INITIATIVE-WIDE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- The leadership group, the ADAPP Coordinating Team (ACT), met with the FEAs of the three ADAPP Colleges to discuss activities for AY 2010-2011. Each college will be developing and implementing a college plan to focus on specific issues of ADAPP project. These will be informed by data from w/e surveys, inventories of current AHR practices, and focus group discussions and surveys regarding leadership issues. The college plans for the College of Engineering, College of Natural Science and College of Social Science can be found in Attachments A, B, and C respectively.

- Provost Kim Wilcox reinforced his commitment to fund one Faculty Excellence Advocate (at 25%) in each of the 16 degree granting colleges at MSU. The FEAs of all colleges will be constituted as a FEA AHR consortium, under the leadership of Terry Curry, the Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources. The grant leadership team helped refine and finalize the agenda and materials for a meeting of the FEA AHR Consortium held on June 21, 2010. The agenda of workshop can be found in Attachment D. Two documents were shared at the workshop (and revised after feedback) -- Keys to Being an Effective Faculty Excellence Advocate (Attachment E) and Aligning Colleges’ Policies and Practices with MSU’s Goals of Quality and Inclusivity of Faculty: Recommended Intervention Points for FEAS (Attachment F).

- Enhanced focus on evaluation. Reviewed and discussed the Ohio Evaluation & Assessment Center’s Evaluation of MSU-ADAPP/2009-10 Annual Report, focusing on recommendations in that report. Reviewed how the ADAPP work environment results could be integrated into the regular College Diversity Planning meetings held with deans of colleges every summer. Planned a campus visit from the evaluation team for early September 2010. All aspects of evaluation will be reviewed at that time.

- Developed enhanced communication plan for 2010-2011. Hired a senior graduate assistant for 30 hours a week to manage communications (including a web site revision).

- Developed a process for defining ADAPP-based research projects, authorship rules and management of requests from outside the project to use ADAPP data.

- Initiated revision of the structure of the Faculty Advisory Committee and its goals

- Discussed activities and outcomes of the Faculty Work life Committee and its connection to the ADAPP project.

- Continued MSU’s contribution to a regional network of ADVANCE institutions via attendance at the Midwest Regional ADVANCE Workshop at Purdue (6/3/10-6/4/10).
Four individuals attended from MSU -- Melissa McDaniels, Estelle McGroarty, Tiffeny Jimenez (GA) and Jillian Hmurovic (GA). We disseminated ADAPP project materials (ADAPP Poster, copies of ADAPP brochures and samples of three toolkits and summary of approach). Estelle McGroarty helped lead a discussion on “Obtaining and Tracking Data”. Melissa McDaniels facilitated the discussion on “Interdisciplinary Working Groups”

- Partnered with Faculty & Organizational Development on New Faculty Orientation (8/22/10) and New Administrators Orientation (8/9/10, 8/10/10, and 8/17/10). Annual Review and RP&T Toolkits were distributed at these orientations (Attachment G and H). Activities highlighted in PPT presentations by Terry Curry.

**COLLEGE-BASED ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

**Engineering**

- Created college plan for 2010-2011 (Attachment A)

- The College of Engineering Department Chairs and faculty mentors were encouraged to attend the 6th Annual Spring Institute on College Teaching and Learning on the topic of "Mentoring Early Career Faculty in Times of Change." This workshop, held on May 20, 2010, was co-sponsored by the ADAPP ADVANCE Grant and MSU F&OD. This workshop was attended by the ME Department Chair and one of their full professor mentors. The ME department is working to improve their mentoring program with ADAPP's help. In an earlier meeting with ADAPP's Clare Luz, most of the department’s faculty mentors and the department chair participated in a discussion of various strategies for effective mentoring. Our CEE department continues to work closely with Clare Luz to create their first mentoring program. The CEE Department Chair and several of their senior faculty had previously attended the 2009 workshop on “mentoring”, along with the FEA.

- The FEA continues to work with the college development team on improvements in our web-based Faculty Activity Information System (FAIS). This approach for annual reporting of faculty activity adds consistency and transparency to the faculty annual review process. In addition, our college’s web-based system for preparation and reporting of RPT documents by faculty and administrators will be utilized for the first time in AY 2010-2011. This system is expected to bring more consistency to our tenure and promotion evaluation process.

- Several ADAPP matters were discussed in a July meeting of the College of Engineering Department Chairs Group. The focus of attention was the college-specific data from the MSU work-life climate survey. The FEA also reviewed with the group the results from ADAPP's last year inventory of Engineering Chairs and the weaknesses that were identified. The Chairs have a commitment to rectify all the identified weaknesses, some
of which have already been addressed. The Group also discussed the upcoming workshop, “Success in the Academic Hiring Process from Start to Finish: What Chairs and Search Committees Need to Know.” The FEA discussed the importance of each department’s participation, particularly those with a search in progress.

- The FEA regularly collaborates with College and Department administrators, and individual faculty, to promote opportunities for our women faculty. This includes opportunities external to MSU and also within MSU (e.g. departmental and college award nominations). Examples include the following.
  
  - The CoE women faculty in the tenure stream were made aware of, and encouraged to attend, the "Purdue Conference for Pre-Tenure Women" to be held September 23–24, 2010.
  - The FEA worked with administrators in the College to make them aware of, and assist with the nomination of two women faculty to, the Frontiers of Engineering Education (FOEE) symposium of The National Academy of Engineering (NAE).

- The FEA helps organize the College of Engineering New Faculty Orientation at the beginning of fall semester. A highlight of this year’s orientation includes a discussion of “Evaluation and Promotion” by Dean Udpa where our college’s standards for success and expectations for tenure and promotion are articulated. In addition, two experienced and well-regarded professors (Drs. Lyle and Wolff) will present “Teaching engineers: everything you always wanted to know (in 90 minutes or less) about teaching, assessment, and evaluation but were afraid to ask.”

- Even though the following activity is not directly related to ADAPP, it does serve the broader vision of the ADVANCE grant in terms of its long-term view of inclusiveness in the STEM fields.
  
  - It is well recognized that having good role models is very important to the success of a diverse body of students. Each year we publicly recognize our highest achieving graduate students by our College-wide Fitch-Beach Awards. Each graduate program in our College also presents their individual Outstanding Graduate Student awards. In AY 2009-2010, 3 out of 5 Fitch-Beach Award recipients were women and 3 out of 8 Outstanding Graduate Student Awardees were also women.

Social Science

- Created college-plan for 2010-2011 (Attachment C).

- The College of Social Science (CSS) at Michigan State University works closely with the ADVANCE grant team to recruit, retain, and advance a diverse faculty. As part of this collaboration, we presented several ADVANCE-grant toolkits during the new faculty
orientation. We particularly focused on the expectations that new faculty should have regarding the mentoring they should receive. We also discussed the annual review process that they would experience and some of the details of the promotion and tenure process in the CSS. The toolkits were very helpful in this presentation and were well-received by the new faculty.

