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OVERVIEW

The 6/1/09 – 8/31/09 quarter has been a productive one for MSU’s ADAPP-ADVANCE team. We produced concrete outcomes (e.g., new brochure & toolkits) as well as detailed strategies for project implementation in YR2. In addition we document where policy changes and changes in practice have been made and where others are being developed.

This report of the ADAPP activity for Q4 in the following areas:

- Communication/Dissemination
- Grant Administration
- Project Team Implementation Activities
- Policy Changes
- Changes in practice
- Evaluation of impact of process and policy changes

This report also contains additional reflections, including: “significant accomplishments/best ideas yet” and “areas of difficulty/greatest challenges”.

COMMUNICATION & DISSEMINATION

- Designed and printed our ADAPP-ADVANCE brochure to be used for both internal and external distribution and promotion (Attachment 1).
  - Distributed to chairs of ADAPP colleges. The brochure will be distributed to all faculty in the fall semester.
  - Brochures also disseminated at New Administrator Orientation (8/2009) and New Faculty Orientation (8/2009)
- Developed a presentation (ppt) that describes ADAPP-ADVANCE. For use & modification by Provost, Chairs, Deans and co-PIs in presenting ADVANCE to various stakeholders (Attachment 2)
- Melissa McDaniels (Project Director) presented poster on our initiative and conceptual approach at NSF’s Joint Annual Meeting in Washington in June 2009. (Attachment 3)
- Provost Kim Wilcox (PI) introduced the ADAPP-ADVANCE initiative to 7 additional colleges across MSU (during meeting on 8/24/09): Human Medicine, Osteopathic Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, Arts & Letters, Lyman Briggs Residential College, Agriculture and Natural Resources. Background about the project was distributed, and MSU Academic Human Resources is hiring 7 additional Faculty Excellence Advocates.
- Developed Talking Points for Provost and Project Personnel to address points in the National Academies Press Report: “Gender Differences at Critical Transitions in the Careers of Science, Engineering and Mathematics Faculty” (Attachment 4).
- Developed toolkits for Annual Review & RP&T (described in detail below under project team reports) and distributed them to chairs for feedback to ADAPP (Attachments 5 & 6).
- FEAs and senior faculty on GMT met with Chairs and Directors of the Colleges of Engineering, Natural Science, and Social Science.
‐ Provost Rep, Curry, McGroarty meetings with Provost to maintain good bi-directional communication between Provost and ACT/GMT
‐ Co-PI Tamara Bush presented an overview of the MSU’s ADAPP project at a “diversity luncheon during the American Society of Biomechanics Conference at Pennsylvania State College (August 26 – 29).

**GRANT ADMINISTRATION**

Training of Personnel

‐ Leadership Excellence for Academic Diversity (LEAD)  
  [http://www.engr.washington.edu/lead](http://www.engr.washington.edu/lead) (Fayetteville, AR; June 2009)  
  o ADAPP’s Project Director, two FEAs, an additional College of Social Science faculty member, and a co-PI attended this event to learn more about best practices in areas of academic human resource leadership development.
‐ NSF Joint Annual Meeting (Washington, D.C., June 2009)  
  o Attended by Project Director & Director of Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives

Transition in Information Technology Support

‐ One of the challenges of YR1 was technology support. The office on-campus that ADAPP-ADVANCE contracted with to provide this support was not able to serve our needs appropriately.
‐ As of 8/2009, we are in the process of moving our servers/system/share drive to the support office in MSU’s College of Engineering. This transfer should be complete by September 1.

Office Move

‐ In June 2009, we received notice from our central facilities office that ADAPP-ADVANCE would need to move to new office space.
‐ We are currently in discussion with the deans of the three participating colleges (Engineering, Natural Science & Social Science) to secure new office space that is assigned to them.

Retreat

‐ On August 24, a retreat of the GMT, FEAs and Project Support members was held. The agenda for this retreat is attached (Attachment 7)

NSF YR1 Site Visit

‐ On August 27, Dr. Kelly Mack visited MSU for YR1 site visit to provide technical assistance as we move into YR2.

**PROJECT TEAM IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES**

Faculty Information Tool (FIT) (formerly “e-Portfolio”)

1. ADAPP-ADVANCE has continued to play a critical role in defining future of AHR data to be collected and made available for various levels of reporting at MSU. As mentioned in our YR1 report, the university is in the process of changing institution-wide technology systems (financial, human resource and research administration programs). ADAPP personnel have taken the lead in convening a group of personnel from across the institution to prioritize and collect quality and accessible Academic Human Resource (AHR) data. The planning of the FIT dataset is critical to ADAPP goal’s of aligning AHR practices with unit, college and University goals.
2. We are in the process of selecting a current departmental chair to lead the FIT planning group that will develop and prioritize list of faculty information needed to align criteria and practices in academic human resource management. This prioritized list will be used to determine what information will be captured on the University’s new Human Resource Information system.

3. First meeting of this group, held on July 6 and outlined how the group might function. Representatives at the meeting included personnel from:
   - Inclusion & Intercultural Initiatives
   - Office of Planning & Budgets (IR)
   - Academic Human Resources
   - Human Resources Information Systems
   - Enterprise Business System Project (EBSP) (unit coordinating university-wide systems change (above)

4. Initiated discussions with Office of Budget and Planning (OBP) on 8/28/09 about locating the FIT development team in that Office connected to the other EBSP initiatives. If FIT does end up residing in OPB, it represents a significant policy change for the university vis-à-vis faculty data and effort reporting.

5. Beginning to identify technology staff for developing the FIT datasets.

**FEA Activities**

1. Redefined role of FEAs (Attachment 8)

2. Working with the Provost to identify FEAs for 7 additional colleges that will participate in the refinement and use of ADAPP-ADVANCE resources and toolkits.

3. FEAs to be co-presenters with a representative from the ADAPP Grant Management Team in rolling out the ADAPP project to chairs and unit directors in the ADAPP colleges.

4. FEAs working with GMT reps to collect input from units on implementation of resources.

5. FEAs will work with GMT reps and internal evaluator to develop interview tools to determine impact of resources from representative groups of faculty and chairs

6. FEAs will work with GMT to determine what formal and informal policies and practices have been developed in the three colleges as a result, in part, of the ADVANCE grant

**Faculty Search (Team Lead/co-PI: Mark Roehling)**

1. Identified and reviewed: 1) all MSU official policies regarding the conducting of faculty searches; and 2) other MSU created support materials relating to faculty searches (resulting in the identification of out-of-date materials relating to faculty searches that were still being made available on-line to chairs and search committees).
2. Conducted an extensive on-line search to identify all U.S. universities and colleges (i.e., not limited to ADVANCE grant awardees) providing tools or other materials relating to faculty recruiting, hiring or other search activities on-line; systematically reviewed the newly identified tools/materials (i.e., those provided by universities and colleges that were not ADVANCE grant awardees).

3. Developed the following faculty search-related tools/materials:
   - “Overview of Faculty Search Process”
   - “Master Checklist for Faculty Searches”
   - Principles for Conducting Fair and Effective Faculty Searches: The Human Resource Management Perspective

4. Met with the search committee for the Mechanical Engineering (ME) chair position to discuss the search process, effectiveness and inclusivity issues, specific search tools, and the type of support the ADAPP project could provide.
   - Followed up the meeting with email communications with the ME search committee chair and individual search committee members, providing them additional tools (e.g., sample form for conducting a structured interview).
   - Met with internal evaluator Jan Urban Lurain to “debrief” the meeting with the ME search committee and record relevant information.

5. Reviewed the National Academies Report to assess its relevance to the Faculty Search Work Group activities.

6. Obtained survey data regarding faculty search practices, and faculty assessments of the fairness of the search process, for all units in the three participating colleges, and conducted initial analyses of faculty responses.

7. Contacted the Deans of the three colleges participating in the grant and communicated our offer to work directly with search committees in their respective colleges. Subsequently, the Dean of the College of Natural Sciences made arrangements to begin working with search committees in that college when the fall semester starts up.

8. Participated in meetings with EBSP and an outside vendor to provide input and assist in evaluating whether PeopleAdmin (a system to track applicants and collect search data) should be adopted by MSU for academic faculty searchers.

Annual Review (Team Lead/co-PI: Estelle McGroarty)

1. Obtained data from chairs and directors in all three colleges on the practices currently used in annual review. These data have been grouped and summarized based on discussions with the internal evaluator and with the assistance of the graduate assistant; the summary is attached as Attachment 9.
2. Prepared slide set to include some of the results of the Annual Review practice Inventory. These slides will be used in the presentation to Chairs and Directors. These are included below:

Key points regarding annual review practices in **College of Engineering**
- All EGR units have a common format for faculty to use in submitting information for annual review
- 1/3 of EGR units indicate they do **NOT** use uniform performance appraisal tool
- 1/3 of EGR units do not refer to prior reviews in annual review feedback
- 1/3 of EGR units indicate they meet only with pre-tenure faculty in annual review process
- 1/3 of EGR units indicated they do not seek input from other unit(s) for jointly appointed faculty

Key points regarding annual review practices in **College of Natural Science**
- All CNS units have a common format for faculty to use in submitting information for annual review
- ⅔ of CNS units indicate they do **NOT** use uniform performance appraisal tool
- 1/3 of CNS units do not refer to prior reviews in annual review feedback
- 1/3 of CNS units indicate they meet only with pre-tenure faculty in annual review process
- Only ¼ of CNS units indicated they have faculty expectations clearly stated in writing and readily available to faculty

Key points regarding annual review practices in **College of Social Science**
- All SSC units have a common format for faculty to use in submitting information for annual review
- Less than ⅔ of SSC units indicate that they use a uniform performance appraisal tool
- 40% of SSC units indicate that they do **NOT** refer to the prior year’s reviews and a similar number do not use goals set in previous years in the annual review process.
- 1/3 of SSC units indicate they do not meet with pre-tenure faculty in annual review process
- 60% of the SSC units indicate that faculty are **NOT** made aware of expectations through written documentation or other direct communication.

3. Met with Annual Review Work group 8/17/09
- Meeting included personnel from the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development to provide input on resources and discussed workshops this next year related to annual review. A complete set will be available in the next week or two.
- Reviewed draft of Resource Guide on Annual Performance Review of Tenure Faculty
- Reviewed summary of data from inventory of current practices regarding annual review processes. Discussed how best to use the data.
- Discussed roll out of resources related to annual review: resource guide, workshops
- Discussed activities and plans for next year:
  - Meeting with 7 additional Deans at August 24 retreat
  - Presentation of resources to Chairs and Directors of three ADAPP Colleges
  - Developing a communication plan about Annual Review resources
- Feedback on resources and their use will be provided by workgroup members by end of August.
1. Obtained data from chairs and directors in all three colleges on the practices currently used in Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) review. These data have been grouped and summarized based on discussions with the internal evaluator and with the assistance of the graduate assistant; the summary is attached as Attachment 10.
2. Prepared slide set to include some of the results of the Annual Review practice Inventory. These slides will be used in the presentation to Chairs and Directors. These are included below:

   Key points regarding RPT practices in **College of Engineering**
   - None of the responding units include information about stopping the tenure clock in their RPT guidelines
   - Half of the responding units do not provide the written criteria for evaluation to the authors of the external letters.
   - For RPT review of jointly appointed faculty, the evaluation criteria of the other unit is not requested during the evaluation.

   Key points regarding RPT practices in **College of Natural Science**
   - ¾ of the responding units do not have RP&T guidelines in their bylaws
   - NONE of the responding units include information about stopping the tenure clock in their RPT guidelines
   - 1/3 of the responding units do not provide the written criteria for evaluation to the authors of the external letters.

   Key points regarding RPT practices in **College of Social Science**
   - Only ¼ of the reporting units include information about stopping the tenure clock in their RPT guidelines
   - 1/3 of the responding units do not provide the written criteria for evaluation to the authors of the external letters.

3. Added the Chair of the personnel sub-committee of the University Faculty Affairs Committee to be a member of this workgroup to connect the work of this group to possible changes in University Policy through actions of Academic Governance.

4. Annual Review Resource Kit was sent to all members of the workgroup for input and that was used to refine the resources.

5. Requested listing of the Workshops proposed by the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development and how resources could be used or modified for use in these workshops.

6. Asked Workgroup members for input on the roll out of resources related to RPT: resource guide, workshops
   - Discussed activities and plans for next year:
     - Meeting with 7 additional Deans at August 24 retreat
     - Presentation of resources to Chairs and Directors of three ADAPP Colleges
- Developing a communication plan about Annual Review resources
  - Feedback on resources and their use will be provided by workgroup members by end of August.

Leadership (co-Team Lead/co-PI: Tamara Reid Bush)

1. Obtained data from chairs and directors in all 3 colleges on leadership activities of their faculty. Currently in the process of summarizing and analyzing these data.

2. Obtained data on leadership activities and perceptions from the faculty work environment survey. Currently in the process of summarizing and analyzing these data.

3. Met with internal evaluator regarding strategies for additional data collection around women and leadership in the STEM disciplines. These activities include:
   - focus group with women in current and past leadership roles on campus
   - focus group of women faculty who are currently serving in leadership positions within their disciplinary society
   - Topics for the above focus groups will include recruitment and selection; the reasoning or desire to apply to/assume leadership role; the value or benefit of serving in the leadership; leadership mentoring; concerns, challenges, and barriers; and advice for the current or next cohort of women faculty leaders at MSU
   - A separate IRB will be filed for the focus group work

4. Obtained a list of past chairs, identified 7 potential women who were past chairs and in STEM discipline for possible focus group on leadership.

