question (for example, bartenders must be 18 years old to serve liquor in Michigan). It is imperative, therefore, that persons interviewing candidates, participating in the interview process, or checking references be aware of and follow these guidelines on information which should **NOT** be sought from applicants or references.
# PRE-EMPLOYMENT INQUIRY GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>LAWFUL PRE-EMPLOYMENT INQUIRIES</th>
<th>UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT INQUIRIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>For access purposes, inquiry whether applicant’s work records are under another name.</td>
<td>Original name of an applicant whose name has been changed by court order or otherwise. Applicant’s maiden name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>To request place and length of current and previous address. To ask for applicant’s phone number or how he/she can be reached.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRTHPLACE</td>
<td>Birthplace of applicant. Birthplace of applicant’s parents, spouse or other close relatives. Requirement that applicant submit birth certificate, naturalization or baptismal record, unless as part of I-9 form.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>Are you 18 years or older? (This question may be asked only for the purpose of determining whether applicants are of legal age for employment.)</td>
<td>How old are you? What is your date of birth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGION OR CREED</td>
<td>Inquiry into an applicant’s religious denomination, religious affiliations, church, parish, pastor, or religious holidays observed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE OR COLOR</td>
<td>Complexion or color of skin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOTO</td>
<td>Any requirement for a photograph prior to hire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHT</td>
<td>Inquiry regarding applicant’s height.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEIGHT</td>
<td>Inquiry regarding applicant’s weight.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL/ PARENTAL STATUS</td>
<td>Do you have any relatives employed by this employer?</td>
<td>Requirement that an applicant provide any information regarding marital status or children. Are you single or married? Do you have any children? Is your spouse employed? What is your spouse’s name?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>Mr., Miss or Mrs. or an inquiry regarding sex. Inquiry as to the ability to reproduce or advocacy of any form of birth control.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PRE-EMPLOYMENT INQUIRY GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>LAWFUL PRE-EMPLOYMENT INQUIRIES</th>
<th>UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT INQUIRIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISABILITY</td>
<td>Can you perform the essential duties of the job in which you wish to be employed, with or without accommodation?</td>
<td>Inquiries regarding an individual’s physical or mental condition which are not directly related to the requirements of a specific job and which are used as a factor in making employment decisions in a way which is contrary to the provisions or purposes of the Persons with Disabilities Civil Rights Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>If not a citizen of the United States, does applicant intend to become a citizen of the United States? If you are not a United States citizen, have you the legal right to remain permanently in the United States? Do you intend to remain permanently in the United States? (To avoid discrimination based on national origin, the questions above should be asked after the individual has been hired, even if it is related to the Federal I-9 process.)</td>
<td>(Questions below are unlawful unless asked as part of the Federal I-9 process.) Of what country are you a citizen? Whether an applicant is naturalized or a native-born citizen: the date when the applicant acquired citizenship. Requirement that an applicant produce naturalization papers or first papers. Whether applicant’s parents or spouse are naturalized or native born citizens of the United States; the date when such parent or spouse acquired citizenship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL ORIGIN</td>
<td>Inquiry into languages applicant speaks and writes fluently.</td>
<td>Inquiry into applicant’s lineage, ancestry, national origin, descent, parentage, or nationality, unless pursuant to Federal I-9 process. Nationality of applicant’s parent or spouse. Inquiry into how applicant acquired ability to read, write or speak a foreign language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>Inquiry into the academic, vocational, or professional education of an applicant and the public and private schools attended.</td>
<td>Specifically ask the nationality, racial, or religious affiliation of schools attended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>Inquiry into work experience. Inquiry into countries applicant has visited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRESTS</td>
<td>Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Are there any felony charges pending against you?</td>
<td>Inquiry regarding arrests which did not result in conviction. (Except for law enforcement agencies.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>LAWFUL PRE-EMPLOYMENT INQUIRIES</td>
<td>UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT INQUIRIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK SCHEDULES</td>
<td>To ask willingness to work required work schedule.</td>
<td>To ask willingness to work any particular religious holiday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To ask if applicant has military reservist obligations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIVES</td>
<td>Names of applicant’s relatives already employed by this company.</td>
<td>Address of any relative of applicant, other than address (within the United States) of applicant’s parents, spouse and minor dependent children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTICE IN CASE OF EMERGENCY</td>
<td>Name and address of person to be notified in case of accident or emergency.</td>
<td>Name and address of nearest relative to be notified in case of accident or emergency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONS</td>
<td>Inquiry into the organizations of which an applicant is a member, excluding names or characters which indicate the race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry of its members.</td>
<td>List all clubs, societies and lodges to which you belong.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.11 Search Committee Recommendations and Follow-Up

To act upon information while it is fresh in people’s minds, and avoid the type of delays in getting back to candidates that research\textsuperscript{23} shows may have a significant negative impact on their assessment of an organization and their willingness to accept an offer, the search committee should meet as soon as possible after the completion of interviews. There are many reasonable approaches that the search committee should take in arriving at its recommendations, and there are a number of factors that influence what might be considered the best for a given unit (e.g., the role of input from the general faculty in the unit). The important point is that whatever the approach that is taken, the process for making a decision should be discussed and agreed upon at the beginning of the search.

