In the second quarter of our second year (ending 2.30.10), ADAPP’s primary objective was to continue to extend our reach into the departments within the three participating colleges. This report is organized as follows:

I. Accomplishments/Progress on ADAPP Projects

II. Accomplishments/Progress related to Grant Management Activity

III. Accomplishments/Progress in Institutionalization

IV. Challenges

V. Best Idea Yet

VI. Response to First Year Site Visit

I. ACCOMPLISHMENTS/PROGRESS ON ADAPP PROJECTS

1. The accomplishments listed in this section are organized by ADAPP-ADVANCE PROJECT NAME. The accomplishments are the result of direct work by co-PIs, college leaders & faculty, administrators, evaluation team members, as well as heads of project support offices. Each accomplishment is coded (PI, COLL, PSO, ADMIN, EVAL) to indicate stakeholder participation.

2. **Faculty Search**

   A. Mark Roehling in collaboration with Terry Curry & Paulette Granberry Russell further developed the Faculty Search Toolkit, expanding it to include [PI, PSO]:

   1. The University’s first “Master Checklist for Faculty Searches” that integrates University faculty search requirements, faculty search “best practices” that are recommended (but not required), and references to support materials and tools for items listed in the checklist.

   2. Specification and discussion of what constitutes a “successful faculty search” in the context of the University’s values of inclusivity and quality, legal requirements, and the importance of how the search
process is perceived in the University community.

3. A presentation of the process for identifying faculty competencies (knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics relevant to successful performance in a faculty position), and examples of common competencies and specific competencies that would reflect a unit’s commitment to diversity and tend to promote a diverse applicant pool.

4. A checklist for candidates’ campus visits that is, based on our review of ADVANCE websites and books addressing faculty recruitment, more comprehensive than any such list currently available.

5. A sample protocol for conducting highly structured interviews of candidates.

6. Development of a PowerPoint presentation for training sessions addressing “Fair and Effective Faculty Searches.”

7. Development of learning objectives for on-line training that addresses “Fair and Effective Faculty Searches,” and began developing training content to address the learning objectives (The training content explains the recruiting and selection process in greater detail than the typical toolkits provided by other ADVANCE awardees).

B. College of Natural Science

1. Mark Roehling conducted a training session on “Fair and Effective Faculty Searches” for the Biochemistry department (January 13, 2010). [PI]

C. College of Engineering

1. Although most faculty searches in the College of Engineering are frozen, the notable exception is the search for the Mechanical Engineering Chair. The search committee (including co-PI Bush), worked with Mark Roehling and Paulette Granberry Russell to develop search and interview strategies. [PI, COLL, PSO]
2. Mark Roehling, in collaboration with Paulette Granberry Russell developed a rating assessment tool to be completed by all faculty members for each of the three chair candidates. These data will then be summarized and presented to the faculty prior to the faculty vote. [PI, PSO]

3. A guide for best interviewing practices was distributed to all faculty in the ME department and an e-mail reminding faculty of categories of inappropriate questions for interviewing was also sent. [PI, COLL, PSO]

3. **Annual Review & RP&T**

   **A. Design and Implement Cross-College Workshop** [PI, PSO]

   “Faculty Performance Review and Development: Improving the Process and its Outcomes” January 19, 2010. The workshop was lead by Terry Curry, co-PI, and offered through our Office of Faculty & Organizational Development. 25 participants. [PI, PSO]

   **B. Further Refinement of the Annual Review and RP&T Resource Guides** [PI, COLL]

   1. The resource guides for Annual Review & RP&T were revised and refined during December and January and this resource is now on the ADAPP Website (http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/resource/annual-review-RP&T-resource-guides-0). The resource guides provide summaries of university policies and links to the complete policies regarding annual review and RP&T. The online resource guide also provides a list of best practices that is anticipated to evolve as units provide input. The FEAs for the three ADAPP colleges are informing chairs and faculty about the resource guide. An additional 7 colleges are joining the project, and we have informed their deans and FEAs of these materials. As the University community reviews and uses this resource guide, we are a) counting the number of visitors to the site and b) requesting comments and input.

   2. As we talk with chairs in the three participating colleges and as additional colleges are brought into the project (see Section III), these units are sharing best practices regarding the annual review process. These practices are being collected and some may be added to the
resource guide. The project will use all of these materials in focus group discussions with Chairs and Directors next Quarter.

C. College of Social Science (CSS):

1. During this year’s Chair’s and Director’s (C&Ds) Retreat (Sept. 3, 2009) the CSS handed out the available Annual Review and RP&T resource guides. The CSS sent out a reminder email to all the chairs and directors with a link to the aforementioned web site. [COLL]

2. During this year’s Chair’s and Director’s Retreat, the CSS conducted several sessions that spoke to the Annual Review and RP&T process. Along with discussions written materials were provided that spoke to the goals of the ADAPP grant and how they might be applied in the AR and RP&T process. Each chair and director was provided with a copy of JoAnn Moody’s monograph, “Rising above Cognitive Errors: Guidelines for Search, Tenure Review, and Other Evaluation Committees.” Dr. Moody visited the College in the previous year and spoke to the chairs and directors, so the monograph reinforced her earlier visit. [COLL]

3. CSS has developed the guidelines and checklist for submitting portfolios for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure and has augmented these this year with new language for the Chair/Director letter to specifically address the area of sponsored research, including mentoring on grants. Associate Deans Maxwell and Goddeeris are reviewing each RP&T packet to ensure that these changes were implemented.

4. CSS led the discussion on Post Tenure Review at a seminar (sponsored by Faculty & Organizational Development) last semester, and this was considered a “best practice” for the university as a whole. Our process actually is a “faculty development process” that enables us to identify senior faculty whose careers need some encouragement and helps us to provide them with new options for the future. [COLL]

D. College of Natural Science (CNS):

1. One of the primary means of communication in CNS are the monthly meetings of the Deans with the college Chairs and Directors. The goals of the ADAPP project, and the resources being developed by the project, have been discussed several times at these meetings.
Outlined below are college activities in response to specific ADAPP initiatives, as well as several on related topics. [COLL]

A. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure. Although not written in response to the ADAPP initiative, the new college guidelines for RP&T are certainly relevant to it. They are now published on the college web site.

B. Teaching Evaluation. A committee of CNS faculty members has drafted this document, which describes college level expectations for the evaluation of teaching, and the role of these evaluations in RP&T.

C. Workload Policy. A committee of CNS faculty members has drafted this document, which describes the college level workload expectations for tenured and tenure track faculty.

2. CNS Documents Completed or in Progress

A. Guidelines for Faculty Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure in the College of Natural Science. (http://naturalscience.msu.edu/administration/policies and procedures/PTPage.htm)

B. CNS Faculty Development Series (Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 schedules, Appendix A, B)

C. Faculty Mentoring in the College of Natural Science (Draft Policy Statement, Appendix C)

D. Guidelines for Implementation of Teaching Evaluation in CNS (Draft Statement, Appendix D)

E. College of Natural Science Workload Policies (Draft, Appendix E).

E. College of Engineering (ENG)

1. The College has communicated with the Chairs about the ADAPP activities and the AR and RP&T resource guides by distributing hard copy versions of the guides and sharing updated versions on the ADAPP web site. [COLL]
2. The AR an RP&T processes in EGR departments are consistent with ADAPP goals and no major changes have been necessary. In one department the AR has been modified to include ideas suggested by ADAPP. [COLL]

3. Co-PI Bush disseminated (1/2010) the annual review toolkit to the interim chair of Mechanical Engineering who went on to read and utilize the toolkit. [PI, COLL]

4. Assessment [EVAL]:

A. Analysis of questions in the Work Environment survey of tenure system faculty in the three ADAPP colleges regarding the annual review process indicated that there were not statistically significant differences in the perception of men and women in regarding the process or application of criteria used in the annual review process. The data did indicate that all faculty in ENG, both men and women, indicated less agreement that written and formal feedback was provided compared to the other two colleges.

B. ENG analysis of questions in the Work Environment survey indicated that there were not statistically significant differences in the perception of men and women in 1) the clarity of understanding of unit processes for RP&T, 2) the clarity in understanding the specific criteria used by the unit, 3) the understanding that the recommendations are based on objective standards, 4) that individuals receive regular feedback, and 5) that the RP&T process was fair. There was a statistically significant difference, however between men and women in their perception of the consistency in applying RP&T standards with women indicating, on average, that fewer women agreed that the standards were consistently applied compared men.

4. Mentoring

A. Luz researched mentor evaluation tools used by other institutions and sent key criteria and a formal instrument to the GMT, FEA, and several chairs. [PI]
B. Luz finalized a one page resource sheet on “Best Practices for Formal Mentoring” geared to leaders at the organization and unit level. Distributed the document to GMT, FEA, and chairs of several departments. The plan is to distribute the resource to PIs at other ADVANCE institutions who have expressed interest. [PI]

C. Luz, and the Mentor Workgroup are working with the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development [F&OD] to develop and co-sponsor a workshop on mentoring as part of the F&OD Spring Institute [SI]. The half-day workshop, Mentoring Early Career Faculty in Times of Change, will target mentors, both experienced and new, who want to learn more about how to effectively mentor early career faculty members and facilitate their productivity, advancement, and retention. The format will feature a moderated discussion with a panel of distinguished mentors, and recent mentees, who will actively interact with participants. Participants will learn why formal mentoring matters; key characteristics of good mentoring; successful mentoring strategies to advance early career faculty in teaching; annual review, promotion and tenure; and leadership; how to mentor across differences; and concrete tips and tools to help with mentoring and evaluating impact. It will be promoted heavily across campus. [PI, COLL, PSO]

D. Online resource kit for mentoring continues to be under development as does a strategic plan for university-level support of formal mentoring across all campus units. [PI, COLL]

E. College of Engineering

1. Luz communicated and met with senior mentors in Civil and Environmental Engineering [CEE] to facilitate development of the department’s new formal program (built upon past efforts) including a plan for tracking and evaluating mentor/mentee activity and outcomes. All early career/tenure track faculty now have two formal mentors, one for research and one for teaching. Each mentor/mentee pair is meeting regularly and keeping a log of activity. Luz met with the full group and provided overview of ADAPP, mentoring, and initial tools to get started (e.g. worksheets to facilitate first meetings). There was active group discussion, high interest in ongoing communication as new program unfolds and evolves. The full group plans to reconvene at end of year to share experiences and suggestions for improvements. [PI, COLL]

2. Luz communicated and met with chair of Mechanical Engineering [ME] to plan spring meeting with all formal mentors in the
department. Agenda will include a brief overview of the evidence for formal mentoring – the impact on career development and measures of success; a discussion of key characteristics of good mentoring and recommended best practices; an assessment of current mentor practices in the department; and review of concrete tips, tools and resources to help mentors efficiently and effectively mentor in tight-budget, time-limited times. The chair clearly supports improving mentor practices in the department and will be advocating that all mentors attend the university/ADAPP sponsored workshop planned for spring 2010 on how to be a good mentor. [PI, COLL]

3. The FEA in Engineering met with the Dean and discussed how to further advance formal mentoring in the college. He shared the Best Practices resource sheet with the Dean and will share with all chairs. He also recommended establishing a college Distinguished Mentor award – now under consideration. Per request from CEE, the FEA will facilitate communication across units on mentoring to share lessons learned. [COLL]

4. Faculty are generally supportive. Some areas of difficulty include the following. Not all faculty members see the benefit of continued mentoring after a few years. The best mentors are also already very busy and there is concern about overloading them. We are trying to identify mechanisms to bring recognition to the importance of good mentoring. We are considering the creation of a mentoring award as part of our existing annual faculty recognition.

F. College of Natural Science

1. Luz continued to communicate with the FEA in the Colleges of Social Science and Natural Science. Provided Best Practices resource sheet and is pursuing the possibility of spring meetings with mentors, either across all units in each college or at unit level. Both express interest and planning meetings are being scheduled. [PI, COLL]

2. Luz has been invited to be a guest lecturer for the graduate seminar series, Women in Science: the Leaky Pipeline coordinated by Dr. Cynthia Jordan, a member of the ADAPP mentor workgroup. The session will focus on Mentoring: the need for change in academia. [PI, COLL]

3. After reviewing the “Best Practices in Mentoring” document provided by ADAPP, a draft CNS policy statement on faculty mentoring was
developed by Susan Conrad, Duncan Sibley, and James Kirkpatrick. This document was presented and discussed at the December Chairs/Directors meeting, and was generally favorably received. The discussion was followed up by and e-mail copy of the draft, along with a request that have written descriptions of their mentoring program send these descriptions to S. Conrad. To date 3 have been received. A meeting/roundtable to discuss departmental mentoring programs with Chairs and/or their representatives is in the planning stages for spring, 2010. [PI, COLL]

G. College of Social Science

1. Luz has continued to communicate with the FEAs in the Colleges of Social Science and Natural Science. Provided Best Practices resource sheet and is pursuing possibility of spring meetings with mentors, either across all units in each college or at unit level. Both express interest and planning meetings are being scheduled. [PI, COLL]

2. During this year’s Chair’s and Director’s Retreat (Sept. 3, 2009) CSS conducted a session specifically on mentoring. Written material was distributed, providing resources for C&Ds use in developing mentoring programs for their units. In addition, CSS requested that each unit develop a strategic plan that would develop or enhance the unit’s mentoring of young faculty. CSS FEA team members (Agbenyiga & Caldwell) have met with ADAPP staff (Luz) during the fall semester to discuss the College’s mentoring programs. As CSS identifies needs that the ADAPP staff can help it meet, the College will ask for the necessary assistance. [PI, COLL]

H. Luz is scheduled to meet with Associate Dean of Research for the College of Nursing [CON] to discuss the CON college-wide formal mentoring program which has been identified as an exemplary model. [PI, COLL]

I. Plan for the next quarter include:

1. Finalize plans for, and conduct spring workshops in ME, the Colleges of Social Science and Natural Science, and for the university F&OD Spring Institute.

2. Continue to work with chairs in Engineering to develop formal mentoring programs. Expand efforts to work with other chairs in other departments and colleges.
3. Draft a strategic plan for university support of formal mentoring programs across all units and submit to Provost for consideration.

4. Establish an online mentor resource kit.

5. Continue to establish ties to the national ADVANCE institution network on issues related to mentoring.

6. Per the NSF first year site review report, and in collaboration with the Women’s Resource Center and F&OD, build on the informal mentor network that currently exists.