5. Summarized data by college for gender and leadership.

6. Drafted an e-mail and questionnaire asking about disciplinary society involvement and leadership activities of women in STEM. Input on the questionnaire is being sought prior to the development of the final draft. Once a final version has been developed we will seek IRB approval.

Mentoring (Team Lead/Co-PI: Clare Luz)

1. Met with mentor workgroup and finalized goals and action plan. Specifically, discussed
   - Need for online “mentor resource center” with range of available resources from which individualized “toolkits” can be created, with assistance of FEA and unit/faculty input. Additionally, FEA will assist in identifying additional workshops to be developed for units.
   - Toolkits to include best practices, checklists, templates for college or unit level guidelines and policies, workshops, reference articles, etc.
   - Need to build on wealth of existing resources at MSU and within national Advance network
   - Expansion of ADAPP to 7 additional colleges
   - Need to work with FEA and build relationships at unit/faculty level to provide evidence-based information on value of mentoring to retention and advancement and to increase value placed on formal mentor programs. In process of developing a communication plan to accomplish this which includes providing chairs/directors and FEA with materials to share through distribution lists, newsletter articles, listserv postings and other venues.
Need to emphasize inclusivity and alignment with annual review, RP&T and leadership policies and practices within unit and college.

2. Finalized mentoring inventory and administered to chairs and directors of all departments in 3 beta colleges to establish baseline of current practices related to formal mentor programs at the college and unit levels. Currently in the process of summarizing and analyzing these data. Early findings indicate little consistency in implementation of mentor programs or in value placed on formal programs across units. This confirms information from discussion with Deans in these 3 colleges. Determined that all 3 Deans:
   - place high value on formal mentoring and believe that it positively affects retention and advancement
   - desire to build formal mentor programs at unit level and will welcome assistance from FEA and ADAPP in form of identifying best practices, tools, and workshops, and dissemination to faculty
   - Are establishing college-level expectations for such programs

3. Data from the Work Environment survey have been obtained by the GMT, and the workgroup is currently examining items specifically about faculty experiences and perceptions related to mentoring, including how they bridge with the mentor inventory.

4. Met with internal evaluator regarding data analyses of both the mentor inventory and work environment survey data and to begin to identify additional data collection needs. Detailed methods for additional data collection will be developed once analyses of current data are completed. Determined that these will include collecting data on existing best practices/models on campus, e.g. models that meet evidence-based criteria/standards of best practice in literature. Such data will be used to provide recognition to reinforce criteria/standards of best practice in literature. Such data will be used to provide recognition to reinforce behavior including posting exemplar practices on ADAPP website and via the “mentor resource center”.

5. Attended the 2009 LEAD National Workshop for SEM Chairs and Faculty in Fayetteville, AR which had several workshops devoted to Faculty Mentoring and Development. Began to establish ties to national Advance community and identify mutual interests and work related to mentoring.

6. Continued to collect existing literature and resources on best mentoring practices. Will now begin to assemble into resource guide and toolkit that can be individualized to specific unit needs.

7. Worked with Deb DeZure and the MSU Faculty & Organizational Development Office to co-sponsor and present a Spring Institute workshop on Designing Effective Faculty Mentoring Programs. The workshop was successful in terms of being well attended, all 3 ADAPP colleges were represented, and evaluations indicate that it was relevant and provided valuable information.
Climate and Culture (Work/Environment Survey) (Team co-Lead: Mark Roehling)

1. Meet with IPPSR personnel (Karen Clark, Nat Ehrlich) to discuss: a) data analysis strategies, and b) operational details regarding the initial analyses.

2. Conducted initial analyses (descriptive statistics) for all individual survey items, for: a) all respondents (faculty in all MSU colleges), and b) respondents in each of the three participating colleges (CSS, CNS, Engineering).

3. Constructed scale scores for the multiple item measures included in the survey and examined the basic psychometric properties of the scales to establish their “threshold validity.”

4. For each of the three participating colleges:
   - Conducted statistical tests of gender differences in: (i) responses to survey items pertaining to faculty search, promotion and tenure, and annual performance review; and (ii) climate and attitude constructs assessed by the multiple item measures (e.g., general diversity climate, climate for women, incivility, and global satisfaction).
   - Constructed tables reporting the results of the above analyses, provided FEAs the results, and solicited FEA reactions/input.

5. Conducted statistical tests of race differences (White versus Non-White, White versus African American) in survey responses described in 4a, immediately above, constructed a table reporting the results of analyses comparing White versus African American faculty responses, and provided FEAs the results.

EVALUATION

1. Internal evaluation team began to collect data on changes in policies and practices at the college level in the three participating colleges.
   a. Entered and analyzed unit responses to inventories of current practices related to Retention, Promotion and Tenure (RPT), Annual Review, Mentoring, and Leadership. Inventory response rates were: RPT -22/29 units (76%); Annual Review - 27/29 units (93%); Mentoring – 25/29 units (86%), and Leadership - 27/29 units (93%).
   b. Prepared written summary of preliminary analyses of findings related to policy and practice consistency, transparency, objectivity and inclusiveness for all inventories.
   c. Conducted meetings with each work group/team leaders to 1) review preliminary findings and 2) determine further qualitative data needs and quantitative analyses to be conducted during the first Quarter Yr 2.
   d. Initiated discussions to determine crosswalks between unit inventory-derived findings and feedback from the faculty worklife survey.

2. As we move into YR2 we are connecting activities and interventions from each of the workgroups to the four primary goals of the project:
- To increase the recruitment of women faculty in STEM
- To increase the retention women faculty in STEM
- To increase the advancement of women in STEM by increasing leadership development for women,
- To improve the climate for women faculty in the three participating colleges.

3. We are reconsidering the expectations of the external evaluator and are considering identifying an evaluator that will more critically review proposed goals and activities of the grant.

4. A meeting with the External Advisory Board is planned for late September.

**SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS / BEST IDEA YET**

1. Assembling a FIT stakeholder coordination team

2. Establishing the Office of Planning and Budgets (IR) as a possible host for FIT

3. Planning strategy to get ADAPP-ADVANCE work “into departments” via chairs/directors meetings during August 2009.

**AREAS OF DIFFICULTY / GREATEST CHALLENGES**

1. ADAPP-ADVANCE at MSU is walking a fine line between being “sage on the stage” (reinforcing mandatory processes that must be followed) vs. “guide on the side” (provider of guidelines and best practices.

2. Meeting evaluation needs going into YR2 of the grant.
ATTACHMENT 1
To Contact Us:

**ADAPP-ADVANCE**
Office of the Provost
Michigan State University
524 South Redler
East Lansing, MI 48824-1032
tel. 517.353.8818
fax 517.353.8859
adapp@msu.edu

Advancing Diversity through the Alignment of Policies and Practices (ADAPP)

MSU’s ADVANCE program has been established to promote MSU’s values of quality and inclusion by enhancing the alignment, consistency, transparency and objectivity of academic human resource practices across the STEM fields.

Kim A. Wilcox, Ph.D., Principal Investigator
kwilcox@msu.edu

Estelle McGroarty, Ph.D., Lead Co-Principal Investigator
mcgroar1@egr.msu.edu

Theodore H. Curry, M.B.A., Co-Principal Investigator
thcurry@msu.edu

Tamara Reid Bush, Ph.D., Co-Principal Investigator
reidtama@msu.edu

Clare C. Luz, Ph.D., Co-Principal Investigator
clare.luz@hc.msu.edu

Mark V. Roehling, Ph.D., Co-Principal Investigator
roehling@msu.edu

Melissa McDaniels, Ph.D., Project Director
mcdani73@msu.edu

www.adapp-advance.msu.edu
“The United States can no longer afford the under performance of our academic institutions in attracting the best and brightest minds to the science and engineering enterprise. … our academic institutions must be held accountable and provide evidence that women and men receive equitable opportunities, resources and support.”

(National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, Institute of Medicine, 2007)

**WHAT IS ADVANCE?**

The National Science Foundation (NSF) ADVANCE program aims to strengthen the scientific workforce through the increased representation of women in academic science and engineering careers. MSU is one of 37 colleges and universities funded by NSF.

**WHAT IS ADVANCE at Michigan State?**

ADAPP (Advancing Diversity through the Alignment of Policies and Practices) is MSU’s ADVANCE initiative. Its goal is to promote MSU’s values of quality and inclusion by attracting, retaining and promoting the highest quality faculty possible across all disciplines. It will begin its efforts by enhancing academic human resource practices such as faculty search, annual review, RP&T (reappointment, promotion and tenure), mentoring, and leadership development across the Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) fields.

**WHY IS MSU IMPLEMENTING THIS INITIATIVE?**

By recognizing and increasing diversity among faculty and women, ADAPP will:

- Promote MSU’s core values of quality and inclusion;
- Enhance the opportunity for all faculty to thrive within a rich, intellectually stimulating and supportive community;
- Clarify expectations, creating equitable access to resources, and fostering and rewarding achievement;
- Increase the number of, and diversity among, women who are hired, retained and advanced.

**HOW WILL ADAPP IMPACT FACULTY AND HOW WILL THEY BENEFIT?**

Faculty will benefit from increased transparency, consistency, objectivity, inclusivity and alignment of academic human resource practices.

Benefits include:

- A clearer understanding of criteria and expectations for faculty searches, annual review and promotion & tenure which can reduce bias in related decisions;
- Improved access to and information about mentoring and leadership resources that advance faculty careers;
- Higher quality & more diverse faculty with whom to collaborate; and
- A more positive work environment.

In addition, an electronic faculty information tool will be developed to serve as a central repository for faculty performance data, which can increase efficiency and simplify multiple reporting requirements.

To accomplish these goals, faculty will be asked to participate in workshops, assist in the development of toolkits, and work with the ADAPP team to implement best practices in their units.
Advancing Diversity through the Alignment of Policies and Practices (ADAPP)

What is ADVANCE & What is ADVANCE at Michigan State?

- NSF’s ADVANCE Institutional Transformation grant program aims to strengthen the scientific workforce through the increased inclusion of women in STEM. These awards support comprehensive programs for institution-wide change.

- Michigan State is one of 37 of ADVANCE’s Institutional Transformation Grant Awardees ($3.98M over 5 years).

- Provost Kim Wilcox is the Principal Investigator.
  - Karen Klomparens, Provost’s Representative
  - Estelle McGroarty, Terry Curry, Tamara Reid Bush, Clare Luz, and Mark Roehling are co-PIs

- 3 colleges currently involved (CNS, CSS, CEGR). Plan to expand to 7 additional colleges (CVM, CHM, COM, CN, CAL, CANR, LBS) in 2009/2010.
GOALS

• Increase the number of women faculty recruited
• Increase the retention of women faculty
• Increase the advancement of women faculty
• Improve the work climate for all faculty, including women.

APPROACH

• Align academic human resource (AHR) processes & goals (faculty search, annual review, RP&T, mentoring, leadership) at the unit level with the college & university goals.

• Develop evaluation criteria that are consistent, transparent, aligned, and objective and focus on improving quality and inclusivity.
Approach supported by theory and a large body of research demonstrating that increasing the structure and alignment of policies and practices will promote a high quality and inclusive workforce (Arthur and Doverspike, 2005; Ericksen & Dyer, 2005; Evans, Puckik, & Barsoux, 2002; Gratton & Truss, 2003).

This project is creating **tools NOT rules!**

- Units, colleges, Provost & academic governance create and modify the “rules”
- Tools will be built on best practices & be responsive to college-based needs (as presented in data collection).
Units in CNS are not consistently following annual review & RP&T policy or best practices. Results from survey of CNS Chairs shows:

- ½ of CNS units indicate they do **NOT** use a uniform performance appraisal tool
- 1/3 of CNS units do not refer to prior reviews in annual review feedback
- Only ¼ of CNS units indicated they have faculty expectations for annual review clearly stated in writing and readily available to faculty
- NONE of the responding units include information about stopping the tenure clock in their RPT guidelines
- 1/3 of the responding units do not provide the criteria for evaluation to the authors of the external letters used in the RPT process.
Analysis of work environment survey results from CNS faculty shows:

- Women in CNS units report a less favorable assessment of hiring, performance review and RPT processes AND significantly lower levels of overall satisfaction with their position, compared to men.
- Women perceive less consistency in hiring, annual review and RPT policies & practices in units.

Analysis of University data shows:

- The number and % of women in departments decreases as rank increases (consistent with National Academy Report)
- Women are being recruited into CNS units in numbers lower than the relative number of recent PhDs but in proportions higher than the present representation in the CNS faculty.
- Female faculty in STEM disciplines leave MSU at 2x the rate compared to men.
ADAPP ACTIVITY IN 2009/2010

- **Resource Development**
  - Resource Guides that bring together current MSU policies & best practices, as well as new ideas from other ADVANCE institutions.
  - On-line Faculty Resource Center (present current policies and best practices for faculty search, annual review, RP&T, mentoring & leadership)

- **Workshops**
  - Refine existing and develop new workshops based upon college needs reflected in baseline data.

- **Electronic Faculty Records**
  - Faculty Information Tool
Based upon core values of the University (quality & inclusivity)

**Will make your work (and that of your faculty) more effective & efficient**
by improving recruitment, retention, and advancement of faculty in your unit.

Tools will help increase faculty quality, productivity, and retention, as indicated by strategic human resource management research (Schneider, et. al. [2003]).

Just as you do in your own research, we should apply careful, thoughtful, thorough and well documented methods for AHR processes to guarantee quality.