Once the search committee’s recommendations have been arrived at following the agreed upon procedures, the Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.4 A, requires that the search committee submits its recommendations to the unit administrator, along with the following:

- Interview dates (entered into the COMPASS system).
- Documentation of special efforts to include women and minorities in all phases of the selection process, in addition to efforts already listed on the Academic Hiring Report.
- The search committee’s evaluation of final candidates (Sample Search Committee Report available at www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/aa_searches/samplereport.htm).
- For each applicant who is not on the final candidate list, specific position-related reason(s) along with supporting documentation.
- Any applicant materials not included in the COMPASS system.
- A file of the search committee’s procedures including copies of sample letters, screening criteria, core questions asked in the interview, meeting minutes if kept, etc.

The unit administrator and the Dean approve a final selection and the appointment terms (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.4.B). Before doing so, the Dean is required to review the final selection process for convincing evidence of affirmative action, equal opportunity, and non-discrimination in all decisions (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.4.B). If the appointment terms involve making an offer of Associate Professor with tenure, prior approval must be obtained from the Provost and President (Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.4.C).
After a candidate has accepted the position, the search committee should conclude its responsibilities by:

- Notifying the remaining applicants who were not on the final candidate list.
- Notifying the final candidates who were not selected.
- Organize the candidate files and verify that the records of the search process will be maintained for three years after the date of appointment, as required by *Academic Hiring Manual, section 2.4.D*. These records include all the materials provided by the search committee with their evaluations of final candidates.
- If more than one candidate is offered the position and the initial salary offers were different, the reason(s) for the difference must be documented and added to the records which are kept for three years.
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Parenting & Caregiving Resources Website (www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/parenting-caregiving-resources-faculty)

Parenting & Caregiving Resources for Faculty

This page provides an overview of the top MSU faculty resources around issues of parenting and caregiving. If you do not find what you’re looking for on this page, please visit the MSU Family Resource Center website or the MSU Work/Life website. To review all work/life topics and resources, click here for the full Work/Life Guide for Faculty & Staff.

FINDING CHILDCARE

Whether you are a new faculty member just moving to the area or an established faculty member newly expecting or adopting, finding quality childcare is an important issue for all families.

Resources specific to infant care:

- **MSU Child Development Labs** has 6 infant slots available only to pre-tenure MSU faculty. If a spot is available or anticipated, pre-tenure faculty can reserve a spot by paying full monthly tuition prior to the child’s arrival.
- **Spartan Child Development Center** has 10 infant slots available to faculty, staff and students. Faculty of any rank can reserve a spot, if available, by paying full monthly tuition prior to the child’s arrival.

Resources for finding childcare for all ages, including infants:

- **Great Start for Kids** - Search for childcare providers of all types (centers, in-home providers, preschools) throughout the State of Michigan by clicking on your county of residence and selecting your city and needs.
- **Ingham County Providers** - Search this spreadsheet of Licensed Ingham County Childcare Providers, created and maintained by the MSU Family Resource Center. This list does not include centers in Lansing. *(Last update: 12/14/11)*
- **MSU on Care.com** - Create a user account on care.com with your MSU (NetID) email account to gain free access to this one-stop shop for babysitters, nannies, senior/elder care support, housekeepers and even pet sitters! At care.com, you view detailed profiles of their vetted providers and select by experience, hourly rate, availability and more. Care.com is a great way to identify childcare if you prefer to have a
provider come to your home, either on a regular basis or if you need a one-time sitter. You can also search other areas of the nation and arrange care while you are at a conference. The MSU group (link above) is your portal to access this resource for free (space is limited).

- **MSU Sick Child Care Program** brings qualified home care aids into your home to supervise your child who is ill. The University subsidizes 70 percent of the cost, and the parent or legal guardian is responsible for the remaining 30 percent.

- **MSU Emergency Childcare** is available when your regular childcare provider is not available. Each MSU employee is eligible to use this service five days each year for each child in the family. The service is free of charge. To arrange care (up to 2 weeks in advance), call one of the designated centers on the Emergency Childcare website.

**AREA SCHOOLS**

Exploring area schools is important prior to enrolling your child.

- **2011-12 School Directory** - This directory of area schools includes individual school web addresses and contact information. Prepared by the Ingham Intermediate School District, a Regional Educational Service Agency.

- **Michigan Schools of Choice** - The Greater Lansing Area schools participate in the State of Michigan "schools of choice." The schools of choice provisions in Section 105 and 105c of the State School Aid Act are designed to allow local school districts to enroll nonresident students and count them in membership without having to obtain approval from the district of residence.

**MSU GROUPS/EDUCATION**

- **MSU Work/Life Listservs** - Listservs are available for: Staff & Faculty Parents, Eldercare, Breastfeeding, Adoption, Special Needs Kids

- **Parenting or Eldercare Classes** - The Family Resource Center provides free workshops for MSU employees about important issues, such as breastfeeding, parenting kids with special needs, and eldercare.

- Support Networks for **elder caregiving**, **autism**, and **adoption** meet regularly to share experiences and learn from others in similar circumstances.
MSU POLICIES

- **Parental Leave** - Faculty and academic staff who are appointed on at least a 50 percent basis for nine months or more are eligible for parental leave in accordance with this policy. This policy is to be read in coordination with the Short-Term Disability policy and the Family Medical Leave Policy. Faculty and academic staff are eligible to receive up to six (6) weeks of paid parental leave in connection with the birth of a child. Faculty and academic staff who adopt a child younger than age six and/or not attending school full-time are eligible to receive up to six (6) weeks of paid parental leave.

- **Family & Medical Leave (FMLA)** - Eligible employees are allowed to take unpaid leave, or paid leave if earned, for a period of up to twelve work weeks in any twelve month period for the following reasons: incapacity due to pregnancy, prenatal medical care or child birth; to care for the employee's child after birth, or placement for adoption or foster care; to care for the employee's spouse, son or daughter, or parent, who has a serious health condition; or for a serious health condition that makes the employee unable to perform the employee's job.