5. Leadership

A. Leadership Questionnaire [PI, COLL, PSO, EVAL]

1. The Women’s Leadership Team provided all tenure stream women faculty (in the three ADAPP colleges) a summary document of disciplinary involvement and programming needs. This summary was the result of the analysis of data gathered through the leadership questionnaire (Appendix F) distributed in August 2009 to tenure stream women in the participating colleges.

2. Using the summary responses of the questionnaire, the current and future plans of the Women’s Leadership Team were updated. (see Appendix G)

3. Dissemination of the leadership summary document to the following individuals/groups:

   A. Provost
   B. Deans and FEAs of the three ADAPP colleges
   C. Women’s Advisory Group to the Provost
   D. Directors of Support Offices: Women’s Resource Center, Family Resource Center, Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives , Faculty and Organizational Development
   E. Spoke in person with Elizabeth Simmons, Dean of Lyman Briggs College about the results of the summary document
4. Data from the leadership questionnaire clearly identified three programs that women would like to see offered. These programs included:

   A. How to say “NO” and still succeed – of interest to both tenured and un-tenured women
   B. How to self promote - of interest to both tenured and un-tenured women
   C. How to assume a leadership role – of interest to pre-tenured women

Plans are to develop at least one of these programs for fall semester 2010.

B. Focus Groups (PI, PSO, EVAL)

1. Deans focus group was conducted on December 2, 2009 with a participation level of 50% of the female Deans across the MSU campus (n=4/8).

2. Women Chairs and Directors focus group was conducted on December 1, 2009 with a participation level of 58.8% of the female Chairs and Directors across the three ADAPP colleges (n=10/17).

3. Women Assistant and Associate Deans (tenure stream) was conducted on January 19, 2010 with a participation level of 40% of the across the MSU campus (n=8/20).

4. Women Leaders in their Disciplinary Society: The Leadership Team is in the process of arranging the final focus group. This group will consist of tenure stream women from the three ADAPP colleges who have held a leadership role in their disciplinary societies. The FEA in engineering (Manooch Koochesfahani) asked chairs to identify women for this group; the FEA in natural science (Sue Conrad) sent an e-mail to the women faculty asking for self-identification of these activities. Several women in Social Science had been previously identified.

5. Findings from focus groups

   A. Women in titled leadership roles on campus have had or are currently in leadership roles in their disciplinary society.
I. In developing an invitation list for the final focus group (leadership in their disciplinary society) the leadership team found a significant overlap with women who are currently in titled roles (Dean, Assist. /Assoc. Dean or Chairs/Director) and women who are or have been highly active in their disciplinary society. The women who were identified as having leadership roles in the disciplinary society (identified through results of the leadership questionnaire) showed that 46% (6/13) were already (or had been) in titled roles on campus.

B. Nearly half (49%) of the women in Assistant/Associate Dean positions on the MSU campus are in fixed term appointments as compared to 29% of the male Assistant/Associate Deans

I. In the process of identifying women for the Assistant/Associate Dean focus groups, the leadership team found the distribution of women at this level to be nearly evenly distributed between the fixed-term appointment and the tenure stream appointment, however the percentage of male Assistant/Associate Deans in the fixed term/specialist appointment was much lower, 29%. Male (n=45 – 54% of all Assist/Assoc Deans); 29% fixed term/specialist appointment; 71% tenure stream appointment; Female (n=39 – 46% of all Assist/Assoc Deans); 49% fixed term/specialist appointment; 51% tenure stream appointment

II. These statistics support the theory and other data stating:

1. There is a large population of women who tend NOT to seek tenure stream positions but rather seek fixed-term appointments. Further exploration is needed to determine the reasons for the fixed-term status of this group of women— it may be the nature of their discipline, or it may be due to family balance issues that started earlier in their careers or other reasons.
C. Women can hold leadership positions as fixed-term faculty members (particularly in medical areas) at MSU.

C. Work Environment Data on Women’s Leadership [PI, EVAL]

1. Initial summaries from the work environment survey were received by the leadership team on February 4, 2010. These summaries are being studied to extract specific findings for the 3 ADAPP colleges which will be presented next quarter.

D. Building a Community of Women Leaders [PI, PSO]

1. A meeting occurred Feb 1st, 2010 with Pat Lowrie (Women’s Resource Center), Lori Strom (Family Resource Center), Deb DeZure, Eron Drake and Allyn Shaw (Faculty and Organizational Development). The meeting was arranged by Pat Lowrie of the Woman’s Resource Center and a member of the leadership team. Challenges communicating with the women faculty was identified and discussed. Not all women will be engaged or want to participate in ADAPP activities, however, the leadership team felt that we needed to brainstorm potential interventions to address this problem.

2. The first targeted program will occur immediately following the Mary Ann Mason’s public forum on March 25, 2010. A space has been reserved directly outside the lecture hall for a reception. The Leadership Team and the Support Offices want to be deliberate about communications, networking and engaging women at MSU during this reception period. The details have not yet been completed, but this time will be used to facilitate building a community of women across campus.

E. Mary Ann Mason Visit [PI, COLL, PSO]

1. Three ADAPP Deans will be invited to one of the dinners with Mary Ann Mason this will be another opportunity for discussions around ADAPP and policies that have the potential to benefit women.

2. The second dinner will be used as a networking opportunity for MSU women. Cindy Jordan (member of the Leadership Team) is establishing an invitation list for that dinner. [COLL]
F. Other News

1. Overall, there seems to be a great deal of grassroots momentum among women faculty regarding leadership! We have anecdotal evidence that informal networks are advancing in and across various departments. For ADAPP, how do we harness these grassroots accomplishments, support them generally, and support them with formal mechanisms, where possible?

2. The Engineering Alumni award winners (about a year ago) did not present any form of diversity. This year the Coordinator of Women in Engineering and Society for Women Engineers and PI Tammy Bush worked together to develop the nomination packet for a female nominee -- for the most prestigious Engineering Alumni award – the Claud Erikson Award. She received it, and is the FIRST WOMAN to receive the award since its inception in 1982!!! [PI, COLL]

6. Faculty Information Tool (FIT) [PI, ADMIN, COLL, PSO]

A. The main focus of our work during the second quarter is further refining the scope of the Faculty Information Tool (FIT).

B. The FIT team is working closely with stakeholders across the university to define the extent to which FIT will be a portal (with data stored elsewhere) and/or a data collection module.

C. Lead Co-PI McGroarty has been involved in weekly meetings with the Vice Provost for Libraries, Computing and Technology and other individuals leading MSU’s university-wide conversion to a new financial, human resource and research tracking system.

D. In December, negotiations were completed to recruit Marshall Hestenes to lead the FIT development team and carryout the main programming. During that month initial discussions with the Enterprise Business System Project (EBSP) personnel were initiated regarding the scope of the project.

E. In January, additional members of the planning committee were recruited including Rochele Cotter (currently working on the team designing the EBSP data warehouse) and Rebecca Hallisy (human resource workgroup lead for the human resource/payroll team in the EBS project). During January the planning group identified an extensive list of data elements that potentially would a) be reported out from the data warehouse through the Faculty Information tool, and b) would be collected through the portal into the data
warehouse as the single source of such data, and would also be reported out through this tool.

F. In February, additional personnel were recruited to the planning committee including Mary Black, Director of Institutional Studies in the Office of Planning and Budgets, Jennifer Sweet, Data Resource Analyst in the College of Natural Science and for the ADAPP project and Donald Ries, Director of Enterprise Information Stewardship and a member of the EBSP staff. During several meetings of this group, the data elements that will exist in the MSU data warehouse when the systems “go live” in January 2011 were defined from the list developed in January. The additional data elements not to be maintained through other EBSP systems but which could be collected through the FIT portal were identified, reviewed and initially prioritized regarding which the elements should be collected through this portal. FIT will replicate the current Administrator’s Assistant, software which reports limited information regarding the background and productivity of faculty and staff from the current MSU data warehouses. It was also determined that FIT will NOT be the portal for collecting data related to space assignment.

G. In March 2010 the list of data elements to be reported in FIT will be shared with the Council of Research Deans (Associate Deans from all college), to get input and suggestions regarding the priorities data elements and structure of reports to be presented by FIT.

H. Other meetings focusing on FIT have included:

1. McGroarty and McDaniels met with JR Haywood, Assistant Vice President for Regulatory Affairs, to discuss data elements related to regulatory issues that might have a place in FIT (12/16/09).

2. McGroarty and McDaniels met with programmer of FIT, along with representatives from the university’s larger technology transition team, to refine FIT data elements (12/18/09).

3. McGroarty and McDaniels met with the Director and Assistant Director of Facilities Planning and Space Management, as well as the Director of Institutional Studies, to discuss the role that FIT may/may not play in storing space data. (2/3/10)
7. Cross-Project Accomplishments

A. Meetings held between the representatives of the ACT (ADAPP Leadership Team) and deans and FEAs of the 3 ADAPP-ADVANCE colleges to discuss strategies to enhance communication, as well as approaches to utilizing W/E survey and inventory data. (PI, COLL, ADMIN)

1. College of Social Science (Roehling & McGroarty)

   A. College of Social Science – Mark Roehling (co-PI) and Estelle McGroarty (co-PI) met separately (Roehling – 1/20; McGroarty 1/22) with the dean of the College of Social Science to discuss policy issues vis-à-vis the use and dissemination of the data collected through ADAPP-ADVANCE. These conversations resulted in a set of questions that the PI (Wilcox) needs to think about in his position as provost.

2. College of Natural Science (McGroarty) [December 14, 2009]

   A. Attendees: Dean James Kirkpatrick, FEA Sue Conrad, Associate Dean Duncan Sibley, Associate VP Estelle McGroarty

   B. Reviewed work environment survey data tables.

   C. Discussed analysis of two inventories of current practices matched to best practices. CNS group asked if the information could be shared with Chairs –McGroarty indicated they need to think carefully how they would use all of this data.

   D. Discussed the Leadership Survey results – College would like the data on the distribution of Assistant/Associate Deans by gender by TS vs. non-TS ranking.

   E. Discussed the Faculty Information Tool and what it will do. They were supportive of the concept. Concerned about faculty time to upload the information in a CV.

   F. CNS plans to look at all of this data and begin to organize meetings of groups of chairs to consider the various issues that are related to the data. One of the first topics will be mentoring programs. They feel the College is addressing RP&T criteria, but they will also focus this next year on the
annual review process.

G. CNS group was asked to keep the project personnel informed about the activities that they carry out with regard to the AHR processes and their interventions. They agreed to do this. This may be where the FEA meetings will be important – for CNS FEA to share with the other FEA’s types of interventions they are initiating.

3. College of Engineering

   A. On 12/21, Karen Klomparens met with both the FEA and Dean of the College of Engineering. Both stakeholders thought the project was going well. They reported on the mentoring program work that one of the co-PIs (Luz) was undertaking. The College will do little if any hiring, but are paying attention to retention/promotion issues. They talked about FIT and the possible implications for their own EGR system.

B. College of Natural Science – Reported Cross-Project Activity

   1. Under Dr. Sibley’s direction, CNS provides a number of faculty development workshops each semester dealing with various aspects of faculty development, including teaching, grant writing, mentoring, etc.

   2. CNS has promoted the resource guides during their monthly faculty chair and director meetings. The College has also drafted a workload policy describing the college level workload expectations for tenured and tenure track Faculty (see Appendix E), and guidelines for implementation of teaching evaluation in CNS (see Appendix D).

   3. CNS Has added a link to the ADAPP website on the College Home page.

C. College of Social Science – Reported Cross-Project Activity

   1. CSS has added a link to the ADAPP website to the college website and will encourage our units to do likewise.

   2. At the CSS New Faculty Orientation at the beginning of this academic year (August 18, 2009), the College presented information on most of these topics, including: Promotion and Tenure, Teaching, Research Support, Diversity and Inclusion, Mentoring, and other aspects of
professional development. Most of the communication on these matters takes place through channels mediated by the C&Ds. The Dean’s staff meets frequently with the C&Ds and expects that the information and suggestions they offer will be conveyed to relevant faculty in the respective units. For example, CSS has developed a letter that C&Ds can use to stimulate discussion with their faculty about retirement. This letter has already been presented to C&Ds in draft form and will be discussed with C&Ds during a meeting next week. This letter is part of a larger Budget Reduction Plan, and will help to encourage consistent practices around retirement for each unit.

3. As a response to the budget pressures CSS is facing, the Dean convened an advisory committee of Chairs and Directors to make suggestions about budget reductions. One series of recommendations that came from this committee concerned Human Resource management issues. The Dean has accepted these recommendations and the College is in the process of implementing many of them. These recommendations will provide content to the ongoing discussions between the Dean and C&Ds.

D. College of Engineering Reported Cross-Project Activity

1. The link to ADAPP web site has been posted on the ENG home and the faculty/staff pages. The department chairs have been encouraged to do the same on their unit web sites. All five departments in CoE have now an ADAPP link on their home page.

2. The information about ADAPP activities and resources are shared with the departments through their Chairs or meetings with individual faculty. The Chairs share information with faculty through a variety of methods, e.g. personal contact, annual retreats, etc. Information on seminars and workshops at the University and College are widely shared with faculty.

II. ACCOMPLISHMENTS/PROGRESS RELATED TO GRANT MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY

1. Project Support Unit Grant Activity [PSO]
   
   A. Faculty and Organizational Development

   1. Deb DeZure, Director of Faculty and Organization Development, presented to the CIC Academic Leadership Fellows Program for
their second major campus seminar at University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Each of these CIC ALP meetings includes approximately 80 leadership fellows from the CIC institutions, including women in STEM disciplines.

2. DeZure reported the results of the Study of Mid Career Faculty and Chairs. DeZure concluded the program (both this year and last year when presenting at the U-Michigan Seminar) with how MSU has responded to what we learned about campus needs.

3. DeZure discussed the ADAPP-ADVANCE grant as the vehicle by which the University is aligning policies, programs, and practices. This included one of the major findings of the study indicating that criteria for promotion to full professor was unclear in many departments. DeZure explained that ADAPP is reviewing department criteria for promotion to full professor to ensure clarity and equal access to critical information about expectations.

4. DeZure discussed the importance of robust annual review processes and in-person, face-to-face conversations about goals and expectations and disseminated materials on that topic.