This is a large NSF project, and MSU is a highly NSF-funded campus. We want to be successful in the eyes of NSF.
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Michigan State University’s ADVANCE program has been established to promote our institutional values of **quality** and **inclusion** by enhancing the **alignment**, **consistency**, **transparency**, and **objectivity** of academic human resource practices across the STEM fields …

**Academic Human Resource Interventions:**
- Faculty Search
- Annual Review
- Reappointment, Promotion & Tenure
- Mentoring
- Women’s Leadership
- Climate/Culture

**Participating Colleges:**
- Engineering
- Natural Science
- Social Science

**Personnel:**
- Kim Wilcox, Ph.D., Provost & PI
- Estelle McGroarty, Ph.D., Professor & Lead co-PI
- Tamara Reid Bush, Ph.D., Assistant Professor & co-PI
- Theodore Curry, M.B.A., Professor & co-PI
- Clare Luz, Ph.D., Assistant Professor & co-PI
- Mark Roehling, Ph.D., Associate Professor & co-PI
- Melissa McDaniels, Ph.D., Project Director

**Conceptual Model:**

**Planning/Evaluation:**
- **YR 1:** Assess Existing Policies and Practices / Initiate Intervention Strategies
- **YR 2:** Build Awareness of Exemplar Practices / Initiate New Practices
- **YR 3:** Building Practices and Behaviors
- **YRS 4 & 5:** Benchmarking New Practices and Behaviors

**www.adapp-advance.msu.edu**
WOMEN FARING WELL IN HIRING AND TENURE PROCESSES FOR SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING JOBS AT RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES, BUT STILL UNDERREPRESENTED IN APPLICANT POOLS

Data collected at MSU indicates that Women are being recruited in STEM disciplines at in numbers lower than the relative number of recent PhDs but in proportions higher than the present representation of women on the faculty.

“Our data suggest that, on average, institutions have become more effective in using the means under their direct control to promote faculty diversity, including hiring and promoting women and providing resources,”

As previously noted, women at MSU are being recruited in higher proportion that the present distribution in the faculty presumably because of more effective means in promoting diversity. The relative number of women and men promoted at MSU is not different.

In each of the six disciplines, women who applied for tenure-track positions had a better chance of being interviewed and receiving job offers than male applicants had.

At MSU this data has not been collected in the past so we do not know if this is the case here.

The surveys revealed that most institutional strategies to try to increase the proportion of women in the applicant pool -- such as targeted advertising and recruiting at conferences -- did not show significant effectiveness, the report says.

There is no data at MSU related to this.

Men and women reported comparable access to many institutional resources, including start-up packages, travel funds, and supervision of similar numbers of postdocs and research assistants.

This data will be collected at MSU through the Advance grant. Evidence collected does show that similar to the NAP report, the salary for women at all ranks is not significantly different than for men, except, perhaps in the categories of named and University Distinguished Professor ranks, where men had much higher average salaries.

In every field, women were underrepresented among candidates for tenure relative to the number of female assistant professors.

Data from RPT decisions at MSU over the last three years do not show any difference in tenure decisions between men and women, but data has not yet been collected to determine if women were underrepresented as candidates for tenure. Consistent with data in the NAP report, the relative number of women decreases with rank, with a lower proportion of women full professors than associate professors, and a lower proportion of women associate professors than assistant professors.

Female faculty reported that they were less likely than men to engage in conversation with their colleagues on many professional topics, including research, salary, and benefits. This distance may prevent women from accessing important information and may make them feel less included and more marginalized in their professional lives, the committee observed. While on average institutions have done more to address aspects of career transitions under their control, the report notes, one of the remaining challenges may be in the climate at the departmental level.

A Work Environment Survey of faculty at MSU is being analyzed and will to show if women are less likely than men to engage colleagues in discussions related to professional topics

When analyzing the search process it was noted that when the Chair of the search committee was a woman or when there were several women on the search committee, a higher proportion of the applicant pool were women.

Anecdotal evidence indicates that when women headed searches at MSU more women were interviewed. The diversity of the applicant pool from the time of application to the offer will be followed by the ADAPP project.

Grant funding, nominations for awards and honors, and offers of positions at other institutions -- there is little evidence of differences in outcomes. Male faculty had significantly more funding than female faculty in biology; in other disciplines, the differences were not significant.

Differences in grant funding, honors and awards between men and women at MSU have not been collected. However there is strong evidence that women are twice as likely to leave MSU for reasons other than retirement or death.
Overall the newly released data indicate important progress but the findings show that we are not there yet. The gap between female graduates and the pool of female applicants is very real, and suggests that focus next be placed on examining challenges such as family and child responsibilities, which typically impact women more than men."

Examination of challenges such as family and child responsibilities for men and women at MSU will be part of the results of the work environment survey. Still to address, why more women are not applying for tenure-track positions, why female faculty continue to experience a sense of isolation, and how nonacademic issues affect women's and men's career choices at critical junctures.

MSU’s Work Environment Survey will provide some answers as to how faculty views their work environment, both men and women, and how nonacademic issues affect their career choices differently.
ATTACHMENT 5
Annual Performance Review
of Tenure System Faculty at
Michigan State University
RESOURCE GUIDE

RESOURCES FOR FACULTY AND UNIT ADMINISTRATORS
• MSU Policies and Procedures from the Faculty Handbook
• Overview of Resources and Policies on Faculty Effort Review and Evaluation
• Sabbatical Leaves of Absence (MSU Policy)

RESOURCES FOR UNIT ADMINISTRATORS
• Checklist of Best Practices for Faculty Review
• Best Practices for Advancement of Mid-Career Faculty
• Best Practices for Constructive Feedback

RESOURCES FOR FACULTY
• Suggested Annual Review Checklist
• Strategies for Mid-Career Faculty Advancement

This is a working draft. Please send any feedback to adapp@msu.edu, or return to the ADAPP-ADVANCE office at 524 South Kedzie. It is expected that units/departments could modify this guide to meet the unique needs of their contexts.
All units must have procedures for written evaluation of tenure system faculty at all ranks to support the annual merit process and to provide a basis for a clear statement of performance expectations and accomplishments. It is recognized that provisions and practices in units may vary; however, all evaluation procedures must incorporate, at the minimum, the principles included in this model policy for regular faculty review, and must be applied uniformly to all faculty in the unit.

I. PRINCIPLES

While some variation may occur in the approach to reviews, the following principles as implemented by unit procedures are to be followed by unit administrators (i.e., Deans, Chairpersons and Directors) and faculty. In the case of faculty with joint appointments, a lead unit administrator shall be designated. The process should be clearly defined by the bylaws or established personnel policies and procedures of each academic unit.

A. Each tenure system faculty shall be evaluated on an annual basis and informed in writing of the results of his/her review by the unit administrator.

B. Each unit shall have clearly formulated and relevant written performance criteria and shall provide these at the time of appointment, and subsequently as necessary, to all faculty to clarify expectations.

C. Faculty shall be informed of all factors used for evaluation, the evaluation of their performance on each of these factors and the relationship between their performance and decisions on merit salary adjustments and, if appropriate, on reappointment, promotion and tenure. Faculty are entitled to have all their assigned duties given weight in the evaluation.

D. These annual assessments of faculty reviews shall be reflected in recommendations to the Provost’s Office regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

II. GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

A. Units should initiate the annual review process early enough so that the full process, including feedback to faculty, may be completed before the beginning of the fall semester.

B. Each faculty member shall submit a written summary of activities for the appropriate period of time to the unit administrator in a timely manner prior to the review. These materials will be shared with the faculty in accordance with unit bylaws and procedures.
C. If unit bylaws or procedures provide for performance evaluation by peer review committees, unit administrators shall rely on the advice of this designated group, in addition to their own judgment.

D. Unit administrators or their designees, no later than 3 months after completion of the evaluation, shall provide to the faculty member a written evaluation of her/his overall performance. Whenever appropriate, such evaluations shall contain constructive and explicit recommendations and clarify expectations of what is needed to make additional scholarly progress in the tenure system.

E. If, after receiving the written review, the faculty member disagrees with its content or chooses to provide additional documentation or comment, the faculty member shall have an opportunity to respond to the review. Any additional written faculty comment and/or documentation which are submitted within one month of receipt of the written review shall become part of the documentation for the review.

F. The full documentation for this written review, including the faculty member’s response, shall be placed in the faculty member's unit personnel file.

G. Meetings between faculty members and unit administrators are encouraged prior to the written summary to provide feedback about expectations and evaluation. Each faculty member shall have the right to meet in person with the unit administrator or designee after the written review is received.

NOTES:
1. **MSU’s Policy on Faculty Review:** in the MSU Handbook (also in resource packet):
   http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Documents/Faculty/Handbooks/Faculty/AcademicPersonnelPolicies/iv-facultyreview.htm

2. **Conducting and Writing Faculty Performance Reviews from the MSU Faculty Handbook:**
   - http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Performance/Faculty/ConductWrite/
   - Writing Faculty Performance Reviews: General Guidelines
     http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Performance/Faculty/ConductWrite/general.htm
   - Writing Faculty Performance Reviews: A Suggested Format
     http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Performance/Faculty/ConductWrite/format.htm
   - Sample Performance Review Letters
     http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Performance/Faculty/ConductWrite/letters.htm
   - Faculty Performance Reviews
     http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Performance/Faculty/ConductWrite/reviews.htm
   - Strategies for Faculty Development
     http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Performance/Faculty/ConductWrite/strategies.htm
   - Guidelines for Academic Unit Peer Review Committee Composition
     http://www.hr.msu.edu/NR/exeres/5EAB277F-4307-4A62-B257-4E0ED6DEBA41.htm

3. **Annual Evaluation of Chairpersons/Directors from the MSU Faculty Handbook:**
   http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Documents/Faculty/Handbooks/Faculty/AcademicPersonnelPolicies/iv-annualeval
   The policy states that the evaluation instrument (criteria) currently used by each dean in annual evaluations **MUST be filed with the Office of the Provost** prior to each annual cycle of evaluations.

4. **Post-Tenure Review Policy:**
   http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Documents/Faculty/Handbooks/Faculty/AcademicPersonnelPolicies/iv-posttenure

5. **Faculty Career Advancement and Professional Development:**
   - A Special Affirmative Action Responsibility
     http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Documents/Faculty/Handbooks/Faculty/AcademicPersonnelPolicies/iv-careeradvance.htm

6. **Programs and Workshops on Faculty Performance Evaluation and Faculty Orientation**
   – Offered by the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development
   http://fod.msu.edu/
Overview of Resources and Policies on Faculty Effort Review and Evaluation

1. MSU's Policy on Faculty Review: in the MSU Handbook (also in Resource Packet):
   - http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Documents/Faculty/Handbooks/Faculty/AcademicPersonnelPolicies/iv-facultyreview.htm

2. Conducting and Writing Faculty Performance Reviews:
   - http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Performance/Faculty/ConductWrite/WritingFacultyPerformanceReviews:GeneralGuidelines.htm
   - http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Performance/Faculty/ConductWrite/WritingFacultyPerformanceReviews:SuggestedFormat.htm
   - Sample Performance Review Letters:
   - http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Performance/Faculty/ConductWrite/letters.htm
   - Faculty Performance Reviews:
   - http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Performance/Faculty/ConductWrite/reviews.htm
   - Strategies for Faculty Development:
   - http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Performance/Faculty/ConductWrite/strategies.htm
   - Guidelines for Academic Unit Peer Review Committee Composition:
   - http://www.hr.msu.edu/NR/exeres/5EAB277F-4307-4A62-B257-4E0ED6DEBA41.htm

3. Annual Evaluation of Chairpersons/Directors from the MSU Faculty Handbook:
   - http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Documents/Faculty/Handbooks/Faculty/AcademicPersonnelPolicies/iv-annualeval
   - The policy states that the evaluation instrument (criteria) currently used by each dean in annual evaluations must be filed with the Office of the Provost prior to each annual cycle of evaluations.

4. Post-Tenure Review Policy:
   - http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Documents/Faculty/Handbooks/Faculty/AcademicPersonnelPolicies/iv-posttenure

5. Faculty Career Advancement and Professional Development: A Special Affirmative Action Responsibility:
   - http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Documents/Faculty/Handbooks/Faculty/AcademicPersonnelPolicies/iv-careeradvance.htm

6. Programs and Workshops on Faculty Performance Evaluation and Faculty Orientation – Offered by the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development:
   - http://fod.msu.edu/
Sabbatical leaves are an especially important opportunity to maintain the vitality and promoting the development of faculty. The University’s policy on sabbatical leaves, including expectations and eligibility requirements can be found at /HRsite/Documents/Faculty/Handbooks/Faculty/AcademicPersonnelPolicies/iv-sabbatical

**GENERAL POLICY**

1. A sabbatical is not granted automatically, i.e. it is not an entitlement. Faculty must be informed that each sabbatical request is reviewed by the chairperson/director, the dean and by the Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Human Resources as the Provost’s designee. Sabbatical requests may be denied at each administrative level. The normal six-month lead time requirement for requesting sabbatical leaves should be adhered to by faculty members and academic units to permit sabbatical review/evaluation and effective planning.

2. A sabbatical leave is intended for the mutual benefit of the faculty member and the University. Academic unit and dean’s office endorsements must state clearly in writing the expected benefit of the sabbatical leave outcome for the unit, i.e., the institution’s return on investment entailed in a commitment to a sabbatical leave. This endorsement should be detailed enough to permit review and endorsement by academic unit administrators and the Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Human Resources. A faculty member’s past meritorious achievements as reflected in awards, other recognition and merit and market salary adjustments, etc. are relevant to evaluation of the merit, including potential outcomes of a sabbatical leave request.