- During this quarter we had several meetings of the Dean’s FEA “team” to plan for college activities and to determine our focus for the coming year. Because of diminished hiring in the upcoming year, we will be focusing on augmenting our mentoring activities. We have chosen two of our units to develop pilot mentoring programs as demonstrations that can be assessed and discussed with other units. We hope this discussion will open up possibilities for college-wide mentoring activities.

- We have continued to participate in the expanded FEA group, sharing our experience and leadership with the new FEAs from the colleges that have been added to the effort.

- We have appointed two women to Chair positions in the Departments of Anthropology and Psychology.

- We will be conducting a chair search this year and will have identified the chair of this search committee. We will work with this committee to ensure that the ADVANCE perspectives are well understood and that the appropriate procedures are followed.

Natural Science

- Created college-plan for 2010-2011 (Attachment B).

- The College of Natural Science will have several faculty searches in 2010-2011. To insure that department and search committee chairs are aware of ADAPP, and that searches incorporate “best practices” identified by ADAPP, the following activities were conducted by the FEA.
  
  o Contacted department chairs, program directors and search committee chairs in units that will be conducting searches to make them aware of ADAPP activities. Department/search committee chairs were informed of the September 16 “Workshop for Faculty Leaders: Success in the Academic Hiring Process From Start to Finish What Chairs and Search Committees Need to Know”. Chairs of all search committees in the college are expected to attend this workshop.

  o Met individually with Dr. Tom Sharkey, Chair of Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (BMB) and with Dr. John LaPres, Chair of Search Committee in BMB.

  o Met with entire Search Committee for position in Science and Math Education.
- Pre-tenure women in the College of Natural Science were informed of, and encouraged to attend, the "Purdue Conference for Pre-Tenure Women" to be held September 23–24, 2010.

- Initiated monthly meetings between FEA, Dean Kirkpatrick, and Associate Dean Sekhar Chivukula to coordinate and promote ADAPP related activities.

**PROJECT-BASED ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

**Faculty Search**

1. Organized phone conference with Gretal Leibnitz (Washington State) and Gertrude Fraser (U of Virginia) regarding the possibility of a cross-university initiative to develop and assess the effectiveness of on-line training for faculty search committees. A phone conference with Gretal, Gertrude, and individuals from other institutions (Dawn Hunt, Marie Keafer) was held on June 16th, and general plans to follow-up were agreed upon.

2. Conducted review of relevant literature and ADVANCE awardees’ websites to identify learning objectives for an on-line training program for faculty search committees.

3. Search Team members met with Kristine Zayko, MSU legal counsel, on June 22, 2010 to discuss the workshop titled “Success in Academic Hiring” and Kristine’s potential role in the workshop.

4. Search Team Members meet with two of the three FEAS of the three grant colleges (Sue Conrad and Bob Caldwell), and Estelle, on August 11 to answer questions and receive input regarding Faculty Search Toolkit, and the faculty search process more generally.

5. Substantially revised the workshop titled “Success in Academic Hiring” (e.g., changing content, adding more “real world examples; workshop to be conducted September 16, 2010).

6. One-on-one counseling with FEA Sue Conrad on August 12 regarding faculty search questions, ongoing faculty searches in CNS, and her role as FEA in making Faculty Search Committees aware of the resources available through ADAPP and ICCC.

7. Worked with College of Human Medicine to schedule a two-hour workshop on the critical elements of recruiting and selecting faculty, and subsequently prepared the workshop (tailoring to take into account unique aspects of faculty searches in the College of Human Medicine). The workshop is scheduled for Thursday, September 2, 2010.
Faculty Performance Review

1. Redesigned Annual Review Toolkit and created an on-line version (8/11/10)
http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/annual-performance-review-tenure-system-toolkit

2. Distributed Annual Review Toolkit distributed at New Administrators Orientation in presentation by co-PI Terry Curry. (8/11, 8/12, 8/17)

3. Distributed Annual Review Toolkit distributed at New Faculty Orientation in presentation by co-PI Terry Curry. (8/22/10)

4. Redesigned Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Toolkit, and created an on-line version (8/11/10)
http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure-toolkit

5. Distributed Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Toolkit at New Faculty Orientation in presentation by co-PI Terry Curry. (8/22/10)

6. Distributed Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Toolkit at New Administrators Orientation in presentation by co-PI Terry Curry. (8/11, 8/12, 8/17)

Leadership

1. ADAPP Symposium Speaker Series (SASS)

   - SASS activities address improving networking/mentoring for women as well as creating forums for dissemination of ADAPP information.

   - Pam Fraker, a FAC member and National Academy of Science (NAS) member suggested inviting Dr. Maxine Singer (a fellow NAS member) for SASS. We met with Dr. Fraker to discuss the potential format of her visit and details of the invitation. Dr. Fraker contacted Dr. Singer, unfortunately she declined the invitation.

   - Alice Eagly conducts research on leadership; she is a potential for the SASS series. Allyn Shaw, Deb DeZure and Eron Drake were contacted asking if any of them have heard her speak or are familiar with her research. Dean Baba was also contacted to see if she was familiar with Dr. Eagly’s work; she was not, but was supportive of an invitation.
• DARPA Director Regina Dugan was considered for the SASS series however through discussions with Leo Kempel the ADAPP leadership team found that she was invited to participate in a multi-Michigan University event, but declined.

• A list of additional potential speakers has been generated (through contacts with MSU faculty, FAC and GMT members) and a criteria matrix has been developed to help rank these potential speakers. The GMT is in the process of completing this evaluation matrix.

2. Workshops

• Several workshops have been scheduled or are in the process of being scheduled. Each workshop relates to building skills related to leadership. A full description of each workshop can be found in Attachment I.

• Project Management/ Lab Management

This workshop addresses the goal of increasing women in leadership roles (project management is a necessary leadership skill); this topic is also related to improved retention (grad student management/lab management are necessary to have a successful research program).

• Pathways to Success: Leadership in Professional Associations

Holding a leadership role in a professional association is productive and often assists career success, especially in the STEM disciplines. This finding is supported by research conducted both at MSU as part of the NSF ADAPP ADVANCE grant and national surveys. The purpose of this program is to provide examples from among our MSU colleagues who have held leadership roles in their professional associations and who feel that it has served them well.

• Currently in Development

The Leadership team is in discussion with Jane Tucker and Barb Butterfield about the development of a customized workshop with the title “How to make your disciplinary society work for you”. Drs. Tucker and Butterfield conducted a session on negotiation that received outstanding reviews. The goal is to design this workshop from the ground up, including actionable items for early career faculty such as how to cultivate letters for the tenure packet and how to begin to develop a national reputation in your field through the use of your disciplinary society.
Overcoming Impostor Syndrome

In conjunction with the CAFFE program at MSU (NSF # 093182), ADAPP will be bringing in Dr. Valerie Young for a workshop on the Imposter Syndrome. Learning objectives from her workshop include:

1. Understanding the common coping mechanisms "impostors” use to avoid being “found out,” why they work, and at what cost. Some of these coping mechanisms include procrastination, not getting articles/grant applications out the door.
2. How race, class and gender can and do contribute to feelings of fraudulence (hint: it’s not “all in your head”)
3. How to stop the perfectionism, procrastination, and chronic self-doubt standing between you and your goals

These workshops address the goal of improved retention of female faculty. Also, by providing women with the skills necessary leadership activities, it is anticipated that women will become more involved in their professional societies or on campus in leadership roles.