5. F&OD has instituted the new “Orientation to the Mid Career Experience at MSU,” which directly addresses the need to provide greater clarity to mid career faculty about what it takes to gain promotion to full professor. DeZure mentioned the ADAPP ADVANCE Grant at that program and clarify the work that it is doing. That program also had a large audience.

B. Family Resource Center

1. Lori Strom, FRC Coordinator, was invited to present at the “Women in Science; Leaky Pipeline” Course. Dr. Cynthia Jordan (an ADAPP Faculty Advisory Committee member) asked Lori as a Work/Life Consultant to discuss “Work/Life Synergy” for women graduate students in STEM disciplines. Lori discussed the services of FRC and the initiatives that MSU has in place to support women with their personal and professional responsibilities as MSU students, staff and faculty.

2. Lori Strom was invited to present at the SPAM-Student Parents At Med School (Osteopathic Medical School) and PMS-Parents at Med School (College of Human Medicine) luncheon presentation.
3. Lunch with ADAPP Advance Project Director Melissa McDaniels to discuss the role of FRC services and initiatives as they relate to the grant (December 29, 2010)

4. Two Social Work Student Interns are doing their practicum at FRC for the 2009-2010 Fall and Spring Semesters and there have been many conversations about the value of ADVANCE to MSU.

5. As a member of CUWFA, the national College University Work Family Association, the FRC Coordinator has shared information about the MSU Advance grant initiatives.

6. UCLA contacted the MSU FRC to learn more about the services provided to students with children, and information about the Advance grant was shared.

7. Graduate School and COGS event- FRC-Resource Table- Feb. 19, 2010

C. Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives

Paulette Granberry Russell, Director


2. Success in the Academic Hiring Process from Start to Finish. Workshop on Faculty Excellence and Diversity. With ADAPP PIs. 30 participants.

3. Faculty Advisory Committee meeting James Madison College (Recruiting for Excellence and Diversity). 30 faculty attendees (distributed brochures and discussed best practices for search processes).

4. College Level Planning Meetings with 7 colleges to discuss their diversity/inclusion initiatives and programs, referenced the efforts of the ADVANCE/ADAPP (e.g., this is where we learned more about the practices of the College of Nursing that is now regarded as a best practice academic unit in terms of recruiting, retaining, advancing and mentoring faculty (female dominated unit/field)). (Summer and Fall 2009)

5. IDEA Coordinators meeting shared information including brochures on the ADVANCE/ADAPP efforts. Institutional Diversity Excellence in Action Coordinators resides in each of the academic
units. These are individuals that engage in and promote diversity/inclusion efforts within each of the colleges (Fall 2009).

6. Member of the Ad Hoc Faculty Work Life Committee and assures that the work of this committee is aligned with the goals and objectives of the ADAPP grant.

7. Women’s Advisory Committee to the Vice President for Finance and Operations. Shared information re: ADAPP and provided them with brochures

8. ADAPP referenced in the Annual Diversity and Inclusion Progress Report, Executive Summary (published on our web site) presented to the Board of Trustees February 12, 2010 (also June 2009).

2. Central ADAPP-ADVANCE Office updates [PI, ADMIN, EVAL]

   A. As of 2/1/10, the entire collection of reference books in the ADAPP-ADVANCE central office is now online, both names, and publication summaries.

   B. Revised communication plan under development.

   C. Developing partnership with MSU’s NSF Innovation through Institutional Transformation (I3) grant. Attended launch meeting (1/15/10). MSU ADVANCE will serve as key partner in this initiative, which aims to creatively integrate NSF-awarded funds.

   D. Evaluation

      1. Ohio Evaluation and Assessment Center for Mathematics and Science Education was hired to undertake formative and summative evaluation duties (January 1, 2010)

      2. Several phone meetings between ADAPP-ADVANCE team members and Sarah Woodruff (Director of OEAC)

      3. Team visited on February 16 and 17, 2010.

      4. Jan Urban Lurain submitted her final report of formative evaluation in YR1 (Appendix H)

      5. Research Assistant Report (Qualitative Analysis / Toolkits)

         A. All qualitative data generated from the administration of baseline inventories in the College of Natural Science, Engineering, and Social Science as well as peripheral data
gained regarding leadership and mentoring were compiled and sent to the Ohio Evaluation and Assessment Team, anticipating their review of extant data and participation in future projects.

B. Beginning in late November, the RA attended several Annual Review Workgroup meetings around both data and results from analyses of the chairperson inventories and faculty surveys.

   I. During these meetings, ADAPP personnel discussed summaries from his analyses of these data. Also in December, the RA, Lead Co-PI, and Director met with representatives from the Colleges of Agriculture and Natural Resources and Osteopathic Medicine.

   II. In both meetings, ADAPP introduced the nature of the project and discussed both the organization of the FIT project (CANR) and the possibility of administering the chairperson inventories in those colleges (CANR/COM).

C. In December, the RA also edited (copy and content) the resource guides for Annual Review and Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure. These materials are now posted on the ADAPP web site and being disseminated to MSU units through informal and formal interactions and programs.

D. Following a December meeting with the Dr. Aguwa from the College of Osteopathic Medicine, adopted the inventory for online use.

E. During January, RA revised and launched each of the ADAPP inventories online (Annual Review; College and Department-level Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure; Mentoring and Leadership) using Survey Monkey, a commercial survey design software.

F. Working with the Project Director, RA also completed a draft IRB application for the inventory project, following discussions about potential use of these organizational development data in research reporting. This application will be submitted pending the approval of the grant management team.

G. RA is also periodically reviewing and synthesizing research literature on institutional change/transformation efforts.
among decentralized higher education institutions. While the project team prepares to launch the inventories in other Colleges, RA has been asked to locate research-supported strategies for coordinating change efforts with departments and college within research-oriented higher education institutions. The RA's goal is to begin to develop an ongoing literature database of pertinent scholarly articles modeled after similar databases on other NSF projects.

6. Recruited a new Research Assistant, Jillian Hmurovic, to carry out quantitative analysis of data. Report:

A. Prior to December, RA began to analyze data from the 2009 Work Environment Survey. Focusing on item-level data, RA tested for significant differences in attitudes of tenure-stream faculty depending on gender and college affiliation. First, RA made comparisons between the three ADAPP Colleges (i.e., College of Engineering, College of Natural Sciences, College of Social Sciences) on items assessing attitudes of promotion/tenure, annual review, recruitment/hiring, general diversity climate, diversity climate for women faculty, diversity climate for faculty of color, mentoring, relationships within unit, leadership, incivility, and satisfaction. Results of these analyses were presented and summarized in tables created for each facet of the work environment.

B. Upon the completion of these analyses, RA then began comparing additional colleges to the group of three ADAPP colleges. The attitudes of male and female tenure-stream faculty in the College of Nursing were compared to the attitudes of male and female tenure-stream faculty in the group comprised of the College of Engineering, College of Natural Sciences, and College of Social Sciences. These comparisons were made for each of the eleven factors mentioned above, and results were summarized in a set of tables. Similar analyses were done for other colleges. Since December, analyses for the College of Osteopathic Medicine and the College of Veterinary Medicine have been completed. As before, eleven tables presenting results of the analyses were created for each additional college. Since the completion of the set of tables for the College of Osteopathic Medicine and the College of Veterinary Medicine, we have identified and prioritized the analyses of the remaining colleges to be completed in the coming weeks.
C. Analyses Completed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Sections Analyzed</th>
<th>Colleges with ADAPP Comparisons Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>promotion/tenure</td>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annual review</td>
<td>College of Natural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recruitment/hiring</td>
<td>College of Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general diversity climate</td>
<td>College of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity climate for women faculty</td>
<td>College of Osteopathic Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity climate for faculty of color</td>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships within unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incivility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. In anticipation of the upcoming addition of hired statisticians from the Ohio Evaluator, RA organized the dataset to avoid unnecessary confusion in terms of variable labels and scale scores. Data syntax used to run all prior analyses as well as syntax used to create variables in the dataset was also updated for clarity. Following this, the dataset and data syntax was sent to the Ohio Evaluator.

E. In addition to running the above analyses, RA also began to run analyses specifically concerning leadership. At the request of Tammy Reid, RA identified all items in the work environment survey that pertained to leadership (e.g., level leadership involvement, desire for leadership role). For this set of items, responses of tenure-stream faculty in the College of Engineering, College of Natural Sciences, and College of Social Sciences were compared by gender and college affiliation. RA currently in the final stages of creating the tables to present these results in a clear and coherent format.

III. ACCOMPLISHMENTS/PROGRESS IN INSTITUTIONALIZATION

1. College of Osteopathic Medicine (Karen Klomparens, 12/1/2009)

   A. Karen Klomparens (Dean of Graduate School & Provost’s Representative to ADAPP-ADVANCE) met with the dean and FEA from the College of Osteopathic Medicine. The team from this college is very interested in the FIT tool, especially the data that could be included on faculty compliance. The FEA (also an associate dean) is managing their accreditation process and was very eager to start to utilize the chair inventories. COM is also engaging in best practices and they promised to share those practices with the ADAPP team.

   B. Director and RA met with the FEA on 12/9/09 to discuss the college’s use of the inventories.
2. College of Veterinary Medicine (from Mark Roehling, 1/26/2010)

A. Co-PI Roehling met with Dean Brown and Susan Ewart (FEA) on Tuesday, January 26, 2010.

B. Dean Brown could not have been more enthusiastic about the approach of the grant. Dean Brown offered his own strong views about the importance of structure, alignment, transparency, and accountability. Also, Susan Ewart appreciated the value of the grant’s approach (indicating general agreement the Dean’s views, not expressing any significant concerns). In short, it was not necessary to sell the Dean or Dr. Ewart on the wisdom or potential value of what ADAPP is attempting to do.

C. In Dean Brown’s absence (due to another meeting), Ewart and Roehling reviewed the primary findings of the work environment survey relating to CVM. She expressed a keen interest in interpreting the results, and indicated that when she had more time she would like to review the various tables more carefully. She also asked that Roehling provide her file copies of the tables so she could forward them to some of her colleagues within CVM.

D. One of the significant survey findings is that compared to faculty the three comparison colleges (Engineering, CSS, CNS), CVM faculty report statistically significant less favorable perceptions of their promotion and tenure process. Ewart expressed more concern about the CVM’s annual review process than the P & T process. She thought that the negative view of P & T process might be due to the fact that the CVM had a less than ideal annual performance review process that was not closely aligned with the criteria used in the RP & T process, leading to “surprises” in the P & T process. Interestingly, the survey results did not indicate that CVM faculty had a less favorable view of their annual review process than faculty in the three comparison colleges. Ewart’s interpretation of the survey finding is plausible; it is possible that CVM faculty could have favorable views of their annual performance review process despite the fact it was not aligned with the RP & T process. This may be an indication that some of the survey findings are not as “straight forward” in their meaning as assumed.

E. Discussed the fact that the CVM has already been looking at how to improve its annual performance review process and the mentoring CVM provides
faculty. The ADAPP toolkits for annual performance review and P & T were received with great interest, and Roehling mentioned Co-PI Luz’s role in heading up a mentoring work group and briefly described some the group’s activities. Ewart may follow-up with Luz.

F. Ewart wanted to know when the new FEAs would be meeting, and Roehling advised her that efforts to schedule the meeting were underway, and she would be contacted. She also wanted to know whether she was expected to “roll out” the ADAPP grants and CVM involvement in some grand way at this time (late January), expressing the view that she would prefer to wait until the meeting of the new FEAs. She would like to be able to point to more specific and tangible benefits that CVM and its faculty will get from CVM’s involvement in the grant before trying to make a big splash with the faculty.

G. In summary, it appears the leadership in CVM will be willing and thoughtful new participants in ADAPP.

3. College of Nursing (Mark Roehling, 1/24/2010)

A. Began by providing an overview of the goals of ADVANCE and ADAPP. As part of the overview of ADAPP:

1. ADAPP provided and discussed the figure prepared for our ADVANCE poster (the graphic representation of the three core elements of our approach and the primary goals of ADDAP) (they immediately saw links to ADAPP’s approach and what they are already doing in the College of Nursing).

2. Briefly discussed work groups.

3. Discussed toolkits, provided copies of the RP&T and Annual Performance review toolkits, and expressed our interest in receiving any input they would like to offer about the toolkits (Shared extra copies of the two toolkits, and they asked if they could take them to pass out within the College of Nursing).

4. Linked the toolkits to the “increasing structure” of academic HR core element our approach.

5. Discussion of recent/ongoing steps (e.g., FIT) and next steps (e.g., additional toolkits, further data collection). Some of them were
already generally aware of the FIT project. They were very enthusiastic about FIT in general, but express particular interest in the prospect of having a mechanism that could be used to standardize the CV submitted by Nursing faculty as part of their annual performance review process.

4. College of Arts and Letters (Estelle McGroarty, 12/16/09)

A. Lead Co-PI McGroarty met with Karin Wurst, Dean of CAL, and David Prestel, the FEA for CAL. They were very supportive of the ADAPP activities and are interested in using the resources being developed. They are really focusing on measuring and benchmarking faculty productivity, so they were exploring the use of the Engineering system (FAIS) and Digital Measures to capture faculty performance data.

B. CAL administrators were especially interested in the FIT initiative. Prestel is going to meet with Jackie Carlson to discuss the FAIS and its adaptation to fulfill CAL's needs.

C. David Prestel indicated that he would like to see examples of college level expectations for mentoring, RP&T, etc. Such a meeting of the "old" and "new" FEAs could be very beneficial to the new colleges coming on board as they can see how the initial colleges are moving forward in defining expectations and implementation of policies and practices.

5. College of Human Medicine (Estelle McGroarty, 12/17/09)

A. McGroarty met with the Dean of Human Medicine, Marsha Rappley, and William Wadland, the Faculty Excellence Advocate for that College.

B. The dean requested that one of the co-PIs meet with their faculty to consult on faculty search processes. They are very supportive of FIT. They have some good examples of refined criteria for RP&T that they will share with other units.

C. CHM’s Faculty Affairs and Development office is being very proactive in Academic HR activities. They have developed a table of functions that their
office is carrying out, and cross walking those activities with that of the ADVANCE grant and of the US Faculty Affairs Offices.

D. Wadland shared an overview of the activities of the Office of Faculty Affairs.

E. Wadland asked if Co-PI Roehling might meet with their chairs group to talk about the ADVANCE resources for faculty searches.