3. As required by the sabbatical leave policy, the faculty member must provide the unit with a sabbatical leave report evaluating the experience and impact of the sabbatical, particularly as it relates to the expectations set forth in the original sabbatical leave request.

**ELIGIBILITY**

1. Only faculty members with tenure are eligible for sabbatical leaves.
2. A sabbatical leave is not granted until a faculty member has completed six years of service to the University.
3. Years of service are counted from the date of full-time appointment, or from the ending date of the previous sabbatical leave. However, all leaves of absence are excluded in determining years of service for a sabbatical leave.
TYPES OF SABBATICAL LEAVES

1. For faculty on academic year appointments, sabbatical leaves are of two types:
   a. One term with no reduction in pay.
   b. Two terms with a fifty percent reduction in the academic year salary. (*Payments distributed over 12 months.*)

2. For faculty on annual appointments:
   a. Up to six months with no reduction in pay.
   b. Twelve months with a fifty percent reduction in pay.

3. For deans, directors, departmental chairpersons, and other administrative officers:
   a. Three months once every three years with full pay (after six years of service to the University and including at least three years of administrative service.)
   b. Six months with no reduction in pay after at least six years of service to the University after the previous sabbatical or from the date of full-time appointment including at least three years in administrative positions.
   c. Sabbatical leave eligibility following the return to regular faculty duties requires six years of service to the University since the completion of the any sabbatical leave as an administrator.

CONDITIONS

1. Faculty on sabbatical leaves are permitted to receive money for activities approved as part of the approved sabbatical plan without affecting receipt of income from Michigan State University, provided that the total income from all sources does not exceed that received from MSU. (Financial support to offset the costs of travel and subsistence are excluded.)

2. Teaching, research and service activities performed during sabbatical leaves must be in accord with the mission of the unit, college and University. Faculty members on sabbatical leave may accept teaching assignments for pay subject to the following conditions:
   a. The teaching assignment is part of the experiences that improve scholarly/creative competence;
   b. Benefits flowing from the teaching assignment must be included in the sabbatical leave plan;
   c. The details of the teaching assignment are clearly defined in the sabbatical leave plan and are subject to approval by the unit administrator.
3. A faculty member who has been on a sabbatical leave must return to Michigan State University for the following year. A faculty member may not request a leave without pay immediately following a sabbatical. If a leave with no pay is to be recommended, it should precede the sabbatical leave.

DEPARTMENTAL ADJUSTMENTS

1. If a sabbatical leave is granted for one year, the department retains the released salary funds for a replacement, with approval by the dean of the college.
2. If leave is granted for less than a year, the department is expected to make adjustments such as suspending courses or reassigning other personnel to teaching duties.
3. Sabbatical leaves will not be granted to several members of a department concurrently if the efficiency of instruction, research and service programs will be impaired.

NOTES:
RESOURCE FOR UNIT CHAIRS & DIRECTORS

_____ Develop a written set of unit goals to be used in annual performance evaluation which are shared with and made readily available to all faculty.

_____ Consider having the faculty (or a subgroup) review and update these goals annually.

_____ Communicate the workloads for annual evaluation to faculty prior to submission of materials, and make them readily available to faculty.

_____ Establish a set of performance criteria and standards for teaching, scholarly output and service that are clearly communicated to faculty.

_____ Consider providing methods for evaluating excellence that are clearly described to the faculty prior to the submission of annual review materials.

_____ Involve faculty members in setting expectations during performance reviews.

_____ Discuss prior year performance review & goals with the faculty member during the annual review process.

_____ Use performance evaluation results in determining merit raises and indicate the relationship between performance evaluation results and salary increase in the raise letter.

_____ Communicate to faculty members the expectations that are being measured by any performance appraisal tool (e.g., form, formula, electronic system) is used during the annual performance evaluation process?

_____ Strive for the consistent treatment of faculty members (relative to others) during the performance evaluation process.

_____ Utilize annual performance evaluations to develop a program for career development plan (3 – 5 years) for all faculty.

_____ Utilize annual performance evaluations to develop a program for career development for a subset of the faculty

_____ Provide guidance related to expectations for RP&T decisions in annual performance evaluation and clearly state these suggestions in the review letter.
Use annual performance evaluations to identify training and mentoring opportunities to help faculty members reach career goals.

Include sabbatical leaves in discussions of career planning and development during the review process?

Encourage faculty self-appraisal during the annual review process.

For faculty with a joint appointment in another unit, seek input from the additional unit in the annual performance review and in performance management.

As relevant to your unit, have the performance review committee or chair review the following materials (as relevant to your context):

- Career development plan or other statement of goals
- Annual activity report
- Updated Curriculum Vita
- Input from teaching or research mentors
- Other supporting documentation

When finalizing the appraisal, the primary evaluator may choose to:

- Review the prior year’s performance
- Indicate areas needing improvement
- Indicate progress toward reappointment/promotion/tenure
- Indicate other developmental issues

Consider scheduling performance feedback meetings for:

- All faculty
- All pre-tenured faculty
- All Assistant and Associate Professors
- This department does not schedule performance feedback meetings

In performance feedback meetings, consider discussing the following (as relevant to context):

- Draft letter of appraisal that is provided before or at the beginning of the meeting
- Faculty performance (rather than personality)
- Specific issues
- Questions of the faculty member
Coaches or helpers, as necessary
A positive plan for future development
Final performance review letters might include the following (as relevant to context):

- An overview of the unit’s evaluation process
- Assessment of teaching
- Assessment of scholarly output
- Assessment of service and outreach
- A summary of the evaluation
- An overall or general classification or rating of performance
- A list of next steps

Performance review results may be used to (as relevant to context):

- Recognize and reward exemplary performance with merit raises and reappointment or promotion consideration
- Recognize and reward exemplary performance with differential assignments
- Address the needs of the underperforming faculty and develop a plan for improvement
- Help with faculty development and with concerns about teaching, scholarship and service
- Develop and refine a request for a sabbatical leave

NOTES:
CHECK LIST OF BEST PRACTICES FOR CONSTRUCTIVE FEEDBACK DURING ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

RESOURCE FOR UNIT CHAIRS & DIRECTORS

_____ Provide DESCRIPTIVE (vs. evaluative feedback).
    Avoiding evaluative language reduces defensive responses.

EXAMPLE:

Example of non-descriptive feedback: You had a very poor connection to the students in the graduate class you taught last semester.

More appropriate: In your graduate class last semester, students indicated that you did not give them a chance to ask questions about the materials being presented and you were unavailable after class for clarification.

_____ Provide SPECIFIC feedback.

Example of vague feedback: Your publication record was below what was expected for promotion.

More appropriate: As noted in our annual review last year, you anticipated that three articles would be published in peer reviewed journals this year, but only one has been submitted and it has not yet been accepted for publication. We had discussed that, for promotion, you would be expected to publish two papers per year, on the average, over your first four years at MSU.

_____ Focus feedback on BEHAVIOR not personal traits. Use terminology that indicates behavioral traits that could change and NOT personal traits that might be more fixed.

Example of behavioral feedback: It has been noted that you have not shown up for meetings that your student advisees have scheduled with you. In addition, it has been reported for the two courses you taught this last year, you were often late in arriving for the class. It is important that you manage your schedule and commitments better to meet the needs of our students.

_____ Use feedback that addresses both the needs of the unit/university and the needs of the faculty member receiving feedback. The feedback needs to be bi-directional and the faculty receiving feedback needs to be able to address his/her issues.

Examples: It was noted that over half of the lectures in your 401 course last semester were given by your senior research associate, Dr. Smith. I assume that you were closely mentoring him. Was this to give him experience in teaching? I know that you were out of town quite a bit last semester and many of these trips were to present papers and visit with your collaborators, and I support those activities. I assume you remained in close contact with Dr. Smith while you were away? I want to point out that you were responsible for this course – that the syllabus was followed and that the students enrolled received quality instruction. So, I wanted to discuss how you worked with Dr. Smith in this course.
_____ Use feedback to both share information and solicit input from the faculty member receiving feedback.

**Example:** Based on SIRS forms from your XXX 101 class, students indicated that you did not give them information about how the course would be graded. Was the grading scheme in the syllabus and discussed early on in the class? Did you provide this information on the Web? I should point out that, according to the code of Teaching Responsibility, the course syllabus should include the grading criteria and methods used to determine the final course grade.

_____ Provide the appropriate amount and level of feedback

_____ To ensure clear communication, rephrase feedback to make sure what you express is understood by the receiver to reduce chances of disagreement with the message you intended.

**Example:** Are you providing sufficient time to the graduate students in your lab to help guide them in their research projects? Because you have been out of town a significant amount of time during this last year, have you set up a mechanism to communicate with your students? Do you have a senior research associate who is overseeing some of the junior graduate students?

_____ Discuss the consequences of the feedback with the faculty member.

**Examples:** I am concerned that you have not submitted a grant for external funding over the last three years to support your research program, and you have not had external funding for the last 5 years. I note that you are a very good teacher, and your innovative techniques in the classroom are valued and appreciated. Thus, if you do not secure a grant this next year, your teaching load will go up by one course, and if you do not secure external funding within the next three years, your teaching load will be increased by an additional second course and your research space will be decreased in size. This decrease in research productivity and increase in teaching activity will be reviewed and reevaluated every year during the annual performance evaluation process.

Adapted from *A Handbook for Faculty Development Vol I.* The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975, pp. 224-225

**NOTES:**

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________
RESOURCES FOR INDIVIDUAL EARLY CAREER FACULTY

After Initial Appointment at the University

_____ Upon initial appointment you should ask for the performance criteria that will be used in the annual review process and what materials must be submitted to evaluate performance.

_____ Make sure the expected workloads are clearly communicated to you prior to the start of the evaluation period.

_____ Make sure you are informed of the methods for evaluating excellence prior to the evaluation process.

_____ Make sure you are informed of any performance appraisal tool used during the annual performance evaluation process, including the expectations measured by the tool.

Prior to faculty review:

_____ Arrange a meeting to discuss performance evaluation with the department chair or unit head (or appropriate review committee).

_____ Update and print recent copy of CV and take a copy to the review meeting.

_____ Review annual review documentation submitted at time of the request for review materials, read prior to meeting. Take a copy to the meeting.

Items to discuss during the faculty review:

Use annual meeting to ask questions about the review process. The faculty member may want to consider questions similar to the following during review:

Scholarly Output (STEM example):

What is expected in terms of scholarly output? (examples include numbers of papers, books, performances, etc.)

How is the quality of scholarly work evaluated? (examples include: quality of journals published, critical reviews of books or performances, awards received, invitations to speak at meetings/other universities, awarding of external grants, etc.)

How is this work evaluated in relationship to other faculty in the unit? (examples include: average number or range of proposals accepted; average dollar amount of each proposal)

What will be expected of me regarding scholarly output in the next year and at the time of reappointment or for promotion? Scholarship quality? As compared to others in the unit?
Teaching:
What is the average SIRS score for a same level course in this department (i.e. 200 level, 300 level, graduate)?
Where can I obtain information to help develop my teaching skills?
How is the quality of my teaching evaluated?
What changes are expected in my teaching load and quality of my teaching in the future?
Would you be supportive of me attending courses to develop my teaching, such as those sponsored by FOD? Ask about other opportunities for development of teaching skills.

Service:
What are the expected unit/departmental service from a faculty member at my level?
What type of service outside the department is expected?
How is service as reviewer of papers or grants viewed in providing service?
How are different forms of service in the discipline such as organizing a regional meeting, serving as a journal editor, etc., viewed in evaluating my overall performance?

Leadership:
What are the expectations regarding developing faculty leaders within the discipline and/or within academia and how are they evaluated?
What opportunities are there to develop leadership skills and would they be encouraged and supported?

Areas for improvement:
Do you have suggestions for how to improve in specific areas that were identified as needing improvement?
Can we discuss a plan for professional development?
What are your future expectations of me?
How might continue these discussions throughout the year to make sure you are on track?
ITEMS FOR FACULTY TO CONSIDER AFTER REVIEW:

Does your evaluation letter include:

_____ a discussion of professional development or leadership issues?
_____ a summary of the prior year’s performance?
_____ indications of areas needing improvement?
_____ comments on progress toward reappointment/promotion/tenure, if appropriate?
_____ a specific assessment of teaching?
_____ a specific assessment of research and scholarship?
_____ a specific evaluation of service and outreach?
_____ an overall or general classification or rating of performance (i.e. at departmental average with regard to research, above average with regard to publications)?
_____ recommendations and areas for improvement during the next year?
_____ an invitation to respond to the review letter?

After reviewing the evaluation letter:

☐ If you believe that the letter does NOT reflect all the items addressed in the review, then the immediately contact the evaluator via e-mail, note the areas of concern, and arrange a meeting to discuss these specific concerns with the evaluator.

NOTES:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
RESOURCE FOR UNIT CHAIRS & DIRECTORS

- Discuss faculty plans and goals and approaches for reaching the goals.
  - Determine if working toward promotion to Full professor.
- Define clear expectations for achieving rank of full professor.
- Review current projects and whether these projects will help with promotion.
- Consider providing mentoring to assist in meeting expectations for promotion.
- Develop a plan that is reviewed annually or more frequently
- Consider having the mid-career faculty join a new research team or collaboration.
- Provide faculty with a coach to assist with networking or with needed skills.
- Encourage faculty to participate in development workshops. Nominate faculty for professional development opportunities.
- Relocate less productive faculty near higher performing faculty.
- Encourage sabbaticals when appropriate to “retool”.
- Consider course releases to allow faculty to retool or refocus.
- Consider new course assignments or adjusting teaching schedule to allow for retooling.
- Encourage mid-career faculty by nominating for awards and other recognition.
- Consider providing bridge funding if a clear program for refocusing has been developed.
- Provide incentives and additional resources for refocusing (clerical support, undergraduate assistants.)
- Provide unit leadership opportunities.