Workshop Evaluation Strategy

- It is necessary that the ADAPP team confirm any ADAPP co-sponsored workshop has strong links to the ADAPP project and goals. To help in this decision process, Co-PI Bush developed a checklist for preliminary planning of workshops. As part of this checklist, it is required that workshops have concrete objectives and these objectives are relatable to one or more of the ADAPP goals. Because of the increased awareness of the ADAPP project, the number of requests for ADAPP involvement in workshops has been steadily increasing.

- Discussions regarding current workshop evaluations occurred with ADAPP members Curry and Bush and F&OD members DeZure and Shaw. Topics included methods to disseminate the utility of specific workshops, longitudinal evaluation of workshops, ways to increase the participation in workshops, and ways to improve the “match” between a faculty member and a particular workshop. F&OD conducts evaluations immediately after each session and uses the data internally; they were open to collecting longitudinal data to support the effectiveness of workshops – particularly those workshops that are repeated annually. Also, all ADAPP co-sponsored events will have a separate evaluation to be used for NSF reporting.
4. Building a Community of Women Leaders

Addresses improving networking/mentoring for women which will lead to improved retention and improved college climate for women. Also creates pathways for ADAPP information dissemination.

- Last year, ADAPP hosted a luncheon for the women in the College of Engineering (COE). COE has continued hosting such luncheons as “brown bags”. Co-PI Bush is coordinating with Sue Conrad (NS) and DeBrenna Agbenyiga (SS) to establish an initial luncheon in their respective colleges. Such regular meetings will increase networking/mentoring opportunities for women in each college as well as create pathways for dissemination of ADAPP information and resources. Due to the larger number of female faculty in these two colleges different approaches may be necessary compared to the approach taken with Engineering faculty.

- Several informal meetings have occurred with female faculty and Dean Klomparens; topics of discussion include women’s leadership and perceptions/thoughts around ADAPP activities.

5. The leadership team recognizes the significant challenge to increasing the number of women in leadership positions on the MSU campus. Focus groups were held earlier in 2010 with women currently in leadership roles. Findings of the focus groups indicate the following:

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

- These findings are causing the Leadership team to step back and reflect on this goal. Another concern is that in these times of budget difficulties, both women and men are going to be hesitant if not reluctant to assume an administrative role.

Mentoring

Progress continues to be made toward achieving ADAPP goals related to mentoring. In the last quarter, the following tasks have been completed:

1. Per request, Luz met with the College of Human Medicine [CHM] Associate Dean of Faculty Development to discuss the ADAPP project, his new role as FEA, and mentoring in particular
as the CHM Mentor program is one of the few college-wide mentor programs on campus and considered an exemplar model that can be showcased and potentially replicated.

2. Continued to create and assemble resources on best mentoring practices into a resource guide and toolkit that can be individualized to specific unit needs. A draft of a complete toolkit is near completion and will be ready to be launched early in the next quarter.

3. Following last quarter’s successful university-wide workshop on mentoring which included a well received theatrical performance depicting challenging mentor scenarios, Luz has been in communication with the Transforming Theater Ensemble’s coordinator on ways in which to use this powerful teaching tool in other venues.

4. Mentoring was a topic of focus at a kick-off meeting for all appointed and potential FEAs. Luz distributed two documents for their input: drafts of a proposed university statement endorsing mentoring at the unit level and outlining general expectations, and a list of two dozen ideas compiled from other institutions to be considered as the basis for a full University Mentor Program. Since this meeting, Terry Curry, Associate Provost for Human Resources and a Co-PI has taken all comments under review, plans to share the documents with the UCFA and deans at the start of the academic year for comment, and then will move it forward to the provost for approval. This would be considered a signature program for the University, and therefore effort would be given to making it highly visible.

5. The GMT initiated discussion about securing a nationally recognized expert on mentoring to provide a university-wide symposium on the topic, potentially scheduled to coincide with the unveiling of the University Mentor Program.

6. Dr. Barbara Given, Associate Dean of Research for the College of Nursing, initiated a draft description of the college’s mentor program which is exemplary. Luz and Given plan to continue to be in communication about a formal document for this program.

Again, all of these activities align with the objectives for mentoring initially set forth by the GMT and Mentor workgroup. They have resulted in mounting anecdotal evidence of a rapidly growing awareness of the importance of mentoring and an interest in establishing or enhancing current programs as well as ensuring that best practices are followed. Interest is being demonstrated at all levels, from graduate students to upper administration.

Plans for the next quarter include:

1. Finalize the proposal for university statement on mentoring and a full university mentor program. Submit to the provost for consideration.

2. Continue to work with individual units to develop mentor programs.
• Complete initial mentor toolkit, disseminate widely and launch first iteration of online version.
• Continue to conduct review of mentor evaluation tools and compile evidence-based inventory of instruments that can be used at different levels.
• Continue to establish ties to the national ADVANCE institution network on issues related to mentoring.

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

4. Begin to develop scholarly work on mentoring that contributes to the evidence base for and evaluation of formal mentoring programs.

Faculty Information Tool

1. Meeting of co-PI Estelle McGroarty with FIT developers Rochele Cotter and Marsh Hestenes was held in June to discuss the structure of the data tables for the Faculty data input. First template developed and refined was the “committee tables”. Discussed briefly the personnel needed to develop the Faculty Information Tool by August 2011. (6/9/10)

2. Teleconference of FIT stakeholders with faculty from the University of Michigan Medical school who have been involved with using the Collexis software to allow medical school faculty to develop their on-line CVs. The Collexis tool allows publication citation downloads from PUBMED. (6/25/10)

3. Meeting of co-PI Estelle McGroarty with Marsh Hestenes to review data table structures for the FIT portal. Also defined the personnel needs for the FIT initiative. Initiated the paperwork for appointments of Rochele Cotter to be appointed on the project; Hans Lonnemo will be funded by the University to be the systems analyst to develop software for FIT. (6/29/10)

4. Meeting of various stakeholders with Michael Warden, representative from Collexis, who gave a presentation on the modules available with the Collexis software. This system could allow for automatic downloads of faculty publications, major honors and awards, and federal and foundation grant awards. The system also provides a mechanism for networking and for citation analyses. (7/23/10)

5. Meeting of the stake holders interested in the Collexis software as a tool for various solutions. Focus of the meeting was on the system requirements of the projects of the various stake holders and participants considered evaluating various products that could provide solutions to those requirements, including Collexis (8/2/10).
6. Meeting of Estelle McGroarty with Marsh Hestenes and Rochele Cotter about defining the extent of unique data elements to collect, vs. text for capture into database. Determined to identify 2 – 4 departments from across disciplinary areas to be “early adopters” and to participate in defining the core data elements to collect. Consider a two tier system. The University database will collect core data and other information that is part of disciplinary effort reporting will be text based. Colleges/Departments can ask for unique data elements for specific units. Four colleges have been contacted to identify early adopter departments: Education, Arts and Letters, Natural Science and the College of Social Science. We are receiving recommendations and will be meeting with department chairs early this fall. (8/3/10)

7. Susan Kendall from the MSU Library informed the development team of a software package, Data180 (http://www.data180.com/) that provides faculty activity reporting, e-portfolios and resumes, assessment management, and co-curricular transcripts. The development team will schedule a demonstration of this software early in September (8/4/10).