- **Modified Duties** - Upon request, tenure system and Health Programs faculty members who have a new child (or new children) in the home under the age of 6 and/or not attending school full-time may be granted a period of modified duties for up to one semester without a reduction in effort and salary.

- **Stopping the Tenure Clock** - The tenure system probationary appointment is extended automatically for one year, upon request from a faculty member on approved leave of absence (paid or unpaid) for twelve weeks or longer for reasons related to the birth or adoption of a child. View the full policy to review all reasons for Stopping the Tenure Clock.

- **Complete list of MSU Work/Life Policies** - We encourage all faculty to read the full policy statement for each policy. The complete list will take you to the full text.
Listserv Messages (February – April 2012)

The Michigan State University ADAPP-ADVANCE listserv announces news and opportunities related to faculty diversity and inclusion on the first Monday of each month.

If you have accomplishments, resources, or other announcements to be considered, please email them to linleyjo@msu.edu.

To unsubscribe, email listserv@list.msu.edu and include the following line in the text of the message: UNSUBSCRIBE ADAPP-ADVANCE.

February 2012

1) MSU Faculty Highlights
   - LiveSCIENCE Report on Gemma Reguera, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Microbiology & Molecular Genetics
   - Nine MSU researchers have been named AAAS Fellows
   - Two ADAPP-ADVANCE Faculty Advisory Committee members earn MSU awards: Diane Ebert-May (2011-2012 Distinguished Faculty Award) and Kendra Spence Cheruvellil (2011-2012 Teacher-Scholar Award)
   - American Physical Society names Elizabeth Simmons APS Physicist of the Month
   - Lyman Briggs College (Dean Elizabeth Simmons) earns 2012 Excellence in Diversity Award – first time in 22 year history of the program that a college has received an award because of its overall efforts to advance diversity and inclusion throughout the college

2) New Resources for STEM Faculty
   - Streamlined Resources for Parenting & Caregiving – great resource for new faculty hires.
   - ADAPP-ADVANCE LinkedIn Group – Our new LinkedIn group serves as a tool for sharing and disseminating best practices and resources related to women and underrepresented minority faculty success. It is also a networking tool for faculty across colleges.
   - The Office for Diversity Inclusion and Community Partnership at Harvard Medical School is pleased to inform you that the recording for the October 5, 2011 webinar, Diversity Inclusion: A New Systems-Based Institutional Transformation Framework, is now available on the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s (RWJ) newly launched Diversity Matters Community under featured content.
   - Gendered Innovations: Emerging from years of research, the Gendered Innovations project: 1) develops practical methods of sex and gender analysis for scientists and engineers; 2) provides case studies as concrete illustrations of how sex and gender analyses lead to innovation.
   - Women in Engineering ProActive Network (WEPAN) Knowledge Center: Access cataloged and fully cited information resources including research reports, data and statistics, agenda papers, bibliographies, best practices, key programs, and more.

3) Upcoming Meetings & Conferences
   - CIC Academic Leadership Program: Applications due Thursday, February 9
   - MSU Women’s Health Research Conference: Tuesday, February 14, Free Registration
   - AAAS Annual Meeting: Vancouver, Canada, February 16-20, 2012
• Competitiveness through Systematic Mentoring: The Model of the Timbuktu Academy, Dr. Diola Bagayoko, Thursday, February 16, 11:00 a.m., NSCL Lecture Hall (Presented by MSU National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory Women and Minorities in Science Lecture Series)

• Implicit Bias: The Power of Automatic, Unintended Mindsets, Webinar on Thursday, February 23, 1:00-2:00 p.m.

• Big Ten STEM Writing Retreat: University of Nebraska-Lincoln, June 17-22, 2012

• Women in Engineering ProActive Network (WEPAN) Annual Meeting, Columbus, OH, June 26-28, 2012

• SACNAS Summer Leadership Institute: unparalleled training for underrepresented minority scientists interested in advancing their leadership skills, Washington, DC, July 16-20, 2012

March 2012

1) MSU Faculty Highlights
   • Ellen Kossek developed the Work Life Indicator, a tool that assesses an individual's approach for managing the boundaries between work and family. Dr. Kossek is a University Distinguished Professor of Human Resources and Labor Relations, and serves on the ADAPP-ADVANCE Faculty Advisory Committee.
     a. Isis Settles, Associate Professor of Psychology, co-organized the Institute for Academic Feminist Psychologists, held on January 27-28, 2012 in San Antonio, TX.
     b. Each week, a faculty member is highlighted in Faculty Conversations, a video showcase of research and work at MSU. Recent videos include Eric Freedman (Assoc. Professor of Journalism) on his new book, “Presidents and Black America: A Documentary History,” and Robert Caldwell, MSU Ombudsperson and former Faculty Excellence Advocate for the College of Social Science, on the Office of the Ombudsperson.