NOTES:
CHECK LIST OF BEST PRACTICES
FOR ADVANCEMENT OF MID-CAREER
FACULTY (ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS)

RESOURCE FOR INDIVIDUAL MID-CAREER FACULTY

_____ Develop career goals as well as plans and approaches for
reaching the goals.

_____ Request from Unit administrator or appropriate unit committee
the expectations for achieving rank of full professor.

_____ Meet with unit administrator(s) and review career plans and
current projects; discuss whether these projects will help with
promotion and with meeting career goals.

_____ Perhaps in consultation with unit administrator consider identifying
mentor(s) to assist in meeting expectations for promotion.

_____ Consider identifying a coach to assist with networking or with
needed skills.

_____ Participate in development workshops.

_____ Participate in other professional development opportunities.

_____ Consider unit leadership opportunities.

_____ Consider joining a new research team or collaboration.

_____ Request a sabbatical to “retool”.

_____ Request a course release to retool or refocus.

_____ Request new course assignments (especially a graduate course
to stay fresh) or adjusting teaching schedule to allow for retooling.

_____ Request bridge funding after developing a clear program for
refocusing.

_____ Request incentives and additional resources for refocusing
(clerical support, undergraduate assistants.

_____ Consider specific shorter term projects that will assist in
reaching career goals (e.g., short courses, short visits with
potential collaborators)

Other advice:

- Be open to new approaches – listen to graduate students.
- Participate in unit/college/university committees.
- Take a leadership role.
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure
Policies, Practices and Guidelines
at Michigan State University
RESOURCE GUIDE

REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION
AND TENURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
• Policies and Procedures in the MSU Faculty Handbook
• Other Guidelines on the Web

WORKSHOPS, PROGRAMS AND RESOURCES
ON REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE
• Resources for Faculty
• Resources for Administrators

CHECK LIST OF BEST PRACTICES IN RPT
– UNIT GUIDELINES

CHECK LIST FOR BEST PRACTICES IN RPT
– COLLEGE GUIDELINES

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS REGARDING
ADAPP AND THE RPT PROCESSES

This is a working draft. Please send any feedback to adapp@msu.edu,
or return to the ADAPP-ADVANCE office at 524 South Kedzie.
It is expected that units/departments could modify this guide
to meet the unique needs of their contexts.

**Summary:**
Provides principles regarding the start dates for probationary appointments, leaves of absence, notification of non-reappointment, appointments of foreign nationals, interpretation of the tenure rules and where tenure resides.

Granting Tenure Guidelines in the Faculty Handbook: http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/granttenure.htm

**Summary:**
Faculty with the Rank of Professor in the tenure system is granted tenure from the date of appointment.

Faculty Appointed as Associate Professor who having served previously at MSU are appointed in the tenure system for a probationary period of four years.

Under unusual circumstances a newly appointed Associate Professor can be granted tenure from the date of appointment.

Faculty appointed as an Assistant Professor who have not served previously at MSU are appointed for an initial probationary period of four years and may be reappointed for an additional probationary period of three years.

See Faculty Handbook for extensions.

Reassigning Tenured Faculty http://hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/facultyreassign.htm

**Summary:**
Tenure at MSU resides in the University. Thus if a unit is discontinued, reassignment of the faculty is normally in another academic unit and is negotiated with the faculty member and the potential receiving unit.


**Summary:**
Provides reasons for automatic one year extension of probationary appointments, and process for requests of extensions for other reasons.
Post Tenure Review
Policies from the Faculty Handbook:
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facadchandbooks/facultyhandbook/posttenure.htm

Summary:
There is not a distinct policy but is implemented by monitoring performance through the annual performance evaluation process. The post tenure review process can result in
Disciplinary action where **Dismissal is Not Sought**

Faculty Handbook Policy:
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facadchandbooks/facultyhandbook/Disciplinary.htm
Provides causes for discipline, the process and the possible disciplinary actions.

In serious cases: **Dismissal of Tenured Faculty for Cause Procedure**

Faculty Handbook Policy:
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facadchandbooks/facultyhandbook/dismissal.htm
Provides Grounds for Dismissal and the stages of the process.

Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Recommendations
Policies in the Faculty Handbook:
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facadchandbooks/facultyhandbook/recommendations.htm

Summary:
Handbook outlines the process initiated at the unit level, based on peer review of candidate based upon unit standards of performance. Candidates are reviewed at the college and university levels and these reviews are based on explicit unit criteria and quality evaluations, consistent with college and university policies and goals. Recommendations can include: reappointment of an Assistant Professor for a second probationary period, reappointment of a tenure stream untenured Associate Professor with the award of tenure, promotion of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with the award of tenure, promotion of Associate Professor to Professor. Overview of the standards for such recommendations is presented.

Tenure Action and Promotion – Use of an Extensive Form
Overview in the Faculty Handbook:
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facadchandbooks/facultyhandbook/tenureaction.htm

Summary:
Overview of the extensive information needed to evaluate faculty performance for tenure action and promotion. Expectations for action are unit specific and dependent on individual’s particular assignment.
College-Level Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee Policies Guidelines in the Faculty Handbook:
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/reapptTenure.htm

Summary:
UNIVERSITY POLICY
Each college is required to establish a college-level reappointment, promotion and tenure committee that is charged to provide advice to the dean about department/school recommendations for reappointment, promotion and tenure. Deans are responsible for personnel matters in his or her jurisdiction taking into account the advisory procedures of the college. College-level reappointment, promotion and tenure committees provide input to the dean in making reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions.

PRINCIPLES
Each college must include in its written materials governing the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process a procedure for establishing a college-level reappointment, promotion and tenure review committee, including methods for selecting committee members and how the committee will function.

Guidelines for Academic Unit Peer Review Committee Composition Guidelines in the Faculty Handbook:
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/peerReviewUnit.htm

Summary:
Each unit establishes procedures to provide peer review advice to unit administrator regarding recommendations for academic personnel actions, including merit salary increases. The Unit bylaws should indicate the designated group to make recommendations regarding reappointment, tenure and promotion. Guidelines for Peer Reviews Committee Composition are outlined.

External letters of Reference Policies in Faculty Handbook:
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/refLetters.htm

Summary:
External letters of reference are required for all reviews involving the granting of tenure or promotion. Practices may vary by unit, but the principles of soliciting letters of reference are outlined.
Policies regarding the Confidentiality of Letters of Reference:
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacidhandbooks/facultyhandbook/tenureRecommend.htm

**Summary:**
In soliciting letters of reference a specific statement of confidentiality MUST be included in the request. The suggested wording of the statement is listed in faculty handbook reference above.

**Evaluation of Non-Tenured Faculty in the Tenure Systems**
**Policies in the Faculty Handbook:**
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacidhandbooks/facultyhandbook/nontenured.htm

**Summary:**
Recommendations regarding appointment, reappointment or promotion must be in accord with the provisions of the tenure system. Process for evaluating non-tenured tenure stream faculty and actions upon decision not to reappoint are outlined and the possible responses of the faculty member not reappointed are presented in the reference above.

**Faculty Guide for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure – an Overview**
**General Guidelines:**
http://hr.msu.edu/promotion/facacidstaff/FacGuideTenure.htm

**Summary:**
Provides overview of RPT process including time table, early promotion & tenure, visa status, effective dates, Survive and Thrive workshop, University level review, data on RPT from the last 5 years, and tenure and promotion recognition dinners

NOTES:
1. **SURVIVE AND THRIVE IN THE MSU TENURE SYSTEM, PART I**
   
   ![Image](http://fod.msu.edu/SurviveThrive/about.asp)

   **Scheduled for Mid October – Half day Workshop**
   
   The workshop has the following objectives:
   
   - To expand faculty members’ understanding of department and University reappointment, promotion and tenure procedures.
   - To discuss approaches to documentation and record keeping for reappointment, promotion and tenure purposes.
   - To provide practical information on making choices, balancing conflicting demands, and managing departmental politics.
   - To provide an opportunity for communication and problem solving among faculty and academic administrators. Many faculty members find it helpful to attend this program more than once, finding different elements useful at different stages of their pre-tenure experience.

2. **SURVIVE AND THRIVE IN THE MSU TENURE SYSTEM, PART II**

   ![Image](http://fod.msu.edu/SurviveThriveII/about.asp)

   **For Recently Appointed Associate Tenure-System Professors**

   **Scheduled for Early March**

   This workshop is designed for probationary tenure system faculty to provide assistance in functioning successfully within the tenure system at MSU. The workshop has the following objectives:

   - To expand faculty members’ understanding of department and University reappointment, promotion and tenure procedures.
   - To discuss approaches to documentation and record keeping for reappointment, promotion and tenure purposes.
   - To provide practical information on making choices, balancing conflicting demands, and managing departmental politics.
   - To provide an opportunity for communication and problem solving among faculty and academic administrators. Many faculty members find it helpful to attend this program more than once, finding different elements useful at different stages of their pre-tenure experience.
3. **NEW AND EARLY CAREER FACULTY SOCIAL GATHERINGS**  
   [http://fod.msu.edu/newandearlycareercafcsocials/about.asp](http://fod.msu.edu/newandearlycareercafcsocials/about.asp)

These are collaborative ventures between the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development and a variety of MSU departments. These events are designed to give new and early career faculty opportunities to meet new colleagues, network, and explore the richness of the MSU campus.

4. **SPRING INSTITUTE ON COLLEGE TEACHING AND LEARNING**  
   [http://fod.msu.edu/SpringInstitute/about.asp](http://fod.msu.edu/SpringInstitute/about.asp)

Single and multi-day workshops are offered on topics related to active learning, inclusive teaching, and assessment.

5. **ORIENTATION FOR NEW TENURE SYSTEM AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FACULTY, CONTINUING SYSTEM LIBRARIANS AND NATIONAL SUPERCONDUCTING CYCLOTRON LABORATORY APPOINTMENTS**  
   [http://fod.msu.edu/orientation/TSHP_about.asp](http://fod.msu.edu/orientation/TSHP_about.asp)

Orientation for all NEW tenure system faculty events in late August includes a research workshop and a technology workshop.

6. **WORKSHOP FOR FAULTY LEADERS**  
   [http://fod.msu.edu/wfl/about.asp](http://fod.msu.edu/wfl/about.asp)

**Past workshops on:**
- Women and Power Negotiating
- Integrating Entrepreneurship into your Academic Career

7. **EVENTS AND RESOURCES PROVIDED BY THE WOMEN’S RESOURCE CENTER:**  
   [http://wrc.msu.edu/events.php?events](http://wrc.msu.edu/events.php?events)

**Past programs on:**
- Letting Off a little self esteem
- College to Career Transition
- Training for a future in political office
FOR ADMINISTRATORS

ORIENTATION FOR NEW ADMINISTRATORS –
Office of Faculty and Organizational Development
http://fod.msu.edu/orientation/EXM_about.asp

Four half day mandatory orientations early in August.
The program includes:

1. Hiring, Promotion, Tenure and Performance Review
2. University Research Policies and Procedures
3. Survival Skills for New Administrators
4. Conflict Resolution Resources

PRIOR LEAD PROGRAMS –
Office of Faculty and Organizational Development
http://fod.msu.edu/lead/about.asp

Making Joint Appointments a Success

1. Tackling the Human Resources Challenges of the Chair/Director
2. Study of Mid-Career Faculty: Implications for Practice
3. Strategies for Advancing Diversity and Quality at MSU in a Post-Prop 2 Environment

RESOURCES FROM THE OFFICE FOR INCLUSION AND INTERCULTURAL INITIATIVES
http://www.inclusion.msu.edu/home

1. Bias Free Communication Brochure
2. Sexual Harassment training programs
3. Bias Incident Reporting and training
4. Brochure on Assuring Equity and Non discrimination
5. Annual Data Reports on Inclusion and Diversity at MSU

NOTES:
Below are best practices guidelines for UNITS to consider when reviewing Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures.

- This unit has written materials governing the appointment, promotion and tenure process and the procedure for establishing a unit-level RPT/merit review committee.

- The unit has developed general guidelines and expectations for reappointment as Assistant Professor.

- The unit has developed general guidelines and expectations for reappointment of untenured, tenure-stream Associate Professors with tenure.

- The unit has developed general guidelines and expectations for promotion from Associate to Full Professor.

- All guidelines and expectations for reappointment, promotion and tenure are available to all faculty in the unit.

- Guidelines and expectations for RP&T are discussed on a regular basis by the faculty.

- Guidelines and expectations for RPT at the Unit level are reviewed to be consistent with the guidelines and expectations of the College (or Colleges for jointly administered units).

- Description of the materials that must be submitted for the unit-level RPT reviews for reappointment and promotion are readily available to all faculty.

- The process for evaluation of RPT packages at the unit level is clearly defined and readily available to all faculty.

- The chair/director or designated person(s) uses the annual performance review process to inform and guide pre-tenure faculty regarding progress to promotion/tenure.

- The chair/director or designated person(s) uses the annual performance review process to inform and guide tenured associate professors regarding progress to promotion to full professor.
The unit guidelines regarding the number and type of external evaluation letters to be included in the performance review are clearly defined and readily available to all faculty.

The timeline for the unit level RPT process is made readily available to the faculty each year.

The process for stopping the tenure clock or for extensions of the probationary appointment is made readily available to the faculty.

The guidelines for RPT for faculty jointly appointed in multiple units are made readily available to all faculty.