CHALLENGES FOR THE ADAPP-ADVANCE INITIATIVE

1. As the ADAPP-ADVANCE initiative grows, communication with all stakeholders will become increasingly complex. We have added personnel to manage the communications operation of our initiative. We are continuously working on the alignment of our message within the speeches of leaders on campus and beyond. An extensive communication plan is in the final stages of development and input from the external evaluation team will be valuable in finalizing this plan, which includes a quarterly news letter to all faculty at MSU.

2. Maintaining the focus of the ADAPP project on the three participating colleges while also assisting with the institutionalization of the initiative, including the orientation of an additional 13 Colleges and their FEAs.

BEST IDEA YET

1. Provost Kim Wilcox asked each college to present a contextualized plan that will address AHR issues unique to the college context (identified through data), and aligned with the six values of the ADAPP-ADVANCE initiative.

2. Begin to focus on the changes in policies and practices that have occurred with some input from the ADAPP project – not just in the three colleges, but also in the whole university.

3. Development of a comprehensive communication plan to include a reorganization of our web site, an events calendar and a quarterly newsletter.
In AY 10-11, the College of Engineering plans to focus on two of the ADAPP-ADVANCE goals. The draft of our plans is outlined below.

**GOAL 2: INCREASE THE RETENTION OF ALL FACULTY, INCLUDING WOMEN AND FACULTY OF COLOR WITHIN THE COLLEGE**

Our College already has an expectation that all of our departments develop a formal mentoring process, as described in our Faculty Handbook. Our plan is to make sure every department has a mentoring process in place by the end of AY 10-11. In particular, we will work with our CEE department and ADAPP personnel to create CEE’s first mentoring program. The FEA will intermittently check with the new faculty in College to determine if they have been provided mentors and if the process is working for them. If weaknesses are identified, the FEA will consult with the department Chairs, and ADAPP, to find ways to improve the process.

Another area of our focus will be improvement of the faculty annual review process. As part of this, we will share the Annual Review Tool Kit with the junior faculty, their mentors, the department Chairs and the department advisory committee members. We will meet intermittently with the junior faculty before their annual review to see how they are progressing. We will selectively review the formal annual evaluation of the new faculty to assure a consistent process. The FEA will also serve as a resource for faculty after their annual review to determine if they have any concerns.

**GOAL 3: INCREASE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN/DIVERSE FACULTY WITHIN THE COLLEGE**

We currently do not have a direct mechanism in place to assess the involvement of our faculty in career advancement opportunities. To address this deficiency, in AY 10-11 we would like to enhance our web-based Faculty Activity Information System (FAIS) that is used for annual reporting of faculty activity. We plan to add elements to FAIS to allow us get a better picture of the extent our women and diverse faculty are accessing developmental opportunities within the college and university and also leadership and developmental opportunities outside MSU.

We will continue to create opportunities to intermittently meet with our women/diverse faculty to discuss any barriers they perceive in their advancement in our College. We believe such direct communication is perhaps the best way to get helpful input on what the problems may be and the approaches that may work best to resolve them.
CNS ADAPP Plans: 2010-2011 (Draft 1)

Annual Review

An area of concern for CNS that emerged from last year’s data collection is the annual review process. More specifically, significantly fewer faculty members in the College of Natural Science reported that they received a formal annual performance evaluation/review than did faculty in the College of Social Science or the College of Engineering. Thus, the university requirement that all tenure stream faculty members be evaluated annually, and provided with a written document describing the outcome of this evaluation, appears to be inconsistently carried out in the college. In response to this finding, and because the requirement for annual evaluations aligns with ongoing efforts to clearly define expectations and procedures in CNS, our primary focus in the coming year will be on the annual review process. We believe that improvements in this area will also have positive effects on other ADAPP related areas including mentoring, retention, promotion, and leadership development.

Carrying out effective annual reviews, and providing written documentation of the outcome of these reviews, can be a daunting task for the chairs of large departments. Our approach will therefore be to provide tools to make the process as efficient and consistent as possible. This will be accomplished by developing templates that can be used both to guide the evaluation process and to provide written feedback on the results of this process to faculty members. These templates will be provided to chairs and directors to use as an alternative to writing narrative letters for all faculty. Our goal is to increase both the percentage of tenure stream faculty who receive a written annual evaluation, and the usefulness of these evaluations to the faculty member him/herself, and to the department and college.

Mentoring

Last year CNS developed a college mentoring policy statement. This policy will be formally adopted after confirming that it is consistent with the university mentoring policy that is currently being developed. Departments will be asked to submit written descriptions of their own mentoring programs, which will be evaluated for their alignment with college and university policies.

Faculty Search

Procedures will be established to insure that faculty searches incorporate the best practices identified by ADAPP. These will include asking all search committees to submit the following: 1) A written description of the criteria by which candidates will be judged. This description will be submitted before the review of applications begins. 2) A written description of how candidates on the proposed “short list” meet the above criteria. This will be submitted before the short list is approved and candidates are invited for interviews.
College of Social Science
strategic plan to meet the goals of the ADAPP/ADVANCE grant
Fall, 2010

Developed by the College FEA team: Marietta Baba, Robert Caldwell, DeBrenna Agbenyiga, and Pamela Gray

August 16, 2010

Introduction
The College of Social Science (CSS) at Michigan State University works closely with the ADVANCE grant team to recruit, retain, and advance a diverse faculty. These goals are accomplished, in part, by creating a positive and supportive work climate for all. This work is a reaffirmation of the long-standing commitment that CSS has made to sustain and enhance an intercultural and inclusive college. Indeed, this value has been a central part of the former and current CSS strategic plan (See Appendix A, Goal 5).

The ADVANCE grant team has published goals and strategies to achieve some of these same outcomes in their Alignment document (Aligning Colleges’ Policies and Practices with MSU’s Goals of Quality and Inclusivity of Faculty: Intervention Points for Faculty Excellence Advocates (FEAs)).

The plan presented below attempts to integrate the CSS strategic plan with several ADVANCE suggestions presented in the Alignment document. Although we will be active on multiple fronts, our activity will primarily focus on the College’s top 2010-2011 priority: enhancing the formal mentoring systems for pre-tenure faculty throughout the College. We chose this priority in recognition of the fact that, in an era of reduced hiring of new faculty, we need to focus on retaining and promoting the women faculty we have already hired. We believe that effective mentoring is a crucial factor in the retention of quality faculty. The focus on mentoring is also consistent with our reading of various data collected by the ADVANCE grant and shared with the colleges.