F. Faculty hiring in medical schools is a real problem. The turnover of clinical faculty is ~ 40%!!! Academic medicine is not seen as an attractive profession. This is especially true for women. So any help they can get in hiring and retention would be appreciated.

G. They were very supportive of expanding the FIT to include compliance when possible.

H. CHM has developed defined criteria for RP&T.

6. College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (Karen Klomparens, 12/22/09)

A. Klomparens met with the dean, faculty excellence advocate, the associate dean and the diversity assistant dean.

B. Very supportive of FIT

C. They were looking forward to using the best practices tool kits to help them with a reorganization happening in the college.

D. Requested additional data from the W/E survey.

7. Lyman Briggs (Estelle McGroarty, 11/30/09)

A. Reviewed the four main goals of ADVANCE and ADAPP and mechanism to reach these goals.

B. LBC has a very good Faculty recruitment and mentoring program. They have faculty evaluation procedures and information about RP&T on their web site,
as well as information about Mentoring in LBC on their web pages (http://lymanbriggs.msu.edu/faculty/faculty_info.cfm). Also have links to the MSU faculty handbook and links to external resources.

C. Discussed
   2. Surveys of faculty perceptions of practices (w/e survey)
   3. Gathering input on needs of faculty in these practices – survey of women on leadership Discussions with deans on mentoring needs
   4. University’s data on total faculty numbers, hiring, retention-separations, participation in mentoring

D. Discussed resources for units – types of “tool kits”

   1. faculty hiring manual
   2. best practices for mentoring
   3. policies and best practices on annual review,
   4. policies and best practices on RP&T,
   5. resources for leadership development

E. Next steps. Would like to highlight model best practices in units – in particularly LBC.

   1. Work with groups of Women to help define appropriate leadership development activities and resources. Refine university programs for Chairs and Directors (LEAD) on annual review and RP&T.

   2. As part of ADAPP, working with the EBSP personnel to capture more comprehensive academic human resources (AHR) data that will allow for more transparency, consistency and objectivity in AHR processes. Focus is on collecting all personal data currently collected and reported in Administrator’s Assistant but include all degrees and prior positions, time and length, and any additional professional training/certification.

   3. Faculty Hiring Data – information on hiring process, e.g., search committee members, data on applicants and interviewees, who was offered position, offer specifics: salary, startup, space, listing of expectations
4. Effort data for annual performance review - include specific data normally reported in CVs e.g., publications, presentations (citations), awards, grants submitted and awarded (to include internal grants) teaching efforts, evaluations of teaching, students advised, etc. (Second phase – develop CV from data).

5. Information that is collected for RP&T – to be into an “electronic Form D” pre-populated with data from effort reporting.

F. LBC was very interested in this initiative!!!

1. Indicated that LBC can use and provide input to the resources developed by ADAPP
2. Various toolkits, manuals, guidelines
3. Inventories of current practice – compare to best practices
4. Review work/environment survey data from LBC faculty and compare to University data.
5. Regular – at least once a semester of all FEAs will allow for review of materials and best approaches to use ADAPP resources and provide input to additional information/assistance needed.
6. They look forward to the meeting of the FEAs

IV. CHALLENGES

1. How does the “new reality” at MSU (extreme budget cuts, minimal hiring) impact the goals of the ADAPP project?

2. Communications continues to be a big challenge. The team is working to develop a new communications strategy, and considering adding additional human capital to coordinate communications efforts.
V. BEST IDEAS YET

1. ADAPP-ADVANCE got buy-in from seven additional colleges. Each expressed interest in both sharing best practices, and utilizing tools developed in the 3 ADAPP colleges. Also very supportive of the Faculty Information Tool.

2. Growing level of momentum with grassroots of women – learning how to harness this energy moving forward.

3. The scope of FIT was refined and integrated within the planning structures for the larger university-wide Enterprise Business System Project at MSU.

VI. RESPONSE TO FIRST YEAR SITE VISIT (APPENDIX I)
APPENDICES

A. CNS Faculty Development Series (Fall 2009)
B. CNS Faculty Development Series (Spring 2010)
C. Faculty Mentoring in the College of Natural Science (Draft Policy Statement)
D. Guidelines for Implementation of Teaching Evaluation in CNS
E. College of Natural Science Work Load Policies
F. Leadership Questionnaire
G. Summary Report of Women’s Leadership Questionnaire
H. Final Evaluation Report from Jan Urban Lurain (YR1)
I. Response to First Year Site Visit
APPENDIX A: CNS Faculty Development Series (Fall 2009)

College of Natural Science Workshops for Fall 2009

Below is a list of workshops and meetings designed to support CNS faculty. Some of the workshops are designed specifically for CNS affiliated faculty; others are designed for a broader audience but are likely to be of interest to CNS affiliated faculty. Registration information is listed at the end of each description.

Facilitating Learning in Large Lecture Classes
Wednesday September 9, 2009 | 9:00-11:30 AM | 1425 Biomedical Physical Sciences

Facilitator: Karl Smith, Cooperative Learning Professor of Engineering Education, Purdue University and Morse-Alumni Distinguished Teaching Professor, Professor of Civil Engineering, University of Minnesota

This session is specifically designed for CNS faculty who teach large (>50) lecture classes. Helping students’ experience meaningful learning in large lecture classes is a challenge. Whether faculty use clickers or other technology, students are often passively recording information. This session will explore ways to change the dynamics of a classroom from one in which the professor provides information to one in which students are engaged with their peers and instructor in meaningful learning about the most important concepts.

Registration: Contact Faith Peterson (petersof@cns.msu.edu).

Building and Managing Successful Teams for Cooperative Learning
Wednesday Sept. 9, 2009 | 12:45-2:45 PM | 1425 Biomedical Physical Sciences

Facilitator: Karl Smith, Cooperative Learning Professor of Engineering Education, Purdue University and Morse-Alumni Distinguished Teaching Professor, Professor of Civil Engineering, University of Minnesota

Instructors commonly use teams or groups in courses to help facilitate cooperative learning among peers as well as emulate the working environment of professionals in some disciplines. Some of the questions that typically arise among instructors when planning to use teams for course projects include: How should groups be developed to facilitate learning? What will be the responsibilities of team members to accomplish project objectives? How can instructors facilitate good communication and conflict management skills among team members? How can team projects and effort be monitored and evaluated? This session will provide participants with practical suggestions for how they can have students work effectively in teams to meet desired teaching and learning objectives. All participants in this session will receive a copy of Dr. Smith's book, "Teamwork and Project Management".

Registration: Contact Faith Peterson (petersof@cns.msu.edu).
Moving from Effective Teaching to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)
A Lilly Seminar Series Workshop
Thursday, September 10, 2009 | 8:45 – 12:00 PM | Kellogg Center, Michigan Room
(Registration at 8:45 AM.; program begins at 9:00 AM)

Facilitator: Karl Smith, Cooperative Learning Professor of Engineering Education, Purdue University and Morse-Alumni Distinguished Teaching Professor, Professor of Civil Engineering, University of Minnesota

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), which promotes teaching as a scholarly endeavor and a worthy subject for research, has received increased attention in higher education as many faculty embrace more scholarly approaches to teaching and learning. In this seminar, participants will explore the Hutchins and Shulman (1999) SoTL continuum and learn strategies to progress from effective teachers to scholarly teachers who root their instructional decisions on the research on teaching and learning to teachers who advance the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Registration: Send e-mail to registration@provmail.msu.edu or register online at http://fod.msu.edu/cregistration.asp.

Design and Implementation of Active and Cooperative Learning
A Lilly Seminar Series Workshop
Thursday, September 10, 2009 | 12:45 - 4:00 PM | Kellogg Center, Michigan Room
(Registration at 12:45 PM; program begins at 1:00 PM)

Facilitator: Karl Smith, Cooperative Learning Professor of Engineering Education, Purdue University and Morse-Alumni Distinguished Teaching Professor, Professor of Civil Engineering, University of Minnesota

An ongoing challenge for faculty in the classroom is developing effective strategies that engage students with one another and with the instructor. In this seminar, participants will explore various designs of student-student and student-faculty interaction that ensure enhanced learning. Participants will learn more about their role in designing, structuring, and implementing active and cooperative learning activities, the outcome of which will result in higher achievement and greater productivity by all students.

Registration: Send e-mail to registration@provmail.msu.edu or register online at http://fod.msu.edu/cregistration.asp.

Panel: Jim Kirkpatrick, CNS Dean; Julie Libarkin, GLG Asc Prof.; Rich Triemer, PBL Chair; Charlie Hoogstraten, BMB Asc. Prof.; Bill Lynch, PHY Prof.; Yang Wang, MTH Chair
Thursday October 8, 2009 | 3:30- 5:00 PM | 105 Natural Science

This is an opportunity for all pre-tenure faculty to ask questions and join a discussion about P&T guidelines in CNS.

Registration: Contact Faith Peterson (petersof@cns.msu.edu).
MSU's 2009 STEM Symposium
Thursday October 1, 2009 | 8:30 – 4:00 PM | MSU Union, Gold Room (includes lunch)

Organized by the Center for Engineering Education Research (CEER) in the College of Engineering and the Center for Research on College Science Teaching and Learning (CRCSTL) in the College of Natural Science. Sponsorship is by the College of Engineering, CRCSTL, and F&OD and Undergraduate Education—Office of the Provost. It is open to faculty, academic administrators, staff, graduate students, and non-MSU faculty.

Morning Session: Outcomes-based Education
Thursday October 1, 2009 | 8:30 – 1:00 PM | MSU Union, Gold Room (includes lunch)

Facilitators: Richard Felder, Hoechst Celanese Professor Emeritus, Chemical Engineering, North Carolina State University and Rebecca Brent, President of Educational Designs, Inc.

Innovative models that focus on learning outcomes engage faculty in new ways of facilitating and assessing learning. Participants will identify key elements and issues that the academy must address in order to transform the educational experience and culture to a more learning-centered enterprise.

Afternoon Session: Advances in STEM Education
Thursday October 1, 2009 | 1:15 – 3:30 PM | MSU Union, Gold Room

1:15-1:30 Formal Welcome
Associate Dean Wolff, College of Engineering, Dean Udpa, College of Engineering, Dean Kirkpatrick, College of Natural Sciences, and Associate Provost Estry, MSU Undergrad Education and Dean of Students

1:30-2:15 Front Line Reflections: The First Ten Years of The Ohio State University First Year Engineering Program
Robert J. Gustafson, Director, Engineering Education Innovation Center, Honda Professor for Engineering Education, Professor, Food, Agricultural and Biological Engineering, College of Engineering, Ohio State University

2:15-3:15 Science, Mathematics, Engineering and Technology (STEM) Education in Five Years or Sooner
Richard Felder, Hoechst Celanese Professor Emeritus, Chemical Engineering, North Carolina State University

3:15-4:00 Creating a Culture for Scholarly and Systematic Innovation in Engineering Education
Jack R. Lohmann, Vice Provost and Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology, Editor, Journal of Engineering Education
A Discussion of CNS Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

**Survive and Thrive in the MSU Tenure System**
*(For Probationary Tenure-System Faculty)*
Monday, October 19, 2009 8:30 – 12:00 PM | MSU Union, Gold Room A and B
(Continental breakfast and registration at 8:30 AM; program begins at 9:00 AM)

Speakers: June Youatt, Senior Assoc. Provost; Theodore H. Curry II, Assoc. Provost and Assoc. Vice President for Academic Human Resources; J. Ian Gray, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies; Punya Mishra, Associate Professor, CEPSE, College of Education; and Panelists: Deans, Chairs, College Advisory Committee members, and recently tenured faculty

This workshop is designed for all MSU assistant professors in the tenure-system to provide assistance in functioning successfully within the tenure system at MSU.

Registration: Register online at http://fod.msu.edu/SurviveThrive/about.asp.

**Your course syllabus: It’s more than a schedule**
Thursday, November 12, 2009 | 8:15-10:15 AM | 105 NS

Facilitator: Kathy Doig, CNS Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education

How would your syllabus be different if you think of it as a handbook or manual for your course rather than just the schedule and the course rules? The course syllabus is an important communication tool that can set the tone for the course, begin the instruction, reduce student confusion, and help manage student effort, organization and time. It is also an important reference in instances where students and faculty disagree about whether a student’s performance meets acceptable standards or not. In this session you will have an opportunity to review the literature on college course syllabi, examine the items that various authors recommend for inclusion, and weigh the value of including in your syllabi items that are not presently included. Bring your course syllabi to review and to share with others.

Registration: Contact Faith Peterson (petersof@cns.msu.edu).
APPENDIX B: CNS Faculty Development Series (Spring 2010)

College of Natural Science

Faculty Development Series
Spring Semester 2010

Below is a list of workshops and meetings designed to support CNS faculty. Some of the workshops are designed specifically for CNS affiliated faculty; others are designed for a broader audience but are likely to be of interest to CNS affiliated faculty. Registration information is listed at the end of each description.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching
Thursday, January 21, 2010 | 8:00-10:00 AM | 105 Natural Science Building

Facilitator: Duncan Sibley, Assoc. Dean for Faculty Development

In this session groups will develop protocols for peer evaluation of teaching in their units. We will consider a framework for evaluating the alignment of learning outcome objectives, instruction and assessment. Please bring a syllabus and an example of one or more learning outcomes for a course you teach and an example test item or other assignment that students complete to demonstrate their ability to reach the stated outcome(s). The outcomes may be broad outcomes for a course or narrower outcomes for a portion of a course.

Registration: Contact Faith Peterson (petersof@cns.msu.edu).

Grant Submission in CNS
Friday, January 29, 2010 | 2:00-3:30 PM | 105 Natural Science Building

Facilitator: Theresa Young, Director, Office of Research Services

Join us for a practical workshop on the grant submission process from start to finish. This workshop will cover how to identify funding agencies and grant programs to match your research, when to start working on your proposal and what deadlines you need to meet, how to use electronic grant submission packages, how to prepare budgets, and what is needed to get your grant approved on campus and submitted on time.

Registration: Contact Faith Peterson (petersof@cns.msu.edu).