2) New Resources for Faculty
   • Online interactive version of the MSU Faculty Mentoring Toolkit
   • Academia.edu is an online platform for scholars and academics to share research. Create a free online profile and follow research of others in your field from around the world.
   • Association for Women in Science (AWIS) Online Resource Center
   • Cynthia Jordan, Professor of Neuroscience, shared the following article from American Scientist: When Scientists Choose Motherhood

3) Upcoming Meetings & Conferences
   • Stem cell research & IVF expert Alan Trounson presents, Stem Cells in Revolution: Transforming Cell Biology and Medicine: Wharton Center – Pasant Theatre, March 14, 7:00 p.m.
   • Grant Training Center, Professional Grant Development Workshop: Wayne State University, March 15-16
   • Women of Color in the Academy: A Conversation about How to Survive and Succeed: 303 International Center, March 22, Panel 1 – 3:00-3:50; Panel 2 – 4:00-4:50; Conversation – 4:50-5:30
   • Webinar: Fundaments of Proposal Writing: March 26, 2:00-4:00 PM
   • Building Productive Professional Relationships Through Mentoring: MSU Kellogg Center, March 30, 3:00-5:00 PM
   • Call for Proposals – 2012 Mentoring Conference: Deadline May 15 (Conference: Albuquerque, NM, Oct. 24-26)
   • Transitioning to Faculty Life: A Conference for PostDocs Underrepresented in STEM: Columbus, OH, May 31-June 2
   • Big Ten STEM Writing Retreat: University of Nebraska-Lincoln, June 17-22, 2012
   • Women in Engineering ProActive Network (WEPAN) Annual Meeting, Columbus, OH, June 25-27, 2012
   • SACNAS Summer Leadership Institute: unparalleled training for underrepresented minority scientists interested in advancing their leadership skills, Washington, DC, July 16-20, 2012
April 2012

1) MSU Faculty Highlights
   - David Closs, renowned supply chain program chairperson, traveled to the White House March 30 to discuss the nation’s supply chains and ways to make them more sustainable
   - Monir Moniruzzaman, assistant professor of anthropology, has published his study of a growing market for body parts worldwide. Moniruzzaman infiltrated the black market for human kidneys, and found that the individuals he interviewed were typically not paid for their donations as promised, and many experienced serious health problems.
   - Zhenmei Zhang, assistant professor of sociology, was awarded a National Institute on Aging grant to explore the racial disparity between blacks and whites who experience dementia in old age.

2) Faculty Resources
   - F&OD: online, on-demand asynchronous workshops on Teaching Essentials for Careers in Higher Education (TECHE)
   - Susan Reverby, the Wellesley College professor who uncovered a U.S. government medical study in Guatemala in which men and women were given syphilis without their knowledge, will speak on campus April 5, 7:30 p.m., Wharton Center Pasant Theatre.
   - Jane Prey will give a presentation and lead a discussion on why there are so few women in computing, informed in part by studies of differences in different countries, Wednesday, April 11 (watch the event site for time & location)
   - LEAD: Evaluating Faculty Mentoring Programs and Relationships, Tuesday, April 17, 8:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m., Kellogg Center Red Cedar Rooms
   - Spring Institute on College Teaching and Learning: May 14-17, MSU Campus

3) Upcoming Meetings & Conferences
   - Transitioning to Faculty Life: A Conference for PostDocs Underrepresented in STEM: Columbus, OH, May 31-June 2
   - Women in Engineering ProActive Network (WEPAN) Annual Meeting, Columbus, OH, June 25-27, 2012
   - SACNAS Summer Leadership Institute: unparalleled training for underrepresented minority scientists interested in advancing their leadership skills, Washington, DC, July 16-20, 2012
Notes from College Communication Specialists Meetings

In September and October 2011, Jodi Linley met with the 3 communication specialists in the Colleges of Engineering, Natural Science and Social Science. Guiding questions included:

1. Does your Dean communicate with all faculty in your college on a regular basis? If so, how (memo, email)?
2. When faculty read emails, who are they from? (Dean, Chair, Provost, FEA)
3. Does your college use social networking in any capacity? (facebook, twitter, LinkedIn)

Natural Science – Mike Steger

Mike is a tech savvy individual who appears to be directly connected to faculty. For example, a faculty member called him at the end of a workday to ask Mike to set up a blog for his field work in Alaska, and proceeded to seek Mike’s input on what he should blog about, how often, etc. With this in mind, Mike seemed clear on how and who reach the Nat Sci faculty.

The role of FEA (Sue Conrad) is recognized by department chairs. Sue attends chair meetings and presents relevant information. Sue is known as the ADVANCE connection.

Chain of communication is typically:

Dean -> Dept. Chairs -> Faculty

The Chairs (26) act as filters for their faculty. They may receive 20 emails a day (from other units & external folks) and pass on 2-3 that they deem relevant and timely.

The Nat Sci website (http://naturalscience.msu.edu/) is essentially a blog, which Mike prefers because it allows him to communicate news in a timely fashion. The homepage includes an RSS subscription tool and is set up as a news blog.

Nat Sci uses Twitter, Facebook, YouTube and LinkedIn to communicate with their various constituents. Mike is constantly encouraging faculty to use LinkedIn, and prefers that connection over Facebook because so many people use Facebook as a personal social tool.

Mike prefers blogs to newsletters because news reaches people quicker and it’s usually a smaller number of news items at one time (chances of people reading it are higher). If we did continue with a newsletter, Mike encouraged me to think about smart phones and keeping things very short so that they could be read on a smart phone.

Social Science – Michelle Strobel

Michelle serves on the CSS ADAPP team (with the Dean and 3 FEAs) and is very knowledgeable about ADAPP-ADVANCE. This team meets monthly.

CSS is a large college, and if all faculty need to receive something, it is typically sent from the Assoc. Dean for Research via the all-faculty listserv. That list is usually accessed 1-3 times per week. Michelle thinks the Assoc. Dean would be happy to add ADAPP messaging to any of their all-college messages.
Michelle suggested we use the ADAPP website to host all articles/news (view our website as a landing space) to direct people to via other mechanisms (LinkedIn, for example).