Of the four goals presented in the ADVANCE Alignment document, Goals 2 and 4 match most closely with our priority. The Alignment document offers suggestions as ways to achieve these goals. We have grouped several of these suggestions together and will present them with the College’s action plan for the coming year.

---

1 Goal 2 -- Increase the retention of all faculty, including women and faculty of color within the college; Goal 4 -- Improve the work environment (climate) for all faculty, including women and faculty of color within the college
CSS Action Plan 2010-2011: We eagerly await the promulgation of the University policy on faculty mentoring due out this fall. We will work with each of our units to make them aware of this policy and will help them implement the policy in ways that advance the mentoring programs that each unit described last year in their research strategic plan. We also plan to work with two of our units (Psychology and Social Work) to design pilot mentoring programs on a more formal, scientific basis. These pilot mentoring programs will be developed based on a review of the relevant literature and in consultation with the ADVANCE mentoring workgroup. These programs will have an evaluation component as part of their design. The results of this evaluation will be shared with the other units within our college with an eye towards wider adoption of the effective components of the pilot programs.

Additional activities: We will work closely with the ADVANCE mentoring workgroup and the FOD office to provide all of our units with the resources they may need to enhance their current mentoring efforts. We will also deliver feedback to each unit based upon our analysis of their current mentoring programs as described in their research strategic plans prepared last year. Associate Dean Chris Maxwell is planning this feedback for the Fall semester.

ADAPP suggestions from Alignment document -- Goal 4

- **Zealously advocate** for departments and college to implement revisions in policies and procedures to advance the goals of ADAPP and the university. Track the application of new policies and practices within the departments and college. Encourage formal mentors to meet with new faculty intermittently before first annual review to see how they are acclimating (within the department/college/greater community), if they have unanswered questions or concerns (e.g., quarterly intervals), and if they are clear on the criteria and process for evaluation. Determine if new faculty have been provided mentors in accordance with departmental or college procedures or practice.

CSS Action Plan 2010-2011: We have already begun this process. Findings from these surveys will be presented to the Chairs and Directors during the next academic year. We will continue to analyze these data to see if there is more that we can learn from them. In 2010-11 we will work with the Chairs and directors to develop approaches.

ADAPP suggestions from Alignment document -- Goal 4

- **Review** ADAPP work environment survey data for the departments within the college, discuss questions or concerns with ADAPP executive team, discuss data with college administrators and faculty. Recommend approaches for improving, where necessary, college/department work environment.
for addressing areas for improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADAPP suggestions from Alignment document -- Goal 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Review</strong> data on department and college faculty hires, promotion and tenure, salary, work environment survey, or other data to determine degree of institutionalization of ADAPP and university efforts to improve the climate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CSS Action Plan 2010-2011:** While we routinely review these (and other) data, we will pay particular attention to the implications these data have for the institutionalization of ADAPP goals during the coming year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADAPP suggestions from Alignment document -- Goal 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Report</strong> annually to Dean and Provost regarding progress on or barriers to improved work environment (climate) for women/diverse faculty within the departments and college.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CSS Action Plan 2010-2011:** As part of our regularly scheduled biannual meeting with the Provost’s staff (e.g., Terry Curry and Paulette Granberry-Russell) to review the College’s progress on a wide range of diversity issues, we will report on this topic.

Other Alignment goals will also guide some of the College’s activities this coming year. These goals and the college implementation plans now follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADAPP suggestions from Alignment document -- Goal 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Meet with department chairs/directors to review procedures prior to search processes getting underway. Meet with Chair of Search Committee (or entire search committee) before start of search to review best practices of a search process.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CSS Action Plan 2010-2011:** We anticipate a small number of faculty searches this year. We will meet with the ADVANCE workgroup (Terry Curry, Paulette Granberry-Russell, Mark Rohling) to ensure that these search committees work in ways that are consistent with university policy and best practices. We will review our College process and procedures in this area to make sure that diversity concerns are getting appropriate attention and make any necessary revisions. We plan to meet with the search committees prior to their work to share the ADAPP toolkit.
CSS Action Plan 2010-2011: This toolkit has already been distributed to unit Chairs and Directors. They will be encouraged to share it with their faculty.

ADAPP suggestions from Alignment document -- Goal 2
- Introduce the Annual Review Tool Kit to the faculty members, particularly the checklist for new faculty.

CSS Action Plan 2010-2011: We will continue to encourage women and faculty of color to accept leadership positions within their units, the College, and the University. We feel very positive about the number of women Chairs, Associate Chairs, and Program Directors who currently serve in CSS. We will work to maintain or improve this number. Two women Chairs have been appointed during the Summer of 2010 and one Chair search will be conducted during the coming year.

Evaluation and Metrics
We will evaluate the two pilot mentoring programs we will implement this year as well as monitor the development and expansion of mentoring programs in our other units during this year. We expect to see changes on the following metrics:

1. Increased faculty satisfaction with the mentoring process in the units implementing the pilot programs.
2. More units expanding and enhancing existing mentoring programs

With regard to searches, we anticipate that the ADVANCE team and the FEA will work with the each search committee operating this year. Because of the small number of searches, no metrics are proposed as an evaluation target.

ADAPP suggestions from Alignment document -- Goal 3
- Increase advancement of women/diverse faculty within the college.
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Introduction
The College of Social Science at Michigan State University has completed a strategic planning process to develop the College’s next five-year vision and strategic agenda. We have created a measurable plan of action for moving the College to a new level of excellence over the next five years.

Our plan seeks to improve the performance and impact of the College of Social Science across its research, teaching, and engagement missions. Our intent is to create a compelling vision for the future of the College, linked to a set of integrated goals, strategies and metrics that can guide us toward our shared purpose and enable selective investment in high priority areas.

Faculty, staff, and students will benefit from this plan through increased resources and opportunities in the College. Our prospective students, graduates, and donors will benefit from stronger programs that enhance the value of a College of Social Science degree. The College will benefit from moving proactively to strengthen the position from which it operates. Adopting the plan will allow us to continue advancing knowledge and transforming lives within the wider university community.

With nearly 500 points of contact over the past year, many thoughtful minds and committed individuals have helped craft the plan. During 2007-08, the College engaged in a collaborative and inclusive process to involve all constituent groups within the college and the larger campus environment, to ensure that all voices were heard and all points of view were taken into consideration. Each person’s participation was essential to shaping the plan and identifying specific steps required to increase overall excellence throughout the College. Everyone’s continued involvement will be critical to our success in implementing the plan over the next five years.