Learning Changes the Brain
Friday, February 5, 2010 | 1:00-3:00 PM | 1425 Biomedical Physical Sciences Building

Facilitator: James Zull, author of The Art of Changing the Brain
This claim is the foundation for the idea that “teaching is the art of changing the brain.” In order to explain this concept, we will discuss what, specifically, changes in the brain when we learn. There are two answers to that question, and understanding those answers provides opportunities for educators to design experiences and assignments that are likely to produce such change. Those answers tend to support both traditional theories of education, and the more recent approaches of active learning. A second outcome, then, will be development of such experiences and assignments by participants for their specific discipline.

This session is co-sponsored by Center for Research on College Science Teaching and Learning, College of Natural Science, and F&OD. There is also a workshop offered by Dr. Zull as part of the Lilly Seminar Series through F&OD from 7:45–11:00 a.m. on the same day. See http://fod.msu.edu/cregistration.asp

Registration: Contact Faith Peterson (petersof@cns.msu.edu).

Research Misconduct: Thoughts from the Inside  
Wednesday, February 17, 2010 | 8:15-9:00 AM | 105 Natural Science Building

Facilitator: Jim Pivarnik, Research Integrity Officer

This workshop will provide an overview of research integrity best practices. Understandably, many faculty, students and administrators are not even aware of our definition of research misconduct, let alone our procedure for dealing with allegations. Jim will talk about the research integrity issues that come to his office and ways that faculty can avoid these problems.

Registration: Contact Faith Peterson (petersof@cns.msu.edu).

Evaluating Student Learning Online  
Thursday, March 25, 2010 | 3:00-5:00 PM | 105 Natural Science Building

Facilitator: Gerd Kortemeyer, Director of LON CAPA and Assistant Professor Lyman Briggs

In this workshop a progression of usage scenarios for online evaluation will be presented, starting with pre-assessment of student lecture preparation and Just-in-Time-Teaching (JiTT), continuing with formative in-class assessment and online homework, and finishing with summative technology-mediated examinations. For each step, Gerd will discuss logistics, advantages, limitations, and feedback to learners and educators.

Registration: Contact Faith Peterson (petersof@cns.msu.edu).

Teaching with Teams  
Wednesday, April 14, 2010 | 8:00-10:00 AM | 105 Natural Science Building

Facilitator: Doug Luckie, Associate Professor Lyman Briggs
Classroom laboratories typically involve students working in groups where the student-student interaction may be cooperative or not. This hands-on session focuses on promoting cooperative interaction among students during a classroom laboratory. We will provide a general framework of cooperative learning (CL) in the lab, model the idea by having groups work through or design a lab exercise, provide theoretical and empirical support for CL in labs, and help participants translate the ideas to their settings.

Registration: Contact Faith Peterson (petersof@cns.msu.edu).
APPENDIX C: Faculty Mentoring in the College of Natural Science (Draft Policy)

DATE: December 1, 2009

Faculty Mentoring in the College of Natural Science

The College of Natural Science is committed to the professional development and advancement of all faculty members. Support for this is provided by the CNS program of faculty development, which offers programs in such areas as career development; reappointment, promotion and tenure; teaching skills and methods; graduate student, post-doc and junior faculty mentoring; and grant writing. Effective mentoring at the department level is particularly important to the success of new tenure track and fixed term faculty members. Units in CNS should have a formal mentoring program in which all new faculty members are mentored by one or more senior faculty members in addition to the chairperson. Areas of mentoring should at a minimum include building and sustaining a leading research program, effective teaching and engagement of undergraduate and graduate students, and building institutional and disciplinary leadership skills and contributions. The structure of the mentoring program may vary among units depending on the needs of the faculty members, but should include the following elements.

1) Support and leadership from the chair in integrating mentoring activities into the way the department does business.
2) A written document that clearly identifies and communicates program policies, goals and expectations for both the mentor(s) and junior faculty. These may include the following: the mentor selection process, participation of external (outside of department) mentors, the role of the mentor(s) in RP&T, the duration of mentoring responsibilities, the process for changing mentors, expectations for confidentiality, expected mentoring activities (e.g., regular meetings, observing classroom lectures, reading/reviewing grant proposals), and other policies and expectations as determined by the unit.
3) Identification of sources of information on good mentoring practices, including web based materials and workshops.
4) A written evaluation plan to assess the program such as an annual report from the mentor(s) or mentee to the chair discussing the success or limitations of the mentoring process.
5) Recognition for mentoring as a service to the department and college.

The College of Natural Science will provide leadership and support for departmental programs through the faculty development program. This support includes sponsoring college level workshops, orientation programs, and other training opportunities.
APPENDIX D: Guidelines for Implementation of Teaching Evaluation in CNS

Preamble: The CNS Promotion and Tenure Committee drafted guidelines in spring 2009 stipulating that the teaching skills of a candidate under consideration for promotion, tenure, or reappointment are to be evaluated using a set of instruments that include student evaluations, peer evaluations, and the candidate’s teaching portfolio.¹ In the fall of 2009, a separate ad hoc committee was charged with developing guidelines that describe how these instruments are to be implemented and interpreted, and more broadly, with recommending how the college can develop the teaching skills and instructional effectiveness of its entire faculty. This document summarizes the guidelines and recommendations developed by the ad hoc committee.

Our committee recognizes that many faculty members in CNS already provide high quality instruction. The guidelines and recommendations set forth here are not intended as a comprehensive critique of how teaching is currently being done. Rather, their overarching purpose is to identify teachers who are excellent, so that they may be recognized and rewarded, and to provide support and mentoring to faculty in need of improvement. More specifically, the guidelines and recommendations are intended to achieve the following:

- To clarify for faculty how the quality of their teaching will be evaluated by the college and by its departments and programs.

- To identify faculty in need of additional mentoring early in their MSU careers and ensure that departments provide the support those faculty need to become quality teachers.

- To provide incentives that reward faculty whose teaching is consistently excellent, that encourage all faculty to be attentive to teaching quality, and that motivate expert teachers to be mentors to others.

- To recognize and reward departments that foster a culture of teaching excellence.

- To identify especially successful teaching practices so that they may be shared across the college.

- To accomplish all of the above without placing an undue burden on faculty and staff to document teaching accomplishments or to review faculty dossiers.

¹ Note that the definition of a teaching portfolio in the CNS guidelines for promotion and tenure differs from the definition of a teaching portfolio in this document. Here we use the term teaching portfolio to refer strictly to the materials submitted by the candidate as evidence of quality teaching, whereas the term teaching portfolio in the promotion and tenure guidelines encompasses the student and peer evaluations as well.
The responsibility for implementing teaching evaluation that accomplishes these goals rests primarily with the departments of CNS. We recognize that these departments are a heterogeneous group, with teaching loads, course types, and student populations that differ greatly from department to department. We are therefore recommending a broad framework of guidelines that allows departments to tailor the details of implementation to their own needs and constraints.

In general, we expect that departments will provide all newly hired faculty with mentoring in teaching and that they will perform peer reviews sufficient to determine whether their courses are being competently taught. Departments are also expected to provide substantive summaries of teaching accomplishments when their faculty are considered for promotion, tenure, and reappointment. The next section describes the documentation upon which departments should base their assessments of faculty teaching. The section following it describes the format of the summaries to be submitted to the college. The concluding section suggests some support programs and incentives that CNS could provide to promote quality teaching throughout the college.

**Documentation of Teaching Accomplishments:** Written materials documenting a faculty member’s teaching career should provide multidimensional information on teaching analogous to the documentation of research accomplishments. We recommend that the documentation in support of promotion, tenure, and reappointment decisions consist of the following items.

- **Student Evaluations.** SIRS scores, or the equivalent, should be provided for all courses taught at MSU. Student opinion is one among many important instruments for assessing teaching performance, and uniformly low ratings can indicate a real need for improvement. However, the reasons for low scores can vary significantly and should be examined as part of the department’s peer evaluation. If student evaluation scores are no longer available for some courses, a list of those courses should be provided so that the record of courses taught is complete.

- **Peer Evaluations.** The guidelines document drafted by the CNS Promotion and Tenure Committee stipulates that the overall evaluation of a candidate for promotion, tenure, or reappointment will be based in part on peer evaluation of a candidate’s teaching performed by the home department. The college expects that peer evaluation will include both classroom visits by faculty members from the department and reviews of syllabi and assessment tools used in courses. Faculty members who perform peer evaluations should be well informed about best practices. Peer evaluations of teaching should be annual during at least the first two years of a faculty member’s service as an MSU instructor, and they should continue to be annual as long as the department has concerns about the instructor’s teaching. A peer evaluation should also be performed in the year before the instructor applies for promotion.

---

Peer evaluations of all senior faculty should be performed periodically, in order to recognize excellence and to ensure that departments remain broadly aware of their own teaching practices. The time period between peer evaluations will depend on departmental resources but we recommend that the period should not exceed five years.

The purpose of these peer evaluations is fourfold: (1) to place student evaluations in perspective, either corroborating them or providing an alternative viewpoint on the quality of teaching in the course, (2) to verify that the course goals outlined in the syllabus are clearly stated and appropriate and that the assessment tools are well aligned with those goals, (3) to review course content and exams to determine if these materials are appropriate for the course, and (4) to encourage an exchange of ideas among colleagues that enhances the quality of teaching throughout the department. Departments should develop their own processes for peer evaluations, taking advantage of best practices outlined by the National Academies (see footnote on the previous page) and remaining careful to avoid the pitfalls described therein. These processes should be well documented and well known by the faculty and the college. Departments should resist the temptation to demand that faculty adhere to a particular style of teaching, and be attentive to keeping the peer evaluation process from becoming politicized.

- **Teaching Portfolio.** All faculty members in CNS will be expected to maintain a teaching portfolio consisting of three sets of materials provided by the faculty members themselves.

  - **Syllabi & Representative Assessments.** This set of materials is provided to help peer evaluators determine whether course objectives are clearly stated in the syllabus, appropriate for the course, and adequately assessed by examinations or some other tool. A syllabus and a single representative assessment tool, such as a quiz, exam, or homework assignment, should be provided for up to three distinct, recently taught courses. Faculty members who have not yet taught three distinct courses should provide a syllabus and an assessment tool for each course taught. In most cases, the syllabus and final exam for a given course will be all that is necessary. If a final exam was not given or would not be representative, a more representative assessment tool may be provided. This element of the teaching portfolio should take very little time to prepare, as it consists entirely of course materials already developed.

  - **Examples of Excellence.** When faculty members are considered for promotion, tenure, or reappointment, they provide a research dossier consisting of materials selected to highlight their most impressive research accomplishments. The types of materials provided can differ greatly, depending on the faculty member’s research field and particular interests. However, they are generally selected to demonstrate what the faculty member him- or herself believes to be excellence in research.

- This set of materials in the teaching portfolio is analogous. Faculty members have many different points of view on what constitutes teaching excellence, and they should be encouraged to submit materials that exemplify what they believe to be their finest teaching
accomplishments. Any specific examples of successful teaching are welcome. We are simply asking faculty to summarize the high points of their teaching career.

The following list is intended to clarify the kinds of items that faculty might file in this category of the portfolio:

- A statement of teaching philosophy describing the preferred style of teaching and substantiated with evidence showing that it is effective.

- Examples of innovative teaching approaches or of teaching methods that effectively promote student engagement.

- Descriptions of new courses developed or of substantial modifications to existing courses.

- Examples of course materials or texts developed by the faculty member.

- Demonstrations of student learning (some examples include summaries of performance on pretest and posttest questions, descriptions of class projects submitted by students, or summaries of successful student research).

The list is not meant to be complete, nor should faculty be judged on the variety of items they submit—it is not a checklist. What matters most is quality of teaching exemplified in the submitted material.

Up to three representative examples of quality teaching may be submitted in this portion of the portfolio, but fewer should be expected of faculty still new to teaching. Each example should be described in a single-page summary.

If a particularly noteworthy accomplishment cannot be adequately described in a single-page summary, supporting documentation may be provided in an appendix. However, departments should consider implementing their own guidelines and/or page limits on these appendices, in order to manage the burden of reviewing them. For example, faculty members in some departments are asked to provide a sampling of their best peer-reviewed research papers when they are being considered for promotion, tenure, or reappointment. These are generally considered optional reading for evaluators seeking a

3 This request for evidence should not be interpreted as a mandate for faculty to perform research into learning outcomes in their own classes. Evidence that a particular approach to teaching is effective can come from many different sources, including personal experiences, the experiences of colleagues, and the literature on teaching effectiveness. We are simply asking faculty who provide statements of teaching philosophy to explain why they believe that their preferred style of teaching is effective.
deeper understanding of that research. An appendix submitted in support of teaching excellence should be viewed similarly.

**Contributions to the Teaching Culture.** Many faculty members contribute in various ways to create a positive teaching culture in their department, college, university, and discipline. Faculty should provide a list of the activities they have engaged in here. *We are simply asking faculty to briefly summarize the ways in which they have worked with other teachers to improve the quality of teaching at MSU, either by providing or receiving guidance or mentoring.* Examples of items that could appear in such a list are: efforts to develop graduate student teaching, mentoring a younger faculty member in teaching, working with a mentor to improve one’s own teaching, collaborative teaching efforts, and participation in or direction of workshops to improve teaching skills. Reviewers should recognize that many of the items in this area apply more to senior faculty than to junior faculty, who may not yet have had opportunities to act as mentors and trainers of others.

The preparation of teaching portfolios is not intended to be burdensome and is most effectively managed by updating the portfolio each semester. Portfolios of junior faculty will naturally grow as their teaching experience accumulates. Furthermore, during the next few years, reviewers should recognize that faculty coming up for promotion, tenure, and reappointment did not have these guidelines to follow until recently and should make allowances for that fact while evaluating their teaching portfolios.

Senior faculty should not be expected to produce complete teaching portfolios within an unrealistically short time period after these guidelines are implemented. The time frame over which senior faculty should develop teaching portfolios will depend on how a department chooses to do its peer evaluations of teaching. However, the teaching portfolio should be complete before the faculty member comes up for peer evaluation.

**Summarizing Teaching Accomplishments:** The guidelines for promotion, tenure, and reappointment in CNS specify that departments provide a written summary of the teaching evaluations of that faculty member. That summary should devote at least one paragraph to each of the following aspects of teaching quality, based on the department’s review of student evaluations, peer evaluations, and the teaching portfolio.

- **Clear and Appropriate Objectives.** This part of the summary is based on peer evaluation of the syllabi and sample assessments provided in the teaching portfolio. Evaluators should address whether the course objectives and requirements are clearly stated in the syllabi and whether the objectives for each course are appropriate. It is also desirable for evaluators to address whether the assessments are aligned with the stated course objectives and adequately measure student learning, but this type of evaluation may be more difficult for upper division courses with specialized content.