Michelle believes that faculty like blogs and encouraged us to consider a blog with an RSS feed. She thought it would be useful as we work toward institutionalizing to have ADAPP reps staff the blog (FEAs, the Provost, the Deans). If we did this, we would need to develop a campaign to let folks know about the blog, and she suggested setting up a biweekly email summary to remind people it’s there. She also felt strongly that if we create a blog to give it a good year to take off, and that 20% open rates are considered very high.

In CSS, faculty meet by department at least once per semester, and the FEAs could use these meetings as a vehicle to reach faculty.

Chairs/directors meet every other week with the Dean & senior staff.

Michelle stressed that we should consider who will maintain our communication tools when the grant ends and make suggestions to the Provost.

Engineering – Laura Seeley

In Engineering, the Dean communicates directly with faculty via the all-faculty listserv as needed. He sends one end-of-year message that everyone knows will come, and the other messages vary.

Prior to our meeting, Laura reviewed the ADAPP website and was surprised to see Manooch was the designated FEA for the college. She was only familiar with Tammy as “the ADAPP person.”

Their college uses social networking tools (Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn) and those are managed by a marketing staff member.

The Dean invites all faculty to a meeting once a semester, but attendance is very low. Faculty DO attend their departmental meetings, which makes Chairs to keys to accessing faculty.
Faculty & Staff Race and Ethnicity Coding Changes

The following information is from a 9/29/09 email Sarah Nash (HR) sent out to MSU Data users.

Recently, all faculty and staff were asked to self-report ethnicity and race information using a Web-based system. In accordance with the new federal reporting regulations, the respondents were allowed to select multiple racial/ethnic status categories. In addition, the current “Asian/Pacific Islander” category (code 2) was separated into two new categories – “Asian” (code 7) and “Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander” (code 6). New codes will be available for reporting on 10/09/2009. Please note the current code 2 for Asian/PI will be inactive on 10/09/2009 and should only be used for historical reporting prior to October 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Code</th>
<th>Current Definition</th>
<th>New Code</th>
<th>New Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asian / PI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(inactive on 10/09/2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>American Indian / Alaska Native</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American Indian / Alaska Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hawaiian PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey results of the new ethnicity and race codes will be loaded into the HR personnel system (B15) and available for reporting from the HRSPER and HRAPERN tables in the HR database on the MSUData server. The target date for when these changes will be available for reporting is October 09, 2009. You may need to revise your programs, views, and/or queries so they access the updated ethnic information and also look for multiple ethnic/race codes. Table structures for HRSPER and HRAPERN are not changing but will be populated with changes and additional ethnic/race coding as a result of the survey. Values of 1 through 7 may be found in any one of the following data fields, code 2 will be kept on historical records prior to October 2009.

NOTE: Per phone call with Melissa McDaniels 3/11/10, she spoke with Paulette Granberry Russell who told Melissa that it would be appropriate to report anyone who self-identified with more than one ethnic code as “multiple.”
Change in ADAPP Tenured/Tenure-System Faculty Headcount (2010 to 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>10-1-2010 Headcount</th>
<th>Left ADAPP TTS Pool</th>
<th>Joined ADAPP TTS Pool</th>
<th>10-1-2011 Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Resigned</td>
<td>From TTS to FT*</td>
<td>New Hires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Changed from TTS (Tenured/Tenure-System) faculty position to a FT (Fixed-Term) faculty position or vice versa.

** Three TTS faculty members changed tenure home departments between 2010 and 2011. Two of the changes were between ADAPP departments. The third change was from a non-ADAPP department to ADAPP department.
ADAPP Year 4
TTS Faculty by Gender & Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNDR_NM</th>
<th>ADAPP_RANK_CATEGORY</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>ADAPP_RANK_CATEGORY_GEN</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>ASSISTANT PROFESSOR</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>ASSISTANT PROFESSOR</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>PROFESSOR (includes UDP &amp; Named Prof)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNIV DIST PROFESSOR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL FEMALE TTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>247</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>247</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>ASSISTANT PROFESSOR</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>ASSISTANT PROFESSOR</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>PROFESSOR (includes UDP &amp; Named Prof)</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAMED PROFESSOR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNIV DIST PROFESSOR</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL MALE TTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>650</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>650</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1.1 Number and Percent of Women (Tenured and Tenure Track) Faculty in STEM & SBS by Rank and Department - 10/1/2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>SBS Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry &amp; Molecular Biology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Science &amp; Human Nutrition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology &amp; Molecular Genetics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARTH, ATMOSPHERIC AND OCEAN SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGINEERING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering &amp; Materials Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATHEMATICAL AND COMPUTER SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science And Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics-Astronomy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEM SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFESSIONAL/OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Child Ecology *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSYCHOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor &amp; Industrial Relations **</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics &amp; Probability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SBS SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEM &amp; SBS TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Department name changed to Human Development & Family Studies this past year.
** Department name changed to Human Resource & Labor Relations this past year.