This strategic plan is a dynamic working document that will evolve with the college. We will revisit this document annually, reflect upon our collective accomplishments, and refine it with our growth and progress.
Our Mission
To create, disseminate, and apply knowledge in the social, behavioral and economic sciences, and to enhance what we know through interactions with other disciplines and professions across campus and beyond. We are committed to advancing knowledge by gaining a deeper understanding of the human and social dimensions of the world around us, and the relations of those dimensions to the natural and technological worlds. We transform lives through collaborative learning and responsive engagement with people and communities, both locally and globally. By advancing knowledge and transforming lives, we join our university in making lasting contributions to the larger society in which we are situated.

Our Vision for the Future: 2012
The College of Social Science and its units are acknowledged as resourceful, innovative, intellectual leaders in the social, behavioral and economic sciences, on MSU’s campus, as well as nationally and internationally:

- Collaborating in research, teaching, and engagement with partners in the STEMM disciplines – (science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and medicine), and
- Excelling in knowledge creation, dissemination, and application related to global engagement and diversity that is a consequence of any human endeavor at global scales.

Our Values

- Ethical conduct, especially honesty and integrity in all that we do;
- Innovation and entrepreneurship – this is not only the energetic spirit that enables us to survive and thrive in challenging times, and also our budgeting model;
- Communication and collaboration – we will be working hard to keep up open lines of communication between the deans’ offices and all of our constituent groups;
- Diversity: demographic and intellectual – there should be no demographic or intellectual litmus tests for any program in this college, it is an open marketplace of ideas;
- Mutual respect, civility, and courtesy – the keywords are tolerance and collegiality;
- Sharing resources with our partners – we have to invest if we expect a return.

Goals and Objectives for 2012
This vision and goals are the foundation for the College’s objectives. The vision for 2012 acts as a point of reference for the College over the next five years. There are two categories of goals: Mission-Oriented goals and Supporting goals. A Mission-Oriented goal is directly tied to furthering the research, teaching, and engagement of our college mission. A Supporting goal provides resources that help to enhance and sustain the efforts of the Mission oriented goals. An objective serves as a tool for evaluation of the College’s progress toward its vision and a strategy is a specific initiative the College will undertake to achieve those larger objectives.
Next Steps
Headed by the Dean’s office, the implementation process will proceed in phases. The intent will be to begin with those strategies that are most fundamental and most necessary to our future success. We will build on the progress of these strategies to continue the momentum necessary to address strategies that require more advanced preparation. The College also will utilize a coordinated campaign approach, which means that units and individuals within the College may pursue other strategies that support our goals. Two-way communication throughout the year will let everyone know what is happening, and provide opportunities for input and feedback.

Goal 1—Mission Oriented: Sustain and Enhance Core Capabilities, Signature Programs, and Strong Interdisciplinary Efforts (BbD I-V)*

Vision 2012
The College of Social Science has succeeded in sustaining and further developing its core disciplinary and professional strengths through careful stewardship and internal investment. It has further enhanced its Signature Programs through investment and attraction of external resources. Strong interdisciplinary and cross-college endeavors are promoted, especially in two broad thrust areas: 1) the social, behavioral and economic science dimensions of STEMM; and 2) global engagement and diversity that is a consequence of any human endeavor at global scales.

Objectives

- Ratings and rankings of the college’s core and signature programs are sustained and improved;
- Recruitment and retention of outstanding faculty and graduate students are enhanced;
- The college acts as a stimulus for excellence in developing cross-college proposals;
- The College encourages each academic unit to be involved in at least one cross-college endeavor;
- The College ensures that its unit’s intellectual assets are engaged in major strategic initiatives.

Strategies

- College units develop new strategic plans through a coordinated campaign approach
- RFP processes for core signature and interdisciplinary programs are developed and deployed;
- The College provides leadership in mobilizing resources toward global engagement;
- An enhanced metrics framework is developed to link outcomes with resource allocations.
Goal 2—Mission Oriented: Foster Research Excellence (BbD IV)*

Vision 2012
Build on and enhance College strengths in knowledge creation and dissemination. Call for all Departments and Schools to demonstrate research impact and contribute to our resource base to support research. Invest wisely to enhance research productivity while setting high expectations for faculty.

Objectives

- Demonstrate continued progress in knowledge creation through high impact disciplinary-based scholarly publications.
- Promote excellence in targeted interdisciplinary research of high social value.
- Challenge each Department and School to continuously increase external funding to support sponsored research.
- Expect all faculty to contribute to scholarly research mission.
- Improve external rankings of graduate programs.

Strategies

- Implement a comprehensive research plan, including the following elements:
  - Each unit develops in the next academic year its own plan to enhance research activity, measure its success, and contribute to increased external funding.
  - Determine most cost-effective strategies for the College to complement unit efforts to facilitate faculty success in securing external funding. Establish enhanced College Research Support Services within one year.
  - A unit’s success in meeting its research plan is taken into account in allocation of faculty positions. Units are encouraged to identify “target of opportunity hires” willing to bring excellent research programs with significant ongoing external funding to MSU.
  - Research expectations of new faculty are to be made clear at hiring and maintained in the tenure and promotion process.
  - Each unit documents a program for mentoring junior faculty in its research plan.
  - All faculty contribute to the research enterprise. Excellence in research is required for promotion. Continued research activity, including mentoring, is expected of all tenured faculty. Faculty later in their careers who are no longer highly research active contribute in other ways.
  - Graduate student research will be strengthened by establishing a college fund to support enhancements for graduate student research. We will focus on fundraising for graduate student support, and base resource allocation on quality metrics.

Goal 3—Mission Oriented: Student Experience Through Active, Collaborative Learning (BbD I)*
Vision 2012
Student experience is enhanced through experiential and active- and inquiry-based learning in large and small classes. Integrative Studies provides an arena in which to cultivate and institutionalize teaching innovation through collaboration between faculty, teaching assistants, and undergraduate assistants. A diverse faculty and staff serve as the foundation for implementing this goal. Graduate education is strengthened.

Objectives

- All faculty are engaged in teaching enhancement efforts.
- All bachelors degree candidates have at least one out-of-classroom learning experience oriented toward civic engagement, study abroad, and/or career learning.
- Instructional technology is made more readily available and evenly distributed among units.
- The capacity to provide five-year funding for graduate students continues to expand, while such packages become institutionalized.
- Core college curriculum review to ensure quality student experience.

Strategies

- Use Provost’s support to create and institutionalize a Teaching Innovation Program in Integrative Studies (underway).
- Develop a cadre of teacher-scholars the TIP to collaborate with other active learners in efforts to expand teaching innovation throughout the College.
- Strengthen and institutionalize undergraduate research initiatives currently funded by Provost.
- Regularly review study abroad, study away, and service learning components of the curriculum to ensure quality student experiences.
- Integrate global initiatives such as MSU Dubai into the College teaching culture.
- Complete the restructuring of Integrative Studies under its new director, with emphasis on small sections (now 36 capped at 25 seats) and new courses (to add to the 6 created in the past 2 years) and active- and inquiry-based learning.
- Expand graduate student participation in the College Teaching Certification Program.
- Seek additional resources to support graduate study.
- Ensure supportive learning environment for diverse students at all levels.
- Begin review of College core curriculum.