- **Competence in the Classroom.** This section summarizes the student evaluations and the classroom observations of the peer evaluators, who should seek to understand the reasons for either unusually high or unusually low student evaluations. Samples of written student comments can be particularly helpful in illuminating the reasons for the numerical scores. Positive student evaluations are desirable but should not weigh so heavily that fear of lower
scores discourages faculty members from making changes that could improve their teaching effectiveness. If a candidate’s student evaluation scores are persistently low, this part of the summary should explain the reasons for the low scores, as determined by the peer evaluators, and the steps the department and candidate have taken to improve those scores. As departments bear a significant mentoring responsibility, this portion of a candidate’s summary will be one of the means used to assess a department’s commitment to quality teaching.

• **Evidence of Excellence.** This section summarizes the elements of the teaching portfolio that the candidate has provided as evidence of teaching excellence. The documentation the candidate has provided should be available to the CNS Promotion and Tenure committee upon request. Evaluator should recognize that evidence of excellence can come in many different forms, which may include:

  - Evidence showing that students have made learning gains in the candidate’s courses or have been effectively prepared for more advanced academic work.
  - Documentation of exceptional commitment to student learning.
  - Descriptions of innovative teaching by the candidate, which may consist of pioneering teaching methods, applications of new teaching technologies, development of new courses, or substantive revisions to existing courses.
  - Examples of pedagogical materials developed by the candidate, such as textbooks, web sites, or lecture notes, that have been adopted in other professors’ courses.
  - Teaching awards, as long as they come with a statement of the reason for the award.
  - Successful mentoring of research students.

• **Contributions to Teaching Culture.** The last part of the summary describes how a faculty member has contributed to the broader culture of teaching, drawing on material provided in the teaching portfolio.

**Support and Incentives for Teaching Excellence:** In order for these guidelines to be successful, the college must be willing to provide support to faculty members wishing to improve the quality of teaching in CNS and incentives sufficient to motivate our busy faculty to devote some time and attention to quality teaching.

• **Support Programs for Faculty.** Workshops on teaching and learning are offered by MSU’s Office of Faculty and Organizational Development, the dean’s office of CNS, and many professional societies (e.g. American Geophysical Union, American Chemical Society, and Ecological Society of America). Among the programs important to implementation of these guidelines are the following:
- Training in writing an effective syllabus.
- Development of a CNS clearinghouse for sharing and disseminating successful teaching methods.
- Training in evaluating student learning gains.
- Training programs in peer evaluation practices.
- Funding for attending teaching workshops outside of MSU

- **Incentives for Faculty.** Evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching for raises, promotion, tenure, and reappointment should be weighed by chairs and committees in direct proportion to the faculty member’s assigned duties. Among the actions that the college and its departments and programs can take to motivate professors and demonstrate the college’s commitment to teaching quality are the following:

  - Efforts to explicitly acknowledge when excellence in teaching is a factor in raising a professor’s salary.
  - College-sponsored teaching awards for both junior and senior faculty that provide a recurring salary increase.
  - Rewards to departments whose summaries of teaching accomplishments demonstrate that they foster a culture of quality teaching.
The principal roles of the tenured and tenure track members of the faculty of the College of Natural Science are research, classroom instruction, other forms of engagement of graduate and undergraduate students, and leadership/service. The distribution of an individual’s effort among those roles can be different for different types of appointments and can vary over a career and among disciplines. These policies describe the normal expectations within the College. Departments and programs should have comparable and compatible written policies. The overriding principle is that in all cases the assignments of a faculty member should result in a full-time effort. Criteria for reappointment, promotion and tenure are described in the Guidelines for Faculty Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure in the College of Natural Science at Michigan State University, which is available on the College website.

Tenured and tenure track faculty are expected to successfully undertake the full set of research, instruction and leadership/service roles with the distribution of effort dependent principally on research productivity, graduate student supervision and administrative assignments. For faculty with well-funded research programs and large graduate programs, the expected teaching load is dependent on disciplinary norms, the amount of funding and the size of the research program. The expectations in each unit should be discussed and approved at the College level. For faculty without an externally funded research program but who publish at a moderate level and who undertake a normal level of committee work and other service to the university, the expected teaching assignment is two courses per semester. In cases where there is little or no scholarship and the normal level of institutional service is not present, the teaching assignment may be as many as three courses per semester. Exceptionally large courses requiring complex management can be the equivalent of one and a half or two courses depending on the amount of work. Advising or administrative roles may substitute for a course assignment, but the full set of assignments should result in a full time effort.

In a few fields, individual external research funding may not be the expected norm. In these cases the department should develop alternative criteria for evaluating the magnitude of the effort and contributions to research and supervision of graduate students. In extraordinary circumstances, a faculty member in an area with the potential for external funding may have an outstanding program in research and Ph.D. education that warrants reduced teaching responsibilities. These cases should be discussed individually at the College level.

Faculty who lose external funding should be given an appropriate time period to reestablish funding before being assigned increased teaching responsibilities. This requires the faculty member to aggressively pursue external funding during that period, which is typically two or three years in length.

Developing a prominent and well funded research program is a critical task for untenured faculty members during the probationary period, and the university has high interest in their success. It is important that they also develop a strong teaching record during this time. Thus, normal teaching assignments during the probationary period should be equivalent to that of a research active faculty member. Some units also provide course releases during the first year to allow establishment of a research program.
It is important that all faculty members fully understand their workload and performance expectations. These should be described in the initial letter of offer and should be updated as they change.

Annual evaluations should reflect these expectations, and Departments should develop raise policies that reflect different contributions. Proposals to the College for merit salary increases may be based on outstanding performance in any area of activity.

Additional comments:

We need to develop College level awards that reflect both teaching and research and that result in permanent salary increases. Possibilities include a special $5,000 increase for the best teacher or best teacher/researcher in the group receiving tenure each year and an annual outstanding teacher award open to anyone with a $10,000 increase. These increases would need to come out of the college withhold or merit pool.
APPENDIX F: Leadership Questionnaire (Formatting Modified for Report)

Questionnaire on Disciplinary Society Involvement for Female Faculty in the Sciences, Mathematics, Engineering and Technology

As part of the NSF funded MSU-ADAPP initiative to enhance the diversity and quality of MSU faculty and their work environment, the ADAPP LEADERSHIP team is seeking your assistance. This information will be used to identify areas that need improving and to guide programs and faculty development at the University. Your input would be greatly appreciated.

Your participation in this confidential survey is strictly voluntary. You may refuse to participate, or discontinue participation, at any time without penalty. Refusal to participate will not affect your employment in any way. The survey will only take about 10 minutes of your time to complete. All information and responses will be kept strictly confidential and will only be seen by members of the research team. Data gathered from the survey will be summarized and presented in aggregate form so that no single individual can be identified. If you opt to e-mail us the completed survey, all identifying information will be removed prior to analysis. Your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law. Participation in this survey does not involve any known physical, financial, emotional or legal risk to you. You will not receive financial compensation for participation but your responses will contribute to improved faculty diversity, quality and work environments.

You are welcome to contact our office at any time if you have questions about the survey (ADAPP phone 353-8818) or Tamara Bush reidtama@msu.edu, 353-9544 ADAPP Leadership Team and Co-PI. You may also contact the MSU IRB Office (Phone: 517-355-2180; irb@msu.edu) with your questions about research participants’ rights. By proceeding with the survey, you are voluntarily consenting to participate and allowing your responses to be used for research purposes.

Please e-mail or mail your completed response to:
Greg Larnell
524 South Kedzie Hall
MSU
e-mail: adapp@msu.edu
We would appreciate your response by Friday, September 4th, 2009
Are you tenured?  ________ yes

________ no

Please place an "X" next to all activities in which you were involved with your disciplinary societies. We would like you to identify your involvement pre-tenure and post tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRE-TENURE</th>
<th>POST-TENURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>______ oral/podium presenter</td>
<td>______ oral/podium presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ poster presenter</td>
<td>______ poster presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ invited paper</td>
<td>______ invited paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ panel member</td>
<td>______ panel member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ abstract reviewer</td>
<td>______ abstract reviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ committee member</td>
<td>______ committee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ conference organizer</td>
<td>______ conference organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ session organizer</td>
<td>______ session organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ conference chair</td>
<td>______ conference chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ committee chair</td>
<td>______ committee chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ manuscript reviewer for journals</td>
<td>______ manuscript reviewer for journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ editorial position with a journal</td>
<td>______ editorial position with a journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ grant proposal reviewer for funding agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

________ Officer positions (elected positions, e.g., president, vice president, secretary, etc.). Please list positions:

____________________________________________________________________________________
Appointed position(s). please list positions

_________________________________________________________________________

Elected or appointed special programs/leadership opportunities

_________________________________________________________________________

Other, please list and describe

_________________________________________________________________________

Please provide comments regarding involvement with your society. Was your involvement helpful/ not helpful and how so? If you have any thoughts about how your involvement affected or will affect tenure decision, please include those as well.
We are also interested in developing programs for women faculty science, mathematics, engineering and technology. Would you value participating in a 2 hours seminar/workshop in any of the following? Check all that interest you, and if you have additional topics or would be willing to be a speaker/panel member on one of the topics, please provide that information.

_______ How to assume a leadership role
_______ Pros/cons and “how tos” of disciplinary involvement
_______ Successful lab management
_______ Grant writing
_______ Networking in your department and field
_______ How to mentor (provide support and promote independence at the same time)
_______ How to self-promote
_______ How to say “no” and still succeed
_______ Work/life balance (how to be happy at both)
_______ Others, please list

Please provide comments regarding the value of such leadership development programs and provide suggestions regarding organizational structure.
APPENDIX G: Summary report of Women’s Leadership Questionnaire

Leadership
December 2009

As part of the NSF supported project Advancing Diversity through Alignment of Policies and Procedures (ADAPP) (http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu), a leadership questionnaire (located at the end of the document) was disseminated to all tenure stream women in the Colleges of Engineering, Natural Science and Social Science in August of 2009. The purpose of the questionnaire was threefold: 1) to collect data on the levels of disciplinary involvement of female faculty who are tenured and compare those to early career faculty 2) identify women who are leaders in their disciplinary society (elected, appointed roles) 3) identify the programming or workshop needs of female faculty in the three colleges.

The number of women surveyed was two hundred and forty-seven (n=247) and the number of respondents was fifty-nine (n=59): 24% response rate. (Responses were approximately even between Social Science (~50%) and the combined group of Natural Science and Engineering (~50%))

The following is a summary of responses from this questionnaire.

Women were asked two open-ended questions:

1. Please provide comments regarding involvement with your society. Was your involvement helpful/ not helpful and how so? If you have any thoughts about how your involvement affected or will affect tenure decision, please include those as well.

2. Please provide comments regarding the value of leadership development programs and provide suggestions regarding organizational structure.

With regard to the first question, “provide comments regarding your disciplinary society”, the following two themes were noted in the responses. Below each theme are a few excerpts from comments provided by our respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women in Natural Science and Engineering associated their disciplinary involvement with the successful achievement of tenure, while women in the Social Sciences associated their involvement with visibility, collaborations and networking but not necessarily with the tenure decision.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| o Participating in community leadership (panels, committees, organization) is important in visibility, and in meeting potential collaborators or team members. It is clear that tenure decisions use participation in these activities as evidence for standing in the scientific community.  
| o My involvement in reviewing and serving on conference program committees helped me become known to many leaders in my field, which certainly helped for my promotions.  
| o It affected my P&T decisions by establishing my reputation for scholarly excellence nationally. |
All my involvements were very beneficial to me as far as networking, gaining mentors and lay of the land from senior level faculty around the country. They were of more help to me than my own department and I relied heavily on them for support and advice.

Involvement was helpful in terms of meeting people, forming friendships and collaborations, learning about how other institutions work and making a difference in my field.

I also have to say from where I sit, involvement in a society doesn’t really promote getting a grant as much as writing good papers and working with people on review panels.

There is an optimal level of involvement with regard to time vs. reward. The value of a person’s involvement in their disciplinary society will vary by department.

There may also be a perception that one could be involved in “too much” committee work; surely mentors can advise potential tenure candidates when they are approaching that line.

My involvement with XXXX was the only valued activity by my department. Other societies I am a member of and for which I have facilitated at national conferences were not regarded as worthy enough by my department chair.

My service role in XXX society gave me much more visibility and contacts within my professional community. However, I paid the price for it within my department. Even though I had an agreement with my chair.

The second question asked women to, “provide comments on the value of leadership development programs and provide suggestions regarding organizational structure”, the following three themes were noted in the responses.

Chairs and departments need to support their female faculty

The real solution for women is a supportive Dept—with a nurturing, supportive attitude that provides leadership opportunities AND helps promote them at national level. The later is all too lacking still.

I don’t see the value in these programs as long as women continue to be hired in special ways. Until Chairs make it clear when they hire a woman that she was the best candidate, period, it will be difficult for her to succeed. Chairs just do not support and promote their women as they do their men.

This would be pointless, as women are not accepted as leaders in my department. You need to train the men to be less discriminatory.

Women do not feel they have time for workshops; however they have the need for the information

Unless you can offer a workshop on how to stop time or squeeze blood from a rock, those
precious two hours will not change the structural problems I face in my work.

- These things are always a crap shoot—some turn out to be helpful, others a waste of time.

- I certainly could have benefited as an assistant professor from such programs, if they had existed.

- Women need safe places to learn how to protect their own interests and yet be a team player in their discipline. At a younger time of my career the topics you pose would have been of great interest.

- I have experienced some pretty blatant sexism during my career. I would have found it very helpful if someone had taught me how to respond in a way that would still have allowed me to function within my dept.

Workshops must take into account the variability across departments, what is valued by one college/department may not be as highly valued in others

- The one caveat is that not all departments share the same opinions on activities that are beneficial to faculty, and care must be taken that the advice given in these types of workshops does not end up hurting the faculty member.

- Since one’s professional life often encompass multiple institutions and the form/value of discipline society involvement varies by institution, recognizing and planning for differences might make sense as part of early career development.