The multiple appointment memorandum is consulted when reviewing faculty who are jointly appointed in more than one unit (see - http://hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty_forms/FormInfoMam.htm).

Make Information regarding unit, college and university resources to assist faculty in preparing for RPT is made readily available to all faculty.

The Unit RPT committee is given input and guidance regarding the review process so that evaluations are consistent, objective, and are aligned with the stated expectations by the unit and for that faculty.

The unit and college guidelines and expectations, and the university RPT policies are reviewed by the unit RPT committee prior to reviewing RPT materials.

The Chair/Director meets with the unit RPT committee and discusses each recommendation made by the committee.

NOTES:
Below are best practices guidelines for COLLEGE DEAN’S OFFICES to consider when developing, reviewing or revising Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures.

_____ The College has written materials governing the reappointment, promotion and tenure process and procedure for establishing a college-level RPT review committee

_____ Dean has informed the unit administrators about the procedures and criteria that the College will use regarding decisions about reappointment of Assistant Professors.

_____ Dean has informed the unit administrators about the procedures and criteria that the College will use regarding decisions about reappointment of untenured Associate Professors with tenure.

_____ College has developed general guidelines and expectations for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

_____ College has developed general guidelines and expectations for promotion from Associate to Full Professor.

_____ All guidelines and expectations for reappointment, promotion and tenure are available to all faculty in the College.

_____ Guidelines and expectations for RPT are discussed on a regular basis with the unit chairs and directors.

_____ Guidelines and expectations for RPT at the College level are reviewed to be consistent with the University guidelines and expectations.

_____ The process for evaluation of RPT packages at the College level is clearly defined and readily available to all faculty in the College.

_____ The guidelines for RPT decisions for faculty jointly appointed in multiple units or colleges are made readily available to all faculty.

_____ The College RPT committee reviews:
   1) the unit and college criteria for reappointment or promotion prior to reviewing unit recommendations and
   2) the university policies and procedures regarding the RPT process
The Dean meets with the College RPT committee and discusses each recommendation from the committee.

Information regarding unit and college evaluation criteria and expectations are included with the Dean’s recommendation to the Provost’s Office.

The multiple appointment memorandum is consulted when reviewing faculty jointly appointed in more than one unit (see - http://hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty_forms/FormInfoMam.htm).

For faculty jointly appointed in another college, input is sought from the secondary college on College level RPT recommendations.

NOTES:

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________
Q: How will MSU Governance (UCFA and UCFT) be involved with the ADAPP-Advance activities?

A: The Provost and members of the ADAPP-Advance executive management team and internal advisory group of faculty look forward to discussions with UCFA and UCFT about the various proposed strategies and implementation of best practices in relation to tenure and promotion.

Q: How will the ADAPP project impact RPT decisions at the department level?

A: Department P&T committees will be expected to define or review and refine the goals and expectations for faculty and then develop evaluation criteria for RPT decisions that are aligned with these goals. These goals and connected evaluation criteria will be reviewed by the College Dean’s office to be consistent with the College expectations and evaluation criteria. The three colleges are in the process of defining goals and RPT evaluation criteria aligned with these goals. A personnel administrator in the College Dean’s office will work with unit RPT committees to help them define their goals and aligned evaluation criteria. When RPT packages are submitted to the College Dean, each will be reviewed to be consistent with the department and college goals and criteria.

Q: How will the ADAPP project impact RPT decisions at the college level?

A: Personnel Administrations in the College offices will help review, refine or develop goals and guidelines that are aligned with the College and University goals and help develop evaluation criteria that are aligned with goals. These administrators will work with the college P&T committees to apply these criteria during the college review process.

Q: Will the implementation of these changes make it more difficult to be reappointed or promoted?

A: The new processes will not necessarily impact the level of expectations for reappointment or promotion, but will increase the clarity of expectations for faculty to be reappointed or promoted.
Q: Will the RPT processes be different for different groups of faculty within a unit or college?
A: The evaluation criteria will be dependent on the position level, and expectations will be based, in part, on distribution of effort defined by the specific appointment. Goals and criteria will vary by department and college.

Q: What is the main impact of the project on RPT?
A: The Departments and Colleges will carefully review or clearly define goals and expectations for reappointment, promotion and tenure and the evaluation criteria will be clearly defined. This will improve faculty understanding of expectations for advancement. In addition, there will be oversight to assure that these goals are appropriately aligned with college and university goals and that the evaluation criteria are applied equitably.
ATTACHMENT 7
10:00 – 12:00  YR2 IMPLEMENTATION

- PARTICIPANTS: GMT only

- 10:00-10:05  Melissa will open the session/retreat, review day logistics/schedule

- 10:10-10:20  Estelle will open discussion of YR2 implementation

- 10:20 – 11:10  Brief Team Presentations
  - Each team lead will bring a **written report** for YR2 plans:
  - Project goals, strategies to achieve goals, interventions/resources, role of FEAs in getting resources to departments, evaluation plan
  - As our project also needs to be aligned, each team lead will discuss YR2 plans, referring to goals/plans/evaluation articulated in the **annual report**.
    - 10:20-10:30  Mentoring (Presenter: Clare Luz)
    - 10:30-10:40  Leadership (Presenter: Tammy Reid Bush)
    - 10:40-10:50  Faculty Search (Presenter: Mark Roehling)
    - 10:50-11:00  RP&T (Presenter: Estelle McGroarty)
    - 11:00-11:10  Annual Review (Presenter: Estelle McGroarty)

- 11:10 – 12:00  Discussion
  - Coordination among groups for YR2 interventions @ resources

12:00 – 2:00  DATA AND EVALUATION (WORKING LUNCH)

- PARTICIPANTS: GMT, Bob C., Sue C., Lori S., Pat L.

- POSSIBLE PARTICIPANTS: Manooch, Deb D.

- 12:00-12:15  Opening, goals for session, glancing at EM’s inventory data report, glossary provided

- 12:15-12:30  Estelle presents highlights of AR and RP&T data

- 12:30-12:45  Mark presents highlights of AR and RP&T data

- 12:45-1:45  Group discussion of key questions:
  - What things stand out to you from this data? What does it say to you?
  - What interventions might emerge? What planned interventions (e.g., by Project Support Offices) might help address what we have learned here?
  - How do we use and bring these results back to departments?
  - Evaluation – how do we know if resources/interventions are making an impact?
PARTICIPANTS: GMT, Kim, deans of 7 additional colleges

Kim makes presentation. Other available to answer questions.

Materials for Deans:
- Binders (including, glossary, resources/interventions etc.)
- Toolkits
- New brochure
As part of the alignment process, Colleges will engage an individual or team of individuals appointed by the Dean as Faculty Excellence Advocates (FEA). We envision that the individual(s) serving in this role be at senior levels as FEAs must have credibility with tenure stream faculty to be effective as change agents. Possible examples include associate deans, past chairs, or senior faculty with interests in this area. This person should also demonstrate a commitment to a core value of having a diverse faculty.

FEAs will be a link between the College Dean’s Office and the departments in providing input, guidance, and resources to units on academic human resource (AHR) procedures to ensure that these processes are objective, consistent, inclusive, and evaluation criteria used in faculty recruitment, retention and advancement are aligned with the goals of the unit, college and university. Some of the specific duties of FEAs include:

1. Communication
   - Provide input to the NSF ADVANCE project team (see: http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/) about interventions in units that would be most effective in addressing alignment of AHR practices with each other.
   - Help to document the impact of the interventions on the AHR practices
   - Work with the ADVANCE project team to communicate results of data collection efforts (inventories of current practices, climate surveys and other data collected in the colleges) to faculty and administrators at Michigan State. This data will help inform changes in current practice to improve AHR processes so that they are better aligned with unit, college and university goals

2. Design and Implement Tools
   - Work with the Dean and Associate Deans to consider specific college level goals and expectations for AHR process and evaluation criteria important for faculty recruitment, merit review, mentoring, reappointment and advancement, and leadership development.
   - Provide advice and assistance to units to help implement unit level goals and evaluation criteria related to AHR processes (faculty searches, annual review, reappointment, promotion and tenure, advancement/leadership development, and mentoring) that are based on expectations of the College.
   - Work with Dean’s office and ADVANCE project team to develop and implement college-level workshops, programs and resources on refining AHR processes.
   - Provide specific input to the ADAPP (Advancing Diversity through the Alignment of Policies and Practices) workgroups related to resource development and implementation

3. Collect Data
   - Assist with collecting data on faculty AHR processes that are not readily available from central databases (e.g., startup packages, space allocations).

In summary, the FEAs are NOT compliance monitors, but serve as a source of advice and as a communication line between the Deans, the ADVANCE project team and the units in the colleges in implementing the goals of the Advancing Diversity through the Alignment of Policies and Practices (ADAPP project). The ADVANCE PI and co-PIs, in collaboration with the Deans and FEAs in the original ADVANCE project colleges (CNS, CEGR, CSS), who are funded by the project are accountable to NSF for effort reporting, design of criteria and metrics for the evaluation of roles and interventions, and outcomes. Other participating Deans and FEAs will have similar responsibilities to the Provost who is funding the FEA positions.

Following the conclusion of the NSF project, it is expected that the communication, coordination and oversight of AHR processes and policies across units, colleges, and the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources will continue through FEAs (or equivalents).
Report of ADAPP-ADVANCE Annual Review Inventory Data

Total inventory response: 27/29, **93.1%**. Findings presented below are summarized by item or groups of items (e.g., [4] signifies the fourth inventory item). Inventory items are appended to this report.

**Annual Review Period and Medium [4, 5]**

- 79% of reporting departments, across colleges, cover the calendar year in their annual review processes.
  - **College of Engineering (EGR):** 100% of reporting departments indicate that annual review processes are conducted by calendar year.
  - **College of Natural Science (CNS):** 73% of departments report conducting annual reviews that cover the calendar year. 27% report covering the academic year, the fiscal year, or multiple years.
  - **College of Social Science (CSS):** 90% of departments report covering the calendar year (other: academic year). 10% report that annual review processes cover the academic year.
- All departments in each college report having a common format that faculty members use to submit information for annual review.

**Performance Appraisal Tool and Criteria [6]**

Respondents were asked to report whether there is (or is not) a performance appraisal tool currently used during the annual performance evaluation process.

- **EGR:** 66% of respondents report using a uniform performance appraisal tool during the annual performance evaluation process.
- **CNS:** 54% of respondents report using a performance appraisal tool.
- **CSS:** 45% of respondents report having a performance appraisal tool for annual review.

**Information Collected for Annual Review, Productivity Measures, and Faculty Involvement and Communication [7, 8, 12, 15]**

Department chairpersons also reported which college- and unit-level personnel were responsible for determining both the information required for annual review as well as productivity measures used to evaluate faculty. Findings from those items (7, 8) are presented in Table 1.
Chairpersons were also asked directly: Are there departmental committees that collect and evaluate faculty effort and performance metrics? Across the given responses, chairpersons indicate that when committees are involved, they are typically responsible for evaluating individual faculty members after information is collected and presented by the chairperson. Specifically,
• **EGR**: 50% of respondents reported that there is committee involvement in collecting and/or evaluating the effort and performance of faculty in annual review processes. In those cases, a departmental advisory committee receives evaluation materials from the chairperson. One chairperson reported meeting with the committee to “collectively rate each faculty performance in teaching, research, extension/outreach, and service.”

• **CNS**: 81% of respondents report faculty committee involvement in collecting and/or evaluating the effort and performance of faculty in annual review processes. Some respondents reported the details of how these committees are composed (e.g., 4 elected members, 1 appointed; elected each year). One respondent (9%) included documentation from the department’s by-laws that detail the involvement of a faculty committee in annual review.

• **CSS**: 70% of respondents report faculty committee involvement. The responses given all indicate that these committees meet with the chairperson, and that either the chair receives the feedback and makes the final decision or that the decision is submitted to committee vote.

Chairpersons were also reported whether results (yes or no) of performance evaluations and goals set from previous years are used in “current” performance evaluations. They were later asked to report whether the feedback provided to faculty on annual performance refers to results of prior annual reviews [18]. These responses are presented (juxtaposed) in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>[15] Results and goals set from previous years used in performance evaluation/review?</th>
<th>[18] Does feedback provided on annual performance refer to results of prior reviews?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGR</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One respondent (EGR) explicitly indicated that feedback and reference to prior reviews are only used in “problem cases,” and a sample letter is included.

With items 19, 20, 24, and 25, chairpersons were asked to indicate with whom the results of annual review processes are communicated—the faculty member being reviewed (19), other faculty groups (20), and the college dean (24, 25). These results are reported in Table 3.
Table 3

Communication of Annual Review Processes to Various Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coll.</th>
<th>[19] Chairperson meets with pre-tenure faculty to discuss results of annual review?</th>
<th>[20] Chairperson meets with any other faculty groups (including mid-career tenured faculty) to discuss results?</th>
<th>[24] Productivity measures communicated to the College Dean’s Office?</th>
<th>[25] Results of each faculty member’s annual review provided to College Dean’s Office?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EGR</td>
<td>Yes 100% No 0%</td>
<td>Yes 67% No 33%</td>
<td>Yes 100% No 0%</td>
<td>Yes 100% No 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS</td>
<td>Yes 91% No 0%</td>
<td>Yes 64% No 36%</td>
<td>Yes 55% No 36%</td>
<td>Yes 27% No 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>Yes 60% No 0%</td>
<td>Yes 60% No 40%</td>
<td>Yes 10% No 40%</td>
<td>Yes 40% No 30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Respondent reported, “Yes and no. Only if there is a problem.”

b The remaining respondents did not reply to this item.

c At least one respondent reported, “All faculty who wish to meet,” “voluntary,” or “on request”

† Reported that this communication is pending.