Goal 4—Support Oriented: Enhance Resource Development through Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Advancement Efforts (BbD I-V)*

Vision 2012
The College continues to expand its income from private philanthropic support, research grants, and contracts. Strategic initiatives and collaborative partnerships among our internal and external constituencies attract significant financial support to enhance our
scholarship capacity in the College. Obtaining new resources is a means to achieve our mission, not a mission in itself.

Objectives

- The College and each unit have a plan for securing additional resources needed to support our mission-oriented goals.
- Mirror the University’s distribution balance of general and non-general fund revenue.
- Build on the accomplishments of the recent capital campaign and lay foundation for future successes.
- Increase average annual fundraising results to $10M/year (a 43% increase over recent campaign average of $7M/year).
- Substantially increase financial support available to recruit the best and brightest graduate students to MSU.

Strategies

- Enhance development activity and increase philanthropic support, including (in progress):
  - Identify and qualify the top 1,000 prospects from expanded alumni population of over 85,000 and implement ongoing communication and cultivation strategies to secure future financial support.
  - Develop college and unit-specific fundraising priorities.
  - Work with faculty to match donor interests with unit needs.
  - Partner with the units to provide engagement opportunities for alumni that steward current donors and cultivate new prospects.
- Develop joint research, programmatic and fundraising strategies to increase financial support for graduate student education.
- Increase revenue secured by research grant submissions and awarded contracts and associated indirect costs.
- Develop additional successful business models for entrepreneurial activity and share best practices among the key constituencies within and beyond the College of Social Science.
- The College seeks ways and means to return values to our communities by connecting our intellectual assets to economic development efforts in Michigan and the Great Lakes Region.

Goal 5—Support Oriented: Sustain and Enhance an Intercultural and Inclusive Community (BbD I-V)*

Vision 2012
The College provides quality support through programs and initiatives that foster a community climate that acknowledges and appreciates cultural, ethnic, socio-economic, linguistic, socio-linguistic, sexual orientation, and geographical diversity.
Objectives

- Create the College of Social Science Office for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusive Affairs (OEDIA) that supports and enhances the College’s commitment to an inclusive community.
- Provide services that are aligned with the College’s vision to foster leadership, oversight, and an infrastructure for supporting an intercultural and inclusive community.
- Provide information, consultation, support, and resources to the College of Social Science community with regard to diversity, harassment, discrimination, and disability matters.
- Manage and support the University’s compliance efforts in areas of diversity, inclusion, harassment, discrimination prevention, and compliance with all applicable State and Federal civil rights laws.
- Assist linking faculty, staff, and students to the necessary resource structures within and outside of the College.

Strategies

- Offer individual consultation with department chairs and directors, supervisors, faculty, staff, and students.
- Establish a mechanism for reporting complaints of harassment and discrimination.
- Develop infrastructures for responding and tracking complaints of harassment and discrimination.
- Provide an on-going, college-wide training/program initiative that addresses some of the recurring issues/concerns being reported.
- Work collaboratively with entities within and outside of the College to ensure access and support for necessary resources.
- Establish a web presence to facilitate sharing information and providing updates around issues relating to our inclusive efforts.
- Create interest groups where faculty can form broad networks across disciplines to enhance inclusion and multi-culturalism.
- Incorporate information related to our inclusive efforts in existing and other appropriate communications with the College community.

Goal 6—Support Oriented: Communicate Excellence in Intellectual Leadership to Key Audiences (BbD IV-V)*

Vision 2012
The College promotes its unique strengths and impacts internally and externally. It implements a strategic communication plan that identifies target audiences, key messages, and appropriate channels for dissemination.

Objectives
• Position the social, behavioral, and economic sciences at MSU as a diverse and dynamic intellectual community which is central to understanding and addressing the myriad challenges facing our world at local and global levels.
• Build awareness of the expertise in the College available to policy and decision makers
• Enhance a sense of community within the College.
• Increase capacity to provide development-related communication.
• Ensure the College’s intellectual assets are included in major strategic activities as the University tells the MSU story.

Strategies

• Establish regular opportunities for faculty at all levels and across disciplines to network with the dean, associate deans, and among themselves.
• Expand program of faculty visits to legislative staffs in collaboration with the University’s Government Affairs Office.
• Strengthen collaboration with the University’s media relations team to tell newsworthy stories of outstanding scholarship.
• Bolster resources to support and manage the development of external relations publications.
• Implement a program of consistent communication with alumni to advance development messages. Engage the faculty in translating basic research findings into communications that demonstrate the impact of research on the University’s communities and society at large.
• Provide communications consultation to formal and informal communicators within the College.
• Link college marketing messages to university themes and priorities.

Goal 7—Support Oriented: Steward our Resources (BbD V)*

Vision 2012
Develop new initiatives to renew and emphasize a service orientation in the Dean’s Office and throughout the College. Manage the resources in the College efficiently and transparently. Enhance the value of our assets and resources by everything we do.

Objectives

• Continuously seek ways to serve the needs of our faculty, staff, and students through responsible and strategic leadership.
• Develop means to obtain feedback from key constituents to identify issues and concerns that the College’s leadership can respond to.
• Develop processes to ensure the responsible and effective management and care of our physical, informational, financial and human assets.
• Seek to ensure integrity and add value to our College and University in everything we do.
Strategies

- Increase the use of metrics of quality to guide the allocation of college resources.
- Improve the continuous cycle of program review for all of the units in our college.
- Assist the College community to develop succession plans for leadership positions throughout the College, including all chairs, directors, associate deans and dean positions.
- Maintain and enhance the quality of our facilities, the security of our information, the development of our human resources, and the stewardship of our endowments.
- Establish a faculty development program whereby junior faculty across disciplines meet and learn about the research policies and resources of the College and the Dean’s Office.
Meeting of Faculty Excellence Advocate Consortium

Monday, June 21, 2010

AGENDA

*Please bring laptops to meeting*

8:00 – 8:30 Refreshments

8:30 – 9:00 Introductions, Overview of ADAPP/ADVANCE, Role of FEAs

9:00 – 11:00 Role of FEA in Alignment & Structuring of Human Resource Policies / Practices

- Introduction (9:00 – 9:15)
- Group Discussions (9:15 – 9:45)
- Whole Group Discussions (9:45-10:45)
- Next Steps (10:45-11:00)
Keys to Being an Effective Faculty Excellence Advocate [FEA]

The ADAPP-ADVANCE initiative is designed to help Michigan State University improve its ability to recruit, retain and advance a diverse faculty workforce, as well as create a positive and supportive work climate for all. Effective FEAs need to zealously promote and support MSU’s commitment to a high quality and diverse faculty and have a clear understanding of MSU’s/ADAPP’s approach to fulfilling such a commitment. This approach includes applying six guiding principles [quality, inclusiveness, alignment, objectivity, consistency, and transparency] to six targeted areas [recruitment/selection, annual review, promotion/tenure, mentoring, leadership and the work environment] including their structure and associated policies and practices. The approach is supported by theory and a large body of research demonstrating that increasing the structure and alignment of policies and practices will promote a high quality and inclusive workforce (Arthur and Doverspike, 2005; Ericksen & Dyer, 2005; Evans, Puckik, & Barsoux, 2002; Gratton & Truss, 2003).