**Interest in specific workshop topics**

Women were also provided a listing of topics and asked to identify topics of interest. Table 1 provides the preferences for women. The responses are separated by those that are not yet tenured and tenured faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o How to assume a leadership role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o How to self-promote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o How to say “no” and still succeed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first topic was of interest to non-tenured individuals while the last two topics were also of interest to both tenured and non-tenured women.
Table 1. Seminar/Workshop preferences, reported by percentage and tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop/Seminar Topic</th>
<th>Non-Tenured respondents (%)</th>
<th>Tenured faculty respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to assume a leadership role</td>
<td>42.12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pros/Cons and “how tos” of disciplinary involvement</td>
<td>36.84%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful lab management</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Writing</td>
<td>36.84%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to mentor (provide support and promote independence at the same time)</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to self-promote</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to say “no” and still succeed</td>
<td>42.12%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/life balance (how to be happy at both)</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Activity within a Disciplinary Group

Table 2 compares the involvement levels between the tenured and early career faculty. When combining the open-ended responses with the table data, it is clear that:

There is no prescribed method for disciplinary involvement and success. However, it is clear that multiple benefits exist from involvement in a disciplinary society. Thus, this topic should be addressed through mentoring, and annual reviews with early career faculty.
Table 2. Activity involvement with disciplinary societies, reported by percentage within respondent category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Society Membership Activity</th>
<th>Percentage of involvement among non-tenured respondents ((n=19))</th>
<th>Percentage of involvement among tenured respondents—PRE –TENURE ((n=40))</th>
<th>Percentage of involvement among tenured respondents – POST-TENURE ((n=40))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral/Podium Presentation</td>
<td>94.74%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster Presentation</td>
<td>73.68%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Paper</td>
<td>52.63%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel Member</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract Reviewer</td>
<td>42.12%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Organizer</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session Organizer</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Chair</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Reviewer for Journals</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Position with a Journal</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Reviewer for funding agency</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ongoing activities through the Leadership Team

In addition to the questionnaire on leadership activities, the leadership team began conducting a series of focus groups with women leaders. The purpose of the focus group is to explore topics such as understanding how women become interested in leadership activities, the rewards from these activities, and the associated challenges. We hope to better understand why women elect to move (and not to move) into leadership roles. By gaining in-depth knowledge in these areas our plan is to develop recommendations for future women leaders.

We have conducted focus groups with the first two groups listed below, and are in the planning stages for the focus groups of the last two.
- Women Deans across campus
- Women Chairs and Directors of the three colleges supported by the ADAPP
- grant (Engineering, Natural Science, Social Science)
- Associate and Assistant Deans in the tenure stream across campus
- Women who are leaders in their disciplinary societies as represented by the
- three colleges supported by ADAPP

The questions asked of the Deans focus group and the Chair/Director group were the following:
1. What were the factors that led to your decision to take on this leadership position?
   a. Have you held a leadership position before this one, such as in a disciplinary society or other administrative position? Was your decision to take on that position the same as this one, or different?

2. Why do you believe more women do not seek these titled positions?
   a. Probe for lack of institutional support – and what that means to them.

3. What are the challenges of being in a leadership role? Are any of these issues because you are a woman?

4. What are the advantages of being in a leadership role?

Finally, in collaboration with the MSU Chapter for the Association for Women in Science (AWIS) and their Faculty Advisor, Cindy Jordan, we identified Mary Ann Mason as a potential guest speaker. This identification and invitation to speak at MSU evolved through discussions with the leadership team. The series of presentations are scheduled for March 25, 2010.
Background

The Michigan State University Institutional Transformation project, Advancing Diversity through Alignment of Policies and Practices (ADAPP) has four major goals:

1. *Increase the number of women faculty recruited and appointed* into the Colleges of Natural Science, Social Science, and Engineering;

2. *Increase retention* of women faculty in Natural Science, Social Science and Engineering;

3. *Increase advancement* of women faculty in Natural Science, Social Science and Engineering; and

4. *Improve the work environment* (climate) for women faculty in Natural Science, Social Science and Engineering.

These project goals are to be accomplished through implementation of specific initiatives and interventions that are components of a strategic human resource management (SHRM) methodology. MSU ADAPP/ADVANCE is focused on addressing processes used for faculty recruitment, advancement, and mentoring; the project is directed at developing approaches that increase the quality, inclusiveness, transparency, objectivity, consistency and alignment of these activities. The interventions involve integrating goals, policies and practices so that critical behaviors, attitudes, and outcomes that promote diversity are consistently reinforced and rewarded. Specific interventions being instituted include: development of a faculty e-employment portfolio; creation of faculty excellence advisors (FEAs); and delivery of workshops on mentoring, leadership, and other best practices. Three colleges (Engineering, Natural Science, and Social Science) are included in the initial grant application and activities.

Formative Evaluation-Related Considerations

The formative evaluation was designed to assess the implementation and progress of these ADAPP project initiatives and interventions in the Colleges of Engineering, Natural Science, and Social Science. The initial evaluation design included the following elements:

1. **2008-2009 (Implementation)**

   - Create a clear logic model for the project
   - Design, conduct, and analyze baseline inventories of current search, P&T, annual review, mentoring, and leadership development processes; review and analyze baseline data for transparency, consistency, inclusivity, and objectivity/specificity of current policies and practices.
   - Conduct crosswalk analyses between these inventories and with the faculty climate survey findings
   - Use findings/feedback from baseline inventories to:
• Inform the content and focus of workshop/training design
• Identify possible areas for policy analyses and/or development (e.g. spousal hires, joint appointments)
• As comparative data for follow-up to be conducted during 2010-2011/2011-2012

2. 2009-2010/2010-2011 (Implementation/Progress)
• Workshops/Training. Follow-up survey and/or interviews with department chairs, search chairs, and faculty on their application and use of content from training workshops. Use this feedback to determine need for other training sessions and/or follow-up.
• Toolkits. Follow-up survey and/or interviews with a sample of toolkits users (search, P&T, annual review, mentoring, climate/culture, leadership) re: use, value, and impact of toolkit materials. Use this feedback to document usefulness and modify/expand toolkit content.
• E-Portfolio. Conduct assessment to determine if/how use of the e-portfolio is impacting both the annual review and P/T processes. Use feedback to improve implementation of e-portfolio process.
• FEAs. Conduct assessment to determine if/how the role of FEAs is impacting the transparency and consistency of processes/practices within NS, SS, and Engineering. Use feedback to inform the role and activities of FEAs.

3. 2010-2011/2011-2012 (Progress)
• Conduct inventories of current search, P&T, annual review, mentoring, and leadership development processes; analyze and compare with baseline inventory data for evidences of changes/improvements in the transparency, consistency, and objectivity/specificity of current policies and practices.

4. Outcomes – Impact Summary. The following information was compiled in May 2009 as part of the Year 1 Annual Report:

• Year 1 (baseline): Assessing the Existing Policies and Practices
  Activities: 1) Collecting data on existing practices in the Colleges of Engineering, Natural Sciences, and Social Science for conducting faculty search, annual review, retention/promotion/tenure, mentoring, and leadership; 2) Collecting data on faculty perceptions of the work environment.
  Short term results (Learning): 1) Document the (mis)alignment of academic HR procedures and practices currently in use across these colleges; 2) Document exemplar practices currently in use across these colleges; and 3) Identify faculty perception of transparency, consistency, and objectivity of these procedures and practices in the work environment; 4) Recommendations for realignment of procedures and practices

• Year 2: Awareness Building of Exemplar Practices; Initiating New Practices
Activities: Create and deliver content for workshops, toolkits, and training modules that are exemplar of best practice in faculty search, annual review, mentoring, leadership, and retention/promotion/tenure.

Short/Medium term results (Learning and Action): 1) Increased depth of knowledge and awareness of exemplar practices among college and department administrators; 2) Design and adopt realigned practices and procedures within departments.

• **Year 3: Building New Practices and Behaviors**
  Activities: TBD

  Medium term results (Action): Continue to operationalize realigned practices and procedures within departments and programs.

• **Years 4 and 5: Benchmarking New Practices and Behaviors**
  Activities: TBD

  Medium term/ultimate results (Action and Conditions): 1) Continued operationalizing of realigned practices and procedures by departments; 2) Assess the impact of changes in policies, practices, and procedures on improving the recruitment, retention, and advancement of women/faculty of color in the STEM disciplines.

• **Assessment and Status of Year 1 Activities**

  • **Logic model.** A workshop was given in January 2009 to introduce the logic model process to project PIs and college-level participants. A follow-up conversation occurred with the PIs in March. However, a formal logic model was not adopted.

  • **Baseline Inventories.** Five (5) separate inventories were constructed in order to document detailed information on current college and departmental processes and practices for faculty search, retention/promotion and tenure, annual review, mentoring, and leadership development.

    o A 42 item inventory was completed on six (6) sampled faculty searches during January and February, 2009. The six sampled searches included:

      o Criminal Justice - assistant or associate professor, tenure-system, area of corrections; Geography - assistant professor, tenure-system, in the area of hydroclimatology; Civil and Environmental Engineering - faculty position in environmental hydroinformatics; Computer Science and Engineering (CSE); Physics/Astronomy/Chemistry/Engineering - Faculty positions in complex materials for energy applications, materials chemistry and chemical engineering, condensed Matter Physics; and Biochemistry and Molecular Biology - tenure track faculty position in biomass accumulation.
Four (4) additional inventories (reappointment/promotion and tenure, annual review, mentoring, and leadership) were disseminated in March and April, 2009. The sample size for these inventories was twenty-nine (29), reflecting the full number of departments in the three participating colleges.

- **Analyses of Baseline Inventories.** Inventory analyses were conducted in March, July, and August 2009. These analyses focused on identifying factors related to the quality, inclusiveness, transparency, objectivity, consistency and alignment in the processes and practices being utilized by the colleges and their departments.

  - Analysis of the faculty search responses addressed: consistency of practice by departments within colleges; and differences of practice across colleges
  - Analysis of reappointment/promotion and tenure compared across departments: use and description of criteria in the selection of external reviewing; RPT committee composition and engagement; and required information from RPT candidates across departments, by college.
  - Analysis of leadership was disaggregated into leadership among women and leadership among faculty of color. The findings addressed indicators of inclusiveness and participation in both formal administrative and disciplinary-related leadership roles.
  - Analyses of mentoring and annual review inventories were also completed during this timeframe.
  - Baseline analyses which were proposed not conducted included:
    - Aggregate practice within department (i.e., broad picture of how processes work within each department or a set of departments). This information can be used to determine unit by unit improvement action plans as well as priority units for targeted development work;
    - Possible areas for policy analyses and/or development (e.g. spousal hires, joint appointments);
    - Good extant practices vis-à-vis Mentoring, Leadership, Annual Review, and RPT that occur in departments with relatively high numbers of women faculty members as well as other departments with practices where “best practice” may be documented

- **Comparative Inventory and Survey Analyses.** Crosswalks between the baseline inventory and climate survey data were scheduled to be completed during July/August. Data from the climate survey were not available at that time. Proposed foci for these analyses had included:

  - Identified areas of alignment/misalignment between faculty experiences (work life survey) and reported administrative practices (inventory). All data/findings aggregated by college, by department.
  - Comparatives across and within colleges
    - Aggregates at the college level
    - By college, at the department level
• By faculty population (demographic focus) within and across departments and colleges
  • Aggregate practice within department (i.e., broad picture of how processes work within each department or a set of departments)
  • Comparatives between departments or groups of departments, within or across colleges.
  • Crosswalk between Work-Life Environment Survey and Inventory Data, with survey data primarily driving the analyses.
    • By practice
    • By college and/or department
    • By issues/topics that emerge from analyses of the WLE Survey
APPENDIX I: MSU RESPONSE TO FIRST YEAR NSF SITE VISIT

TO:  Kelly Mack, PhD

FROM:  ADAPP Principal Investigator & Co-Principal Investigators: Kim Wilcox, Terry Curry, Mark Roehling, Clare Luz, Tamara Reid Bush,

DATE:  February 27, 2010

REF:  Response to:

Michigan State University (HRD-0811205) - First Year Site Visit Report, August 27, 2009

On August 27, 2009 an NSF program officer conducted the First Year Site Visit at Michigan State University. The program officer in attendance was: Kelly Mack.

The site visit began at 8:00AM and ended at approximately 4PM. Specific agenda items included a series of meetings as follows:

• Grant Management Team
• Campus Administrators
• Representatives from the division of Institutional Research
• Contract and Grants Administration
• Participating Deans
• Women Faculty
• Internal Evaluation Team
• Faculty Equity Advisors

Grant Management Team Meeting

This meeting was comprised primarily of the lead Co-PI, Co-PIs and Project Director. Various aspects of the project were discussed in detail including, but not limited to: implementation of policy across the campus, connections between the project model (as set forth in the original proposal) with project activities and the fundamental needs of the women faculty at MSU. This discussion also included a focus on the role of project evaluation in delineating the overall scheme of the project as it moves forward.

Recommendation: The MSU grant management team is to be commended for the work that has been accomplished at MSU thus far. The ADVANCE Program recognizes that this project is largely focused on the development and uniform implementation of policies that govern women faculty issues. As such, it is imperative that the MSU ADVANCE management team provide oversight and leadership in determining effective means of working with the campus administration in ensuring accountability and uniform implementation of all policies across the campus. Specifically, this collaborative effort between ADVANCE and campus administration
should include a detailed plan for accountability of mid level administrators for their roles in achieving gender equity at MSU. ADVANCE, along with campus administrator should also work collectively to ensure that all campus stakeholders are aware that gender diversity is a campus priority.

Response: To develop a sense of accountability by the campus administration regarding the uniform implementation of policies, the following actions have been initiated:

- The ADAPP Coordination Team (ACT) was constituted with one member of this group assigned as the primary contact with the Dean and Faculty Excellent Advocate (FEA) for each college: Karen Klomparens – primary contact for the College of Engineering, Mark Roehling – primary contact for the College of Social Science, Estelle McGroarty – primary contact for the College of Natural Science. During fall and early spring semester the College Dean and FEA met with the ACT primary contacts. At this initial meeting data collected in the work-environment survey, broken down by unit and gender was matched to the current practices and to related university policies and best practices. Input on current activities in the Colleges was collected.