Unit- and College- level Expectations Regarding Annual Review [9, 10]

Chairpersons were asked to report the degree to which expectations and goals at the unit- and college-levels exist and/or are incorporated into annual review processes.

- **EGR**: All departments (i.e., 100%) report that unit-level goals and expectations are incorporated into their respective annual review processes. 66% report college-level expectations are incorporated. Respondents were asked to describe these expectations. Teaching, research, and service; numbers of supported doctoral students; numbers of graduated doctoral students; peer reviewed publications and patents; research expenditures; and other unspecified “revenue based initiatives” were included among responses.

- **CNS**: 63% of departments report that unit-level goals are incorporated in annual review processes. Those goals and expectations include continued grant funding, steady publication record, teaching performance, enrolled students, academic service, and outreach. 18% of reporting departments indicated that college-level expectations and goals are incorporated into annual review processes.

- **CSS**: Approximately 30% of reporting departments indicate that unit-level goals and expectations are incorporated into annual review processes; one department reported that expectations are included but goals are not. Among those expectations, department chairpersons included teaching, scholarly productivity, outreach/service and leadership. As in other colleges, chairpersons also indicated that goals and expectations were clearly outlined in departmental documents (e.g., bylaws) that are given to faculty.
Respondents were also asked to report, directly, the degree to which these expectations are transparent—that is, the degree to which annual review expectations are clearly stated in writing and made available to the faculty. [11]

- **EGR:** All departments report that expectations are clearly stated and available; two departments included current supporting documents.
- **CNS:** 27% of department respondents clearly indicated (i.e. by selecting, “Yes”) that expectations are clearly stated and presented to faculty. Many respondents offered other responses. Among them,
  - “No. This gap is currently being addressed”
  - “No. Detailed conversations with chair during job interview, amplified annually during one-on-one performance review meetings”
  - “[Expectations are expressed in] faculty by-laws and verbal (oral and written) communication from the chair at annual talks.”
  - “They are in the departmental by laws and are discussed with the departmental advisory committee and with the departmental peer evaluation committee that ranks faculty for merit raises”
  - “No. The criteria are pretty much the same everywhere for research and teaching.”
- **CSS:** 40% of departments indicate that their faculty members are made aware of expectations through written documentation and other direct communication (i.e. by either answering “Yes” or including any phrase that implies that faculty are systematically informed). Among other responses, chairpersons included an emphasis on departmental bylaws:
  - “These expectations are general in nature and communicated verbally and in writing through meetings with director and bylaws”
  - “Stated in bylaws; Discussions with chair”

**Annual review inventory data that connect to other ADAPP inventories [13, 14, 23]**

Several items in the inventory reference topics that are directly relevant to other areas that ADAPP is currently studying—namely, mentoring and reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions. (There are no items in the annual review inventory that connect explicitly to faculty leadership, neither departmental nor disciplinary.)

- **Mentor’s Input.** [13] Chairpersons were asked to report on whether input from faculty mentors is sought in annual performance reviews and evaluations. Across all colleges, 31% of respondents (9 of 29) seek and incorporate input from faculty mentors in annual performance reviews. This input is sought informally in most cases, with three reporting departments (10%) reporting formal input (e.g., written report or correspondence).
- **Links to Promotion/Tenure Decisions.** [23] Chairpersons were also asked to report whether the productivity measures used for faculty annual review are closely linked to the productivity measures used in promotion and tenure decisions for junior faculty members. Only one department, across all colleges (i.e. 3%), reported that it does not explicitly connect these two processes for junior faculty. Other departments report that
the annual review measures and RPT processes are connected and communicated via letters and/or meetings.

- **Seeking Input for Jointly Appointed Faculty.** [14] Chairpersons were asked to report how input is sought from another unit(s) to evaluate jointly appointed faculty.
  
  o **EGR:** 67% of respondents report meeting or discussing the performance evaluation with the other departmental chairperson. The responses indicate that these discussion range from “checking with” with the other chairperson to “meeting with [the chairs] collectively and writing a joint letter of evaluation.” Two respondents reported no direct interaction with other chairs. In those cases, one chairperson indicated that there was “no formal procedure” and the other reported “other units provide their own performance evaluation.”
  
  o **CNS:** The responses among this group were less distinctive and more difficult to clearly quantify. Only one respondent (~1%) indicated that there is no direct means of communication between chairs: “Not sought. We conduct our own independent assessment.” Among other responses, the means of communication varied and included phone discussion, meetings, or that the other chair is invited to “sit in” on reviews of their faculty. Other responses were vague (e.g., “via chair,” “verbal” or “depends on the appointment–there is always some consultation”).
  
  o **CSS:** These responses were also various. Two chairpersons (20%) indicated that their departments did not have jointly appointed faculty at that time. Of the remaining responses given (20% non-response), all chairpersons indicated some form of contact, with one chairperson indicating that requests are made for independent evaluations.

**Feedback on the FAIS system**

Chairpersons were asked to evaluate the Faculty Activity Information System (FAIS), an online software system developed in the College of Engineering for the annual review process. As the inventory indicated, this feedback would be used to inform the possible adaptation and use of this system in other units across colleges. Only one unit within the College of Engineering does not use this system, reporting that there are other qualitative data that are both useful in “truly assessing faculty performance” and not currently captured by the FAIS. This department uses the Digital Measures system in the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

In the Colleges of Natural Science and Social Science, three respondents reported that the system does not capture most of the information currently collected through and for annual review. These respondents reported,

- The system “appears cumbersome and especially awkward for reporting activities to multiple colleges”
- The system is not sensitive to the conduct of “sustained work over many years,” where “progress” and not publication data is a primary unit of review.
• The system simply does not capture the range of materials and data we need (list of specific examples included).

Overall, respondents were asked to suggest other areas to incorporate or other changes to improve the system. Among the responses, several practical points were suggested:

• The ability to copy and paste text from your CV.
• A clear entry point for grants and agreements; IP (patents, etc.); extension publications and talks.
• The ability to deselect certain data categories at the department level. “This might improve compliance”
• Information on extension and outreach activities.

Some respondents suggested that the FAIS should not be mandated. These comments range from mild to strong:

• It’s fine, but it just seems a lot of additional work that is put on faculty.
• It seems reasonable, although it is difficult to say what problem might arise until I ask 40+ faculty members in my department to fill it out.
• I strongly object to mandating this form. Our faculty now cut and paste into a word document which is quick and easy. The new form would significantly punish faculty (like me) who publish 10-15 papers a year, and coordinate multiple grants.
• This system would be annoying for [faculty in my discipline] to use.
Appendix: Annual Review Inventory Items

4. What period does the annual review cover each year?

5. Is there a form or common format that each faculty member uses to submit information for their faculty annual performance evaluation/review? If so, please attach a copy of this form and paste text below.

6. Is there a performance appraisal tool used during the annual performance evaluation process?

7. Who determines what information is collected for the annual review? Check all that apply: Dean; Chair; Departmental faculty; Subset of departmental faculty (for ex. Advisory committee); Administrator of faculty group from other unit for jointly appointed faculty; Other.

8. Who determines the how faculty productivity is measured? Check all that apply: Dean; Chair; Departmental faculty; Subset of departmental faculty (for ex. Advisory committee); Administrator or faculty group from the other unit for jointly appointed faculty; Other.

9. Are there unit-level goals and expectations for faculty productivity that are incorporated into the department's annual performance evaluation/review? [9a] If you responded yes, please describe.

10. Are there college-level expectations for faculty productivity that are incorporated into the department's annual performance evaluation/review? [10a] If you responded yes, please describe.

11. Are expected levels of faculty productivity clearly stated in writing and available to the faculty? [11a] If yes, how are new faculty made aware of the expectations (also paste in document, if available)?

12. Is there a departmental committee that collects and evaluates faculty effort and performance metrics? [12a] If yes, how does the Chairperson work with this committee in the annual review process?

13. Is input sought from mentors in the annual performance evaluation/review? [13a] If 'Yes,' what form does this input take (informal meeting with chair or evaluation committee, written report, etc.)

14. How is input sought from the other unit(s) for jointly appointed faculty?

15. Are the results of performance evaluations and goals set from previous years used in the performance evaluation/review?

16. Does the department provide written feedback to each faculty member summarizing the results of the annual review? [16a] If 'Yes,' please paste in the text from a sample review (remove all identifying information).

17. Are expectations for future performance that are necessary for advancement included in written feedback to junior faculty? [17a] If 'Yes,' please copy and paste the text from a sample review (remove all identifying information).
18. Does the feedback provided on the annual performance evaluation/review refer to the results of prior annual reviews? [18a] If 'Yes,' please paste in the text from a sample review (remove all identifying information).

19. Does the chairperson (or others) meet with pre-tenure faculty to discuss the results of their annual review?

20. Does the chairperson (or others) meet with any other faculty groups (including mid-career tenured faculty) to discuss the results of the annual review? [20a] If 'Yes,' what group(s)?

21. During the annual review meetings do the faculty members have input in setting future goals and expectations?

22. Are the productivity measures used for faculty annual performance evaluation/review linked to the productivity measures used for determining merit raises? [22a] If 'Yes,' is this connection clearly communicated to the faculty?

23. Are the productivity measures used for faculty annual performance evaluation/review closely linked to the productivity measures used in promotion/tenure decisions for junior faculty? [23a] If 'Yes,' is this relationship clearly communicated to the faculty, and how?

24. Are the productivity measures used in your unit for annual review of faculty clearly communicated to the College Dean's Office?

25. Are the results of each faculty member's annual performance evaluation/review provided to the College Dean's Office? [25a] If 'Yes' was answered for question #25, in what way (check all that apply): Summary Statistics of groups of faculty; oral discussion; copies of written statement for each faculty; Other methods.

26. How would you like to see the Annual Review process, policies and forms clarified or changes?

27. Does this system capture most of the information that your unit collects during the annual review of faculty?

28. If you answered no to the prior question, what additional information does your unit collect for annual performance review?

29. What changes would you recommend to improve this system for annual review, in addition to adding the information listed in the prior question? Include format changes.

30. What additional functionalities related to faculty annual effort review would you like to see?

31. What additional functionalities would you like to see that may be valuable but are not necessarily connected to faculty annual effort review (e.g., generation of departmental reports, generation of faculty CV, etc.)?

32. What information is in the system that you would not use?

33. Should any of the items be removed from the system? [33a] If 'Yes,' then why?
34. Please provide any other comments about this system as a way of capturing information on faculty effort.
ATTACHMENT 10
Preliminary Report of MSU ADAPP-ADVANCE Inventory Data on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Processes, reported by College

Total inventory response: 21/29, **72.4%**

- College of Engineering (EGR): 66.7%, 4/6
- College of Natural Science (CNS): 83.3%, 10/12
- College of Social Science (CSS): 72.7%, 8/11

Findings presented below are summarized by item or groups of items (e.g., [4] signifies the fourth inventory item). Inventory items are appended to this report.

**Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Candidate Information [5]**

Chairpersons were asked to report Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (hereafter RP&T) candidate information from 2008-2009 review cycles.

**EGR**: 13 candidates were identified from 2008-09 review cycles.

**CNS**: 25 RP&T candidates were identified.

**CSS**: 12 candidates were identified.

Specifically, respondents were asked to report the RP&T category under which the candidate was evaluated (i.e. reappointment, promotion to associate professor with award of tenure, promotion to full professor) as well as the gender, race, and ethnicity of each candidate. These results are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Aggregated results of review cycle candidate information, 2008-2009.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College (depts.)</th>
<th>Reappointment</th>
<th>Promotion to Associate Professor with award of tenure</th>
<th>Promotion from Associate to Full Professor</th>
<th>Process Type not Specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EGR</strong> (3)</td>
<td>Asian, Male, Non-Hispanic White, Male, White White, Female, Non-Hispanic White, Female, Non-Hispanic Asian, Male, Non-Hispanic White, Male, Non-Hispanic White, Male, White White, Male, Non-Hispanic Asian, Male, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian, Male, Non-Hispanic Male, White White, Male, White White, Male, Non-Hispanic Asian, Male, Non-Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 3</td>
<td>Total: 5</td>
<td>Total: 4</td>
<td>Total: 1</td>
<td>Asian, Male, Non-Hispanic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Candidates by Process Type (Race, Gender, Ethnicity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College (depts.)</th>
<th>Reappointment</th>
<th>Promotion to Associate Professor with award of tenure</th>
<th>Promotion from Associate to Full Professor</th>
<th>Process Type not Specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNS (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 12</td>
<td>White, Male, White</td>
<td>White, Male, European</td>
<td>Male, White, Non-Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White, Male, White</td>
<td>White, Male, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>Male, White, No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White, Male, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>White, Male, No Response</td>
<td>Male, White, Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White, Female, Hispanic</td>
<td>White, Female, No Response</td>
<td>Female, No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White, Male, No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White, Male, Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White, Male, American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White, Male, “Asian? (Indian)”, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White, Male, No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 3</td>
<td>Asian, Female, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>White, Male, No Response</td>
<td>Asian, Male, No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White, Female, No Response</td>
<td>White, Male, No Response</td>
<td>White, Female, No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White, Male, Hispanic</td>
<td>White, Male, No Response</td>
<td>“H/L”, Female, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White, Male, Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Who Conducts Unit-level RP&T Review? [6, 7, 9, 10]**

Chairpersons were asked to identify faculty groups within their respective units that are either active in or carry out the unit’s RP&T process. Chairs also indicated whether each unit’s bylaws detail the groups’ responsibilities. Only one department respondent indicated that their department’s bylaws do not establish criteria by which RP&T groups are assembled.