This document outlines broad ideas on how FEAs can be most effective in their role and includes several concrete examples. The attached document provides detailed recommended interventions that further clarify ways in which the FEAs can be effective agents in promoting change, by working with chairs to implement best practices. The position requires a close alliance with the college Dean who is ultimately responsible to the Provost for the college’s performance on measures of diversity, quality and climate. It is expected that the FEAs will work with chairs and deans in achieving exemplary practices in these areas.

Effective FEAs:

- **Are aware of the key “drivers” of faculty quality and diversity and the associated issues** [in general and those specific to your college]. This requires, for example, a thorough understanding of implicit bias (e.g., how an individual can be unaware of the extent to which ones hidden preferences influence the evaluation of candidates for employment and advancement). **Attend additional FEA training sessions on such topics as implicit bias and effective searches.**

- **Are aware of available data** including academic human resource data that can be used to identify challenges/needs within the college. These data include:
  - a university wide survey conducted on faculty perceptions of their work environment;
  - a university survey related to leadership development; and
  - data available in central databases such as HR, space and financial data sets.

- **Use available data** to:
  - identify needs/challenges to both administrators and faculty and communicate these needs/challenges to both administrators and faculty
  - help track the college’s progress toward achieving MSU goals of enhancing faculty quality and diversity.

- **Utilize other tools** to assist in collecting data from college units as needed. These tools include:
Inventories for completion by chairs to collect baseline data on current policies and practices related to recruitment, annual review, promotion and tenure, mentoring and leadership.

An on-line Faculty Information Tool (being designed to serve as a secure central database of academic human resource information on individual faculty).

- **Have a basic understanding of MSU academic HR policies, practices, and resources** and know how to obtain additional, more specific information when needed.
  - Read and be familiar with the MSU faculty handbooks (university, college and department). Become aware of university resources provided by ADAPP & Academic Human Resources (e.g., ADAPP Resource Guides on human resource processes), the Women’s Resource Center, the Family Resource Center, Faculty and Organizational Development, and the Office of Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives.

- **Assist units in assessing the extent to which their academic HR policies, practices, and resources are aligned with those of MSU and the college, and are well integrated, readily accessible to faculty, and consistently applied.**
  - Understand the concept of “alignment” and be able to explain it (in basic terms) to faculty.
  - Encourage college units to assess the alignment of their academic HR policies, practices, and resources with MSU and college goals as well as the integration, consistency and accessibility of policies and practices. Also encourage the use of resources provided by ADAPP to assist units in conducting these assessments.

- **Are available and approachable to faculty within the college.** Introduce yourself to faculty. Provide information about the goals, your role, and how you can be reached. Send regular communications (e.g. consider having a regular column in the college newsletter). Add an ADAPP link to college and unit websites. Include information in handbooks and orientation packets.

- **Facilitate communication** between faculty and chairs and the college as well as Academic HR/ADAAP.
  - Proactively seek input on quality and diversity issues from faculty. Communicate their ideas and concerns to the Academic Human Resources and ADAPP team as appropriate.
  - Inform college faculty and administrators of important ADAPP activities, relevant MSU policy or practice changes (or contemplated changes), and training and other opportunities.

The FEAs are key agents of the Deans in promoting change in the college. MSU needs FEAs who are passionate champions for building and supporting an excellent and diverse faculty who work in the most supportive environment possible.
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Aligning Colleges’ Policies and Practices with MSU’s Goals of Quality and Inclusivity of Faculty: Intervention Points for Faculty Excellence Advocates (FEAs)

INTRODUCTION

The ADAPP-ADVANCE initiative is designed to help improve Michigan State University’s ability to recruit, retain and advance a diverse faculty workforce, as well as create a positive and supportive work climate for all. Effective FEAs need to zealously promote and support MSU’s commitment to a high quality and diverse faculty and have a clear understanding of MSU’s/ADAPP’s approach to fulfilling such a commitment. This approach includes applying six guiding principles [quality, inclusiveness, alignment, objectivity, consistency, and transparency] to six targeted areas [faculty recruitment/selection, annual review, promotion/tenure, mentoring, leadership development and the work environment] focusing on the structure and associated policies and practices related to these areas. The approach is supported by theory and a large body of research demonstrating that increasing the structure and alignment of policies and practices will promote a high quality and inclusive workforce (Arthur and Doverspike, 2005; Ericksen & Dyer, 2005; Evans, Puckik, & Barsoux, 2002; Gratton & Truss, 2003).

This document provides examples of interventions – strategies that an FEA might use in his or her college context. The interventions undertaken by an individual FEA will be dependent upon goals for a particular college, and the other role(s) that the FEA plays in a college (e.g., Associate Dean or faculty). The FEA Consortium will serve as a forum for FEAs to share best practices and interventions that might be enacted across colleges. Interventions should reinforce the six guiding principles of ADAPP-ADVANCE (outlined above).

This is not a prescriptive document - it is a resource that you can use as you and your dean think of ways your college can move forward with developing a plan to achieve the four ADAPP-ADVANCE/MSU goals. Thus participating colleges will be expected to submit a plan, but will be given autonomy to make the plan relevant to the needs of the college. This document will continue to be revised and expanded as our work together continues.

GOAL 1: ENHANCE AND INCREASE THE QUALITY AND DIVERSITY OF FACULTY RECRUITED AND APPOINTED INTO THE COLLEGE

Examine Search and Hiring Processes and Promote Policies and Best Practices

- Meet with Deans and department chairs/directors to review procedures prior to search processes getting underway.

- On behalf of the Dean & Chairs/Directors, work with chairs of search committees (or whole committees) to assure that job description/posting reflects objective criteria that are also aligned with:
- the screening criteria that are used to determine applicants for interview;
- the selection criteria that:
  - are used to develop interview questions for candidates, and
  - serve as the basis for determining who is offered position; and
- the criteria upon which annual evaluations, and tenure and promotion are conducted

- Meet with Chair of Search Committee (or entire search committee) before start of search to review best practices of a search process:
  - Provide Search Toolkit (if unable to meet with search chair/committee then refer the chair/committee to Toolkit).
  - Remind all of the importance of minimizing bias in the process and emphasize the role of structure in the recruitment and hiring process in addressing bias and promoting quality.
  - Refer chair/committee to campus resources in support of search process (Academic Human Resources and Office for Inclusion).
  - Refer the chair of the search committee (or entire committee) to online training (available Spring 2011) and the current training available on faculty searches.
  - Remind chair/committee of importance of their role in achieving goals of ADAPP/College.
  - Check in with the search committee on their progress, how the applicant pool is shaping up, any need for additional support or resources to achieve a diverse applicant/candidate pool, information on community resources to attract candidates to MSU/greater community, etc.