- In January, the ADAPP project distributed a memo to the FEAs of the three colleges requesting initial information about current activities in the college related to the ADAPP project. The memo included the following questions and requests:
  
  1. We ask that you list the ADAPP web site on your College web site. We ask also that you encourage chairs and directors to include the ADAPP website on their unit web sites.
  2. How has the college communicated with chairs about the resource guides for Annual Review (AR) and RPT? Since this is the time that AR and RPT activities are taking place these materials are very timely. The first version of these guides is on the web at: http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/annual-review-rpt-resource-guides
  3. Has your college developed or modified AR and RPT processes and expectations this last year in ways that are in line with the ADAPP goals? If so, please describe what has been done. Have any of the units made changes to their processes and expectations? If so, please describe.
  4. Has your college communicated with chairs to promote the resources regarding best practices in mentoring this year, and if so, please describe what has been done? Can you provide us with information about what units are developing mentoring programs based on your promotion of these activities? How can the ADAPP team assist you with these?
  5. What plans have been developed for you or your team to meet with faculty in your units to share some of the resources developed and to implement the academic human resource management policies and procedures that are being promoted by the ADAPP project in all areas, including faculty recruitment, hiring, evaluation, mentoring and leadership development?
6. Are you planning to work with new faculty directly or with chairs who will promote the resources on AR, RPT, mentoring, and leadership development to new faculty? If so, please describe.

7. Has your College developed and offered programs this last year, or plan to develop for next semester, related to faculty recruitment, hiring, mentoring, evaluation and leadership development? If so, please send us the information about these programs.

8. What are the College’s plans for continuing to communicate with your units/faculty about academic human resource management issues?

9. What other activities has the College carried out to develop and promote best practices in faculty recruitment, hiring and advancement?

10. What are some areas of difficulty/resistance you have faced (if any) in promoting policies and practices related to academic human resource management?

At this time, three of the three FEAs have formed detailed responses to these items.

- The GMT will meet monthly with the FEAs and ask for brief updates of activities in the colleges to include:

1. What groups or individuals did you or your team meet with related to ADAPP? When were the meetings, who participated, and what were the outcomes?

2. What college programs have been offered, or are being planned or developed? What is the time line for such programs? What types of evaluation of these programs will be implemented? How can the ADAPP group help you with these?

3. What College level policies and/or practices are being developed or implemented? What is the time line for this development and implementation?

4. What units in your college are implementing new programs and practices related to ADAPP? Is the college giving any oversight to these activities, and if so, how?

5. Is the College planning to use the data generated from the ADAPP inventories and work environment surveys to implement changes, and if so how?

6. What are some areas of difficulty or resistance you have faced (if any)?

Monthly meetings have been set for the rest of the 2009-2010 academic year.

Meeting with Campus Administrators

This meeting included the NSF Program Officer, MSU Provost, Kim Wilcox (ADVANCE PI) and MSU Vice President and Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources, Terry Curry (ADVANCE Co-PI).

It is noted that MSU had several policies already in practice at the time of ADVANCE application development. These include, but are not limited to an Office of Faculty and Organizational Development, a Women’s Resource Center, a Work Life Office and a Women’s Advisory Committee that reports directly to the Provost. Additionally, through the Office of the Provost, departments that are not supported by ADVANCE are supported in an effort to spread solutions
related to gender equity across the entire campus. The administrators meet weekly with the ADVANCE grant management team. The administration has recognized the need to invest in gender equity by targeting department heads. As such, orientations, workshops and trainings have already been implemented at MSU. As a means of holding chairs accountable for their roles in gender equity, efforts toward gender diversity of the faculty is used in evaluating department chairs. However, this process of accountability is not uniform across all STEM departments and it is unclear what is determined by the MSU administration as measures of success.

**Recommendation:** There is apparent and open communication between women faculty and the administration, which stems largely from the Women’s Advisory Committee to the Provost. As the project moves forward, this will serve to provide consistent and accurate information for targeting those policies that will most positively impact women faculty in the STEM disciplines at MSU. The MSU administration is encouraged to maintain such active lines of communication. Further, the administration is strongly encouraged to provide the grant management team and the campus, at large, with direction and leadership in structuring a system of accountability to ensure that the policies that are developed as a result of this project are implemented uniformly across the STEM departments and, thus, ensuring success of the project overall.

**Response:**

To remain responsive to issues of Women faculty, the Provost recently reorganized the Women’s Advisory Committee to the Provost to have better cross representation across the campus and of tenure stream faculty. This Advisory Committee now has representation from CNS and CSS, as well as the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Lyman Briggs College and the Cyclotron Laboratory.

To communicate the activities of the ADAPP project and provide information about the activities and resources, an ADAPP website has been developed. Links to this ADAPP site are available from the Women’s Resource Center, the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development and the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives. Also the web site of the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Human Resources is being revised and will provide a conduit of information about the project. As part of the Provost’s vision to have the entire University transformed, an additional 7 colleges have been brought on board and have selected Faculty Excellence Advocates, with 25% appointments funded by the Provost. These colleges include: College of Arts and Letters, College of Agriculture and Natural Resource, College of Human Medicine, College of Nursing, College of Osteopathic Medicine, College of Veterinary Medicine and the Lyman Briggs Residential Science College. Each Dean and FEA from these 7 additional colleges met with a representative of the ACT; goals of the project were outlined, resources were shared, information on best practices was requested from the colleges and data from the work environment survey from faculty in those colleges were shared. A memo is going out from the Provost at the end of February indicating his expectations of data collection, including survey of current practices, and for participating in programs related to the initiative. Each of the FEAs will serve on an already existing AHR Advisory Board, chaired by Terry Curry (co-PI)
PIs realize that communication with all stakeholders (not just the administrators) in a regular and consistent fashion across campus is a challenge. Ownership of communication needs to be shared by the Provost, co-PIs, ADAPP-ADVANCE office, deans, FEAs and department chairs. We are considering hiring a new staff member to be responsible for tracking the success of communication strategies.

Institutional Research Meeting

This meeting revealed several positive aspects related to institutional transformation. The MSU Institutional Research and Human Resources offices utilize an identical data warehouse that houses information on faculty. It was made evident that a closer and broader level of communication would ensue between this body and the ADVANCE internal evaluation team in year two of the project period.

What is most noteworthy about the issue of faculty data stems from the critical juncture of the campus in developing a campus-wide business enterprise system that will more effectively capture faculty data? Members of the ADVANCE management team have played an integral role in determining specific types of data that should be collected for faculty on an ongoing basis and contributed significantly to the development of this new data system. As such, the new data collection system will incorporate the needs of the ADVANCE project into the campus agenda and, thereby, affect the tracking and retention of women faculty in the STEM disciplines.

**Recommendation:** The MSU campus is to be commended for its initiative in capturing accurate and applicable faculty data. The NSF Program Office recommends that this effort continue at the same robust level and that the grant management team document this process fully for annual reporting and subsequent dissemination to the ADVANCE community and social science literature at large. It is also recommended that the level of input from the campus administration that fueled this initiative be replicated in other policy adjustments to the MSU campus.

**Response:** The project has recruited a core of staff to develop the Faculty Information Tool (FIT). The data elements that may be collected by a portal as a part the FIT initiative and the data elements that are in other data warehouses that will be reported with this tool will be defined by the end of February. The scope of the FIT initiative will then be defined and the remainder of the team to develop the tool will be recruited. Input will be sought from representatives from all colleges before the scope is finalized. The design of the data reporting tool is already under development and the source of data existing in other data warehouses is being defined. The processes for defining scope are being documented by the ADAPP office staff. We are also documenting the other policy activities in the colleges through meetings described above.
**Contract and Grant Administration Meeting**

Even though there are no participant costs associated with this project, the NSF Program Office reviewed policies related to the prohibition of rebudgeting related to this issue. The tracking of project expenditures is adequate. There is frequent contact between this office and the grant management team. Finally, the PIs have daily access to an online resource for reviewing account data.

**Recommendation:** None.

**Participating Deans Meeting**

There are three participating deans from the colleges of Social Science (Marietta Baba), natural science (James Kirkpatrick) and engineering (Satish Udpa). The level of commitment and involvement at the decanal level is commendable. The deans also demonstrated a superior level of understanding of the project model and means by which it could be implemented at MSU. As noted by the participating deans, the MSU ADVANCE project focuses on advancing women in discipline leadership, not academic leadership. This is significant given that there are no women chairs in two (natural science and engineering) of the colleges.

**Recommendation:** NSF Program Office concurs with the participating deans in their assessment of the need for MSU to develop sound succession plans at the department level, which could have senior women faculty as a deliberate focus. It should also be noted that while participating deans have developed innovative and effective strategies for enhancing diversity on the campus (i.e., naming women as interim chairs, designing metrics for increased departmental funding), they rely heavily on the campus administration in setting agendas and policies and determining measures of accountability for those policies. Therefore, it is recommended that the campus administration, informed by outcomes of the ADVANCE project, provide clear guidelines for policies and their uniform implementation across the campus.

**Response:** ADAPP will be working with the Provost and Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources to develop clear guidelines and accountability structures to ensure consistent implementation of ADAPP goals in ways that are contextually relevant to each college. One way this will be done is through convening a cross-college FEA group. The FEAs will participate as a coordinating group with the Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources.

**Women Faculty Meeting**

A meeting was held with the NSF Program Officer and several women STEM faculty of MSU. Of significant importance is that all women faculty noted an interest in academic administration either in the short or the long terms. Women faculty also noted a need for service commitments to be weighted more heavily in the annual evaluation of faculty performance. This was also an area identified for direct assistance from the ADVANCE management team, particularly as it relates to the tracking of service commitments for women and men faculty. Most women also noted access to a highly informal mentoring network.
**Recommendation:** The ADVANCE grant management team is encouraged to host additional regularly scheduled meetings with women faculty as a means of determining new priorities for the project and gaining feedback on ongoing initiatives related to ADVANCE. Also, the tracking of service commitments for women faculty is encouraged. Finally, it is important that the ADVANCE management team determine effective means of garnering the momentum of an informal mentoring network, which can be replicated or expanded accordingly, to suit the needs of women faculty at MSU.

**Response:**

ADAPP will host a set of regular gatherings (hosted by at least one co-PI) with women at different career levels to enhance communication of grant activities, but most importantly, to get feedback on the ADAPP initiative as we move forward. The ADAPP team (especially the leadership project team) will work to conceptualize the structure and purpose of these meetings over the next several months.

A committee of co-PIs and project support offices are taking NSF’s advice re: cultivating informal mentoring networks very seriously. The first targeted program will occur immediately following a public talk by Dr. Mary Ann Mason. A space has been reserved directly outside the lecture hall for a reception. The Leadership Team and the Support Offices want to be deliberate about communications, networking and engaging women at MSU during this reception period. The details have not yet been completed, but this time will be used to facilitate building a community of women across campus.

**Evaluation Team Meeting**

The meeting with the internal evaluation team was held. It is apparent that there is considerable communication and interaction between the evaluation and the grant management teams. The evaluation team revealed that they have some input into the direction of the project. The internal evaluation team recognizes the need to align data results with project activities and with the project model proposed in the original proposal.

**Recommendation:** In order for a more seamless mode of operation within the project, it is recommended that a reassessment of all ongoing and planned activities related to this project be completed. This should include a structural diagram of the project including, but not limited to the project model, project goals and project activities, while demonstrating levels of connectedness among various aspects of the project. It is envisaged that this would ensure that all project activities are appropriately aligned and that they serve the needs of the target audience. The MSU ADVANCE management team is also encouraged to ensure that activities and strategies are not implemented without full consideration of the evaluative impacts on the project as a whole. This warrants constant communication from the internal evaluation team and careful consideration of their input prior to initiation of new activities or continuation of ongoing activities. The MSU ADVANCE management team is also strongly encouraged to expedite its process (es) in identifying an external evaluator to support ongoing internal evaluation efforts.
Response: As a result of the conversations that occurred during Dr. Mack’s visit to Michigan State, we realized that our evaluation team, although instrumental in year one, needed to be reconfigured and expanded. As a result, we have contracted with Ohio’s Evaluation and Assessment Center for Mathematics and Science Education (OEACMSE) to lead our formative and summative evaluation efforts (thus we will not have the roles of “internal” and “external” evaluator). Ms. Jan Urban Lurain, our internal evaluator in year one, and Dr. Kelly Ward, our external evaluator in YR1, has provided the new team with full reports of summative and formative progress to date. On February 16 and 17, the OEACMSE team visited East Lansing to meet with key stakeholders on the project. We will receive a visit report from OEACMSE in mid-March 2010, and an evaluative report to include in the YR2 annual report.

Faculty Excellence Advocates

A faculty excellence advocate representing each of the three participating colleges attended this meeting. Thus far, these advocates have interacted extensively with the chairs in their respective colleges. Additionally, novel strategies have been utilized in determining the specific issues of women faculty in various STEM departments.

Recommendation: The role of the faculty excellence advocates can be explored to determine if it responds adequately to needs of women faculty in the most effective and appropriate manner, particularly, given the informal mentoring network at MSU.

Response: the role of the FEA continues to be clarified. ADAPP has instituted more formal accountability structures (see response to GMT meeting) to monitor FEA progress.

Final Meeting with Grant Management Team

A final meeting with the ADVANCE grant management team was conducted. Several key issues that the PI and Co-PIs are encouraged to consider are highlighted above in this report. Additionally, the MSU ADVANCE project is encouraged to execute due diligence in focusing on the following:

- Administration Oversight and Accountability in Policy Implementation. Policy development is presented as a critical area in the funded proposal and, thus, warrants considerable focus in the review of the success of this project. Therefore, effective and specific measures of accountability, reward and/or consequence are necessary as gender diversity policies are developed and implemented within the scope of this project.

While there appears to be some overlap in the extent to which policy implementation in industry can be adapted to the academy, there are some measures (i.e., bonuses, recognition, etc.) that haven’t been included in this project to date, and may not be feasible or easily transferable from industry to academe. It remains unclear how policy development alone, without appropriate oversight and measures of accountability, can prove to be a successful model for transforming institutional culture at MSU. The MSU
ADVANCE management team is encouraged to determine how policy development can be translated into measurable outcomes for the overall project.

Response: The Provost has brought on board 7 new colleges to follow the movements of the 3 ADAPP colleges, thus the need for accountability measures associated with policy implementation for the entire campus is a high priority of the Provost Wilcox (PI). Both Kim Wilcox and Terry Curry (co-PI and head of academic human resources) are aggressively working to determine what oversight measures are reasonable in this context.