- **EGR:**
  - 75% of chairpersons (3/4) indicated that each unit’s bylaws specify that RP&T committees are composed of full professors and are elected to serve on RP&T committees by the faculty. One chairperson indicated that some associated professors may be elected to the committee. In one case, the chairperson appoints the committee, among full professors.
  - In another case, the department’s advisory committee serves this role, and other faculty members with “specific knowledge of those...being considered for action” are asked to join the committee.
• **CNS:** With more respondents from this college than others, the responses from these items were coded for emergent themes and aggregated. These results are reported in Table 2.

Table 2. *Emergent Themes from CNS Responses to RP&T Committee Membership Items* [6, 7]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Membership Responses</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coded Themes from Item Responses</td>
<td>(Chairpersons reported or indicated…)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- RP&T Committee composed of entire unit faculty (committee of the whole) 2
- RP&T committee composed of only tenured faculty (full and assoc.) 4
- RP&T committee composed of faculty who are, specifically, at or above the rank of the candidate. (Also included in category above) 3
- Committee includes subcommittee of faculty mentors 1
- Committee members are elected by the faculty 2
- Whole faculty votes on RP&T decision 1
- Committee purposely varied by disciplinary specialization 1
- Faculty vote contingent upon measure of appointment (e.g., at least 25% appointment to vote on RP&T decisions) 1
- RP&T committee membership term is specified (i.e. bounded) 1
- Committee reviews RP&T candidates, faculty votes on decision 1
- Additional faculty members on RP&T committee approved by committee 1

• **CSS:** Coding responses from these items (6,7) from CSS respondents did not result in many commonalities.
  - Four of eight respondents (50%) in the College reported that the committee is composed of faculty members at or above the rank of the candidate.
  - Each of the following themes were included once among individual responses to these items:
    - Different department constituents select the RP&T committee members. In this case, “One member is selected by the director, one by our faculty advisory committee, and one by the candidate.”
    - Only full professors conduct RP&T reviews
    - Department Advisory Committee conducts RP&T reviews

...
Chairpersons were also asked to report directly whether there is a faculty vote on RP&T decisions. These data are aggregated by college and reported in Table 3.

Table 3
Aggregated Responses to Items [9, 10] on the Conduct and Communication of Faculty Voting in RP&T Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty Vote - Yes</th>
<th>Faculty Vote - No</th>
<th>Communicated to College RP&amp;T Committee</th>
<th>Communicated to the Candidate directly</th>
<th>Communicated to both the College RP&amp;T committee and candidate</th>
<th>Communicated to neither the College RP&amp;T committee nor candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EGR</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS</td>
<td>7 (70%)</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>7 (70%)</td>
<td>7 (70%)</td>
<td>6 (60%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>7 (87.5%)</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formal Committee Preparation for RP&T [12, 13, 14]

Chairs were also asked to indicate whether RP&T committee members are formally prepared at the unit-level for their committee responsibilities. Subsequent items asked respondents to elaborate on the methods of preparation used with 2008-2009 RP&T committees. Workshops, written materials produced by campus offices or other sources, and “multi-media” training (e.g., web-based, DVD training) were identified as possible training methods.

- **EGR.** Three of four reporting departments indicate that faculty members are not formally prepared for responsibilities associated with RP&T committee membership. One chairperson indicated that there are extant processes to formally prepare committee members, “typically a meeting that occurs that the members who have been on the committee the previous year and Department Chair discuss the process, etc., with all the committee members.”
- **CNS.** 50% of reporting departments (5/10) indicate that RP&T committee members in CNS are formally prepared for committee responsibilities. There is considerable variation with respect to the methods used to prepare RP&T committee members. One department indicated that committee members are prepared via workshops (CANR P&T Workshop) and with written materials produced by offices on campus and from other organizations (CANR P&T materials, MSU web P&T materials). Other respondents indicated other forms of preparation,
  - “Continuous discussion and dialog among committee membership at regular monthly meeting of the FAC”
  - “Meeting with chair”
  - “College materials & department bylaws discussed and distributed.”
  - “Professional experience”
• **CSS.**
  - 12.5% of reporting departments (1/8) indicated that RP&T committee members are formally prepared for committee responsibilities. In that case, committee members “review with the director,” as indicated by response to item 13.
  - 62.5% of department chairpersons reported that faculty members are not formally prepared. One respondent, who also reported “no” to item 12, indicated, “There is a brief oral discussion of the committee/tenured faculty’s responsibilities at the beginning of the meeting to discuss the person being considered.”

**Policy: Guidelines & Report from previous RP&T cycle [25-30]**

Several inventory items ask chairpersons to address the communication of policies related to RP&T. These items focused on (a) whether RP&T guidelines are expressed in the unit’s bylaws, (b) if the bylaws and guidelines had been updated, and when, (c) if policies regarding the tenure clock are communicated openly with faculty at the unit level, and (d) if other groups or individuals play a role in RP&T processes.

• **EGR:**
  - 100% of reporting departments report that RP&T guidelines are included in each unit’s bylaws.
  - All departments report updating these bylaws within the past four years, specifically between 2005 and March 2007.
  - None of the units report that these policies regarding stopping the tenure clock are included in their guidelines for RP&T.

• **CNS:**
  - 70% of reporting departments report that RP&T guidelines are included in each unit’s bylaws.
  - 20% of departments do not include RP&T guidelines or language in their unit bylaws. (The remaining department did not respond.)
  - 60% of departments indicated that their unit bylaws have been updated since 2004 or are currently being updated.
  - 100% report that RP&T guidelines included in unit bylaws do not express policies regarding stopping the tenure clock.
  - 40% report that there are other individuals or groups involved in the RP&T process:
    - “Associate chairs in ad hoc advisory roles”
    - “Departmental Advisory Committee. If a chairperson recommends that a faculty member not go forward for promotion to full professor, the faculty member may seek input from DAC.”
    - “Students and research group members of candidate are interviewed.”
    - “For full professors, they will be invited to a faculty meeting where the committee reports will be presented and voted on. The associate professors may only participate in the discussions of the Assistant Professors cases for reappointment and promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. These faculty are also given access to the evaluation letters that have come from outside reviewers. Depending on research area, these faculty may also have input to the list of external reviewers.”
- **CSS:**
  - 100% of department chairs report that RP&T guidelines are included in unit bylaws.
  - 40% of departments report that their unit bylaws have been updated since 2005. The range of dates reported is 1987 to 2008 (and currently being updated).
  - 25% report that their unit guidelines include policies regarding stopping the tenure clock. When asked if these policies are communicated openly with faculty, respondents indicated,
    - “We follow SSC and University policies. These are discussed in individual review meetings with Director and Personal Committee.”
    - “Every faculty member has a copy of the bylaws.”
  - 12.5% (one respondent) reported that groups outside of the RP&T committee have involvement in RP&T processes.

**External Letters, Criteria, and other required materials [15-19]**

Department chairpersons were also asked to report whether external letters are required for reappointment and/or promotion processes. These results are aggregated by College and presented in Table 4. The results of related items are presented in Table 5.

**Table 4.**

*RP&T Requirements for External Review Letters by RP&T process. Results presented in totals and percentages of reporting departments by college.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Reappointment</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EGR</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.**

*Aggregated Responses to Items Related to Criteria for External Review Letters, Reported by college with percentages of reporting departments [35-37, 39]*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item*</th>
<th>EGR (4 units)</th>
<th>CNS (10 units)</th>
<th>CSS (8 units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[35]</td>
<td>Yes-50%, No-25%, 25% Unsure</td>
<td>Yes-70%, No-30%</td>
<td>Yes-62.5%, No-37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[36]</td>
<td>Yes-50%, No-0%, Non-Response-50%</td>
<td>Yes-70%, No-30%</td>
<td>Yes-62.5%, No-0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Response-37.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairpersons were also asked to indicate how the candidate is advised on what materials to submit for annual review processes. These open-ended items were coded for common responses and aggregated. These results are reported in Table 7. [21]

Table 7

* Sources of Candidate Advising on RP&T material submissions [21]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Candidate Advising (All responses represented)</th>
<th>EGR</th>
<th>CNS</th>
<th>CSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair meets or makes contact with each candidate (via meetings or written correspondence)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Committee is appointed or already in place to provide advice to candidate (no other sources indicated)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The unit chair/director and a committee are sources of advice for the candidate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with informal and formal mentors (among others, including the chairperson)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate is referred to published materials (e.g., bylaws)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chairpersons were also asked to indicate the personnel responsible for defining what materials should be required for RP&T processes. Responses to these items are reported in Table 7.

Table 7

* Personnel or Guidelines that Specify Documentation What Materials are Required for RP&T [22]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EGR</th>
<th>CNS</th>
<th>CSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Dept.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Number 1</td>
<td>Number 2</td>
<td>Number 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other College (Joint)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form D/RP&amp;T Policy/Dept. Bylaws</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate &amp; Chair (mutual decision)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* “There is little need for definition as these are standard documents”
Appendix: RP&T Inventory Items.

1. DEPARTMENT (please specify):

2. INVENTORY COMPLETED BY (name, title, date):  
   (Can be completed by a group)

3. YOUR ROLE IN THE REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND/OR TENURE PROCESS THIS YEAR:

4. Which reappointment, promotion and tenure committee (2008-2009) are you referencing (e.g. which department within your college)?

5. For each candidate considered for the 2008-2009 review cycle, please provide information on the following:

   **RPT Candidate Category**
   - reappointment,
   - promotion to associate professor with the award of tenure,
   - reappointment as associate professor with the award of tenure
   - promotion from associate professor to full professor

   **Gender** (male, female, transgender)  
   **Ethnicity** (Hispanic[White], Hispanic[non-White] or non-Hispanic) Hispanic/Latino is a person of Cuban, Mexican, Chicano, Puerto Rican, South or Central American or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race  
   **Race** (White, Black/African American, Asian, Native American/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, mixed)

6. What group in the unit carries out the unit-level RPT review. If a unique committee is constituted, how is the membership selected? [e.g. Who decided? What written criteria were used to make selections?]

7. Is the group carrying out the RPT review detailed in unit bylaws? If not, where is it detailed?

8. For each 2008-2009 committee involved in developing the RPT recommendations, please provide information on the following:

   **Gender** (male, female, transgender)  
   **Ethnicity** (Hispanic[White], Hispanic[non-White] or non-Hispanic) Hispanic/Latino is a person of Cuban, Mexican, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Sough or Central American or other Spanish culture
or origin, regardless of race

**Race** (White, Black/African American, Asian, Native American/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, mixed)

**Rank** (e.g., assistant professor, associate professor, professor)

**Years at Michigan State**

9. Is there a faculty vote on RP&T decisions?

10. To whom is the vote communicated to: (more than one may be selected)

11. Is there an opportunity to discuss the results of the committee actions or recommendations with the candidate?

12. Are committee members formally prepared for their responsibilities?
   
   _____Yes _____No

13. If you answered “Yes” to the previous question, what methods were used to prepare RPT committee members for their responsibilities in 2008-2009?

14. From the previous question, please list which workshops, specify sources for written materials and describe other (if applicable).

15. Are external (to MSU) review letters required for: (check all that apply)

16. What written criteria, if any, are used by your department to identify external letter writers? (If these criteria vary according to the rank of the faculty member being reappointed or promoted, please list all sets of criteria)

17. Does the candidate have input into the selection of external letter writers?

18. If the answer to the previous question is “Yes”, what is the nature of that input?

19. Please provide your unit’s detailed guidelines for selecting external review letter writers, and the instructions provided to those writers, by cutting and pasting the relevant paragraphs from your bylaws or RPT document below. (If these criteria vary according to the rank of the faculty member being reappointed or promoted, please list all sets of criteria).

20. Beyond the required MSU Form D, what materials (e.g. copies of publications, citations, teaching portfolios, personal statement, etc.) are required for candidates for: Reappointment, Promotion to associate professor tenure, Reappointment as associate professor with the award of tenure, Promotion from associate professor to professor

21. How is the candidate advised on what materials to submit?

22. Who defines what these materials should be?
23. Are candidates limited in the amount of materials that can be submitted?

24. If you answered “Yes” to the previous question, please describe those limitations.

25. Does your department have reappointment, promotion and tenure guidelines or language in your unit bylaws?

26. If you answered “Yes” to the previous question, when were these guidelines or bylaws most recently updated?

27. Do these guidelines include policies regarding stopping the tenure clock?

28. If you answered “yes” to the previous question, are these policies communicated openly with the faculty?

29. Are there other individuals or groups that play a role in the RP&T process at the department level, apart from the department RP&T committee, the chair and the faculty as a whole?

30. If you answered “yes” to the previous question, what are those groups? What role do they have?

31. What materials were reviewed at the unit level by the RPT committee, additional faculty, and department chair or school director?

35. Are specific and pre-specified written criteria provided to reviewers to analyze the strength of each candidate’s application?

36. If you answered “Yes” to question #35, do the letters usually reflect the evaluation criteria requested?

37. If you answered “Yes” question #35, are those criteria the same for reappointments, tenure awards, and promotions to full professor?

38. Please specify the set(s) of criteria and how they differ for reappointment, promotion to associate with tenure, reappointment with tenure and promotion to full.

39. For faculty jointly appointed in another department, do you ask for the evaluation criteria used by the other department?

40. For faculty jointly appointed in another department how is input from that department obtained and how is that input used?

41. What information does the unit RPT committee provide to the department chair or school director?
42. How are unit RPT criteria communicated to the Dean and College RPT committee?