NOTE: Data reported by headcounts.
SOURCE: HR data located in the MSU Enterprise Data Warehouse (see ADAPP_Year4_Data db query: Table_11_FTS_Distr_b).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Professors</th>
<th>Associate Professors</th>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Biological and Agricultural Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Caucaian</th>
<th>Hawaiian-PI</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Multiple**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Caucaian</th>
<th>Hawaiian-PI</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Multiple**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mathematical and Computer Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Caucaian</th>
<th>Hawaiian-PI</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Multiple**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Physical Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Caucaian</th>
<th>Hawaiian-PI</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Multiple**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional and Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Caucaian</th>
<th>Hawaiian-PI</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Multiple**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Caucaian</th>
<th>Hawaiian-PI</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Multiple**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STEM Subtotal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Caucaian</th>
<th>Hawaiian-PI</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Multiple**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPS Subtotal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Caucaian</th>
<th>Hawaiian-PI</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Multiple**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STEM & SPS Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Caucaian</th>
<th>Hawaiian-PI</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Multiple**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Footnotes

* Department name changed to Human Development & Family Studies this past year.
** Department name changed to Human Resource & Labor Relations this past year.

Data reported by Headcounts.

Notes: Data reported by Headcounts. HR data located in the MSU Enterprise Data Warehouse [MSAPP_HeadDataReportTable_42_TY_REmoteControl].

Date: As of 10/2011
### TABLE 2.0 STEM AND SBS FACULTY GENDER COMPOSITION BY APPOINTMENT TYPE - 10/1/2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Tenured &amp; Tenure Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track - % of All Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Women %</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>% Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry &amp; Molecular Biology</td>
<td>200 58 29.0%</td>
<td>48 22 45.8%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>19 5 26.3%</td>
<td>8 2 25.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Science &amp; Human Nutrition</td>
<td>23 9 39.1%</td>
<td>6 3 50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology &amp; Molecular Genetics</td>
<td>36 8 22.2%</td>
<td>9 4 44.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience Program</td>
<td>0 0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0 0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>24 5 20.8%</td>
<td>5 4 80.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
<td>32 13 40.6%</td>
<td>2 0 0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>10 2 20.0%</td>
<td>1 0 0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>22 7 31.8%</td>
<td>8 5 62.5%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARTH, ATMOSPHERIC AND OCEAN SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
<td>13 2 15.4%</td>
<td>3 1 33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGINEERING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering &amp; Materials Science</td>
<td>128 14 10.9%</td>
<td>12 0 0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>31 3 9.7%</td>
<td>3 0 0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>22 3 13.6%</td>
<td>1 0 0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>39 5 12.8%</td>
<td>6 0 0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATHEMATICAL AND COMPUTER SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science And Engineering</td>
<td>81 15 18.5%</td>
<td>11 5 45.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>25 5 20.0%</td>
<td>0 0 0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>37 2 5.4%</td>
<td>5 1 20.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics-Astronomy</td>
<td>53 4 7.5%</td>
<td>4 1 25.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEM SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>512 95 18.6%</td>
<td>83 30 36.1%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFESSIONAL/OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Child Ecology *</td>
<td>66 40 60.6%</td>
<td>36 26 72.2%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>22 15 68.2%</td>
<td>5 5 100.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>21 10 47.6%</td>
<td>8 5 62.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSYCHOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>56 28 50.0%</td>
<td>10 7 70.0%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>263 84 31.9%</td>
<td>63 20 31.7%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>25 14 56.0%</td>
<td>5 2 40.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Integrative Studies - Soc Science</td>
<td>27 9 33.3%</td>
<td>14 2 14.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>0 0 0.0%</td>
<td>3 1 33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>44 7 15.9%</td>
<td>2 1 50.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>28 8 28.6%</td>
<td>7 2 28.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor &amp; Industrial Relations **</td>
<td>39 16 41.0%</td>
<td>7 2 28.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>31 7 22.6%</td>
<td>3 1 33.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>30 13 43.3%</td>
<td>5 3 60.0%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics &amp; Probability</td>
<td>22 6 27.3%</td>
<td>8 1 12.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SBS SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>385 152 39.5%</td>
<td>109 53 48.6%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEM &amp; SBS TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>897 247 27.5%</td>
<td>192 83 43.2%</td>
<td>25.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Department name changed to Human Development & Family Studies this past year.
** Department name changed to Human Resource & Labor Relations this past year.

**NOTE:** Data reported by headcounts.
**SOURCE:** HR data located in the MSU Enterprise Data Warehouse (ADAPP_Yr4_Data db queries: Table_20_TTS_comp_b and Table_20_nonTTS_comp_b).**

**DATE:** As of 10/2011.
### TABLE 3.1 TENURE REVIEW OUTCOMES BY GENDER - STEM FIELDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applications submitted Fall 2010</th>
<th>Up for Review</th>
<th>2010-11 Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting Rank</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology &amp; Molecular Genetics</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
<td>Asc</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARTH, ATMOSPHERIC AND OCEAN SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Asc</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Asc</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGINEERING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATHEMATICAL AND COMPUTER SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science And Engineering</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics-Astronomy</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of TOTAL</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of GENDER</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Withdraw from P&T application from review process.

**NOTE:** Data reported by headcounts.

**SOURCE:** FEA Data Collected from colleges and departments.
### TABLE 3.2 TENURE REVIEW OUTCOMES BY GENDER - SBS FIELDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applications submitted Fall 2010.</th>
<th>Up for Review</th>
<th>2010-11 Outcomes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting Rank</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL/OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Child Ecology *</td>
<td>Ast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Asc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Asc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Asc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Asc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor &amp; Industrial Relations **</td>
<td>Asc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor &amp; Industrial Relations **</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Withdrew P&T application from review process.

* Department name changed to Human Development & Family Studies this past year.

** Department name changed to Human Resource & Labor Relations this past year.

**NOTE:** Data reported by headcounts.

**SOURCE:** FEAD Data Collected from colleges and departments.
Tables 4a and 4b

Note: No data to report due to MSU's P&T process - this will be explained in narrative (per MM 4/29/08).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Rank</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>WOMEN % of Women</th>
<th>MEN % of Men</th>
<th>WOMEN % of Men</th>
<th>MEN % of Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2.99</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1 4.0%</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
<td>2 5.7%</td>
<td>1 2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Ind/AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>6 24.0%</td>
<td>12 13.5%</td>
<td>7 20.0%</td>
<td>8 17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>2 8.0%</td>
<td>11 12.4%</td>
<td>1 2.2%</td>
<td>1 2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 36.0%</td>
<td>24 27.0%</td>
<td>9 25.7%</td>
<td>11 23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5.99</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Ind/AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>6 24.0%</td>
<td>13 14.6%</td>
<td>9 25.7%</td>
<td>13 28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>2 8.0%</td>
<td>12 13.5%</td>
<td>2 5.7%</td>
<td>3 6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 32.0%</td>
<td>26 29.2%</td>
<td>13 37.1%</td>
<td>16 34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8.99</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1 4.0%</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Ind/AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>2 8.0%</td>
<td>8 9.0%</td>
<td>5 10.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>2 8.0%</td>
<td>11 12.4%</td>
<td>2 5.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 12.0%</td>
<td>10 11.2%</td>
<td>2 5.7%</td>
<td>5 10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11.99</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Ind/AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1 4.0%</td>
<td>8 9.0%</td>
<td>5 14.3%</td>
<td>4 8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
<td>2 5.7%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4.0%</td>
<td>10 11.2%</td>
<td>6 17.1%</td>
<td>4 8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14.99</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Ind/AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1 4.0%</td>
<td>3 3.4%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td>3 6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 8.0%</td>
<td>4 4.5%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td>4 8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more*</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Ind/AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1 4.0%</td>
<td>13 14.6%</td>
<td>4 11.4%</td>
<td>5 10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>1 4.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 8.0%</td>
<td>15 16.9%</td>
<td>4 11.4%</td>
<td>6 13.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>WOMEN % of Women</th>
<th>MEN % of Men</th>
<th>WOMEN % of Men</th>
<th>MEN % of Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2 8.0%</td>
<td>2 2.2%</td>
<td>2 5.7%</td>
<td>1 2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3 3.4%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td>2 4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Ind/AN</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>17 68.0%</td>
<td>57 64.0%</td>
<td>26 74.3%</td>
<td>38 82.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>5 20.0%</td>
<td>26 29.2%</td>
<td>5 14.3%</td>
<td>4 8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1 4.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>25 100.0%</td>
<td>89 0.0%</td>
<td>35 100.1%</td>
<td>46 100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By Classification:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 or more*</th>
<th># Faculty Range</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>MEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.6 - 25.6 years</td>
<td>15.6 - 27.35 years</td>
<td>15.6 - 27.6 years</td>
<td>15.6 - 34.6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.75</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>24.9333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.38396</td>
<td>3.03521</td>
<td>5.7373</td>
<td>6.36445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 or more*</th>
<th># Faculty Range</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>MEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.6 - 27.35 years</td>
<td>22.7593</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.48622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Data reported by headcounts.

**SOURCE:** HR data located in the MSU Enterprise Data Warehouse (ADAPP_Yr4_Data db queries: Table_51_AscProf_YrsInRank_a thru Table_51_AscProf_YrsInRank_f).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Rank</th>
<th>Ethnicity*</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>% of Women</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>% of Men</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>% of Women</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>% of Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2.99</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Ind/AN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5.99</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Ind/AN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8.99</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Ind/AN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11.99</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Ind/AN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14.99</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Ind/AN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more*</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Ind/AN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th></th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.47 - 28.1 years</td>
<td>21.43 years</td>
<td>29.43 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>22.1075</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>29.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.43</td>
<td>21.743</td>
<td>29.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.42139</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By Classification:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 or more* # Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.47 - 28.1 years</td>
<td>21.43 years</td>
<td>29.43 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>22.1075</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>29.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>22.43</td>
<td>21.743</td>
<td>29.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Deviation</td>
<td>5.42139</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 or more* # Faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.47 - 29.43 years</td>
<td>23.215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>22.93</td>
<td>29.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5.1941</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Data reported by headcounts.

**SOURCE:** HR data located in the MSU Enterprise Data Warehouse (ADAPP_Yr4_Data db queries: Table_52_AscProf_YrsInRank a thru Table_52_AscProf_YrsInRank f).
TABLE 6: VOLUNTARY, NON-RETIREMENT ATTRITION, BY RANK, GENDER AND ETHNICITY - 2011

*Due to federal regulations, MSU revised the ethnic code structure and re-surveyed all faculty and staff during Fall 2009. The new structure allows employees to self-identify one or more ethnic codes. The code of "M" below is used to identify those individuals who selected more than one ethnic identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>Assistant Women</th>
<th>Assistant Men</th>
<th>Associate Women</th>
<th>Associate Men</th>
<th>Professor Women</th>
<th>Professor Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry &amp; Molecular Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Science &amp; Human Nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology &amp; Molecular Genetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%EARTH, ATMOSPHERIC AND OCEAN SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ENGINEERING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering &amp; Materials Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%MATHMATICAL AND COMPUTER SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science And Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%PHYSICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys-Astronomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ETHNICITY SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%STEM SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%PROFESSIONAL/OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Child Ecology *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Integrative Studies - Soc Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor &amp; Industrial Relations **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics &amp; Probability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ETHNICITY SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%SBS SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ETHNICITY TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Department name changed to Human Development & Family Studies this past year.
** Department name changed to Human Resource & Labor Relations this past year.

NOTE: Data reported by headcounts.

SOURCE: HR data located in the MSU Employee Data Warehouse (ADAPP_Yr4_Data db queries: Table_6_Attention_cl).
TABLE 7.1: NEW TENURED AND TENURE SYSTEM FACULTY HIRES, BY RANK, GENDER AND ETHNICITY - 2011

*Due to federal regulations, MSU revised the ethnic code structure and re-surveyed all faculty and staff during Fall 2009. The new structure allows employees to self-identify one or more ethnic codes. The code of "M" below is used to identify those individuals who selected more than one ethnic identity.

* Includes Endowed Professorships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity*</th>
<th>Assistant Women</th>
<th>Assistant Men</th>
<th>Associate Women</th>
<th>Associate Men</th>
<th>Professor* Women</th>
<th>Professor* Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry &amp; Molecular Biology</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino 1</td>
<td>Asian 1</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino 1</td>
<td>Asian 1</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>Caucasian 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Science &amp; Human Nutrition</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino 1</td>
<td>Asian 1</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology &amp; Molecular Genetics</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino 1</td>
<td>Asian 1</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience Program</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARTH, ATMOSPHERIC AND OCEAN SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGINEERING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering &amp; Materials Science</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATHENOMICAL AND COMPUTER SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science And Engineering Mathematics</td>
<td>Asian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino 1</td>
<td>Asian 1</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics Astronomy</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHNICITY (STEM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino 1</td>
<td>Asian 1</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEM SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFESSIONAL/OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Child Ecology *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSYCHOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Asian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Integrative Studies - Soc Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor &amp; Industrial Relations **</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino 1</td>
<td>Asian 1</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Asian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics &amp; Probability</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHNICITY (SBS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL (SBS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHNICITY (STEM &amp; SBS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino 1</td>
<td>Asian 1</td>
<td>Caucasian 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (STEM &amp; SBS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Department name changed to Human Development & Family Studies this past year.
** Department name changed to Human Resource & Labor Relations this past year.

NOTE: Data reported by headcounts.

SOURCE: HR data located in the MSU Enterprise Data Warehouse (ADAPP_Yr4_Data db queries: Table_7_New Hires_c).
### Table 8: Number of Tenure/Tenure-Track Female Faculty in Unit and/or University Leadership Positions - 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Position (Dept/College)</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (Dept)</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8: Number of Tenure/Tenure-Track Female Faculty in Unit and/or University Leadership Positions - 2011 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Position (Sr. Faculty)</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named/Endowed Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Distinguished Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (Sr. Faculty)</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8: Number of Tenure/Tenure-Track Female Faculty in Unit and/or University Leadership Positions - 2011 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership (Powerful Committees @ College Level)</th>
<th>Natural Science</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment, Promotion &amp; Tenure</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Advisory Committee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (Powerful Committees)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8: Number of Tenure/Tenure-Track Female Faculty in Unit and/or University Leadership Positions - 2011 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership (Powerful Committees @ University Level)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate (formerly Faculty Council)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Committee on Academic Governance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Committee on Academic Policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Committee on Curriculum</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Committee on Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Committee on Faculty Tenure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (Powerful Committees @ University Level)</strong></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8: Number of Tenure/Tenure-Track Female Faculty in Unit and/or University Leadership Positions - 2011 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Position (University Level)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Associate Provost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Provost</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (University Leadership)</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide descriptive data on current HR policies.

Compare results of policy analysis to chair reporting of policies and practices, faculty perceptions of transparency and alignment of AR and RP&T policies and practices (W/E Survey, YR1 and YR5, Chair Inventory YR 1, YR 4, YR 5).

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?

Compare results of YR4 inventory to YR1 inventory; Compare results of YR4 to YR5 inventory; Compare results of YR5 inventory to YR5 W/E survey.

To what extent have AR and RP&T policies and practices become more aligned with university expectations and best practice?

To what extent are chair descriptions of policies and practices consistent with faculty perceptions of AR and PR&T policies and practices?

Compare results of YR1 and YR5 W/E survey. Conduct cross-analysis with other data sources.

What are the nature and extent of change in faculty perceptions of the work environment during the ADVANCE initiative?

Provide descriptive data on FEA models to identify strengths and limitations of each model and assess implementation effectiveness across models.

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

Provide synthesis of relevant HR data at disaggregated level.

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

Review college mentoring policies for alignment with university policy.

Study mentoring programs for effectiveness and impact.

To what extent are college 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?

Provide descriptive data on current faculty search process and compare results of study to baseline hiring outcome data.

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?

Provide descriptive data on current HR data at disaggregated level.

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

Provide descriptive data on current HR policies.

Compare results of policy analysis to chair reporting of policies and practices, faculty perceptions of transparency and alignment of AR and RP&T policies and practices (W/E Survey, YR1 and YR5, Chair Inventory YR 1, YR 4, YR 5).

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?

Provide descriptive data on current faculty search process and compare results of study to baseline hiring outcome data.

To what extent have AR and RP&T policies and practices become more aligned with university expectations and best practice?

To what extent are chair descriptions of policies and practices consistent with faculty perceptions of AR and PR&T policies and practices?

Predict retention of faculty subgroups within each college and possibly unit. Data and analyses will be shared in HR meetings with Deans.

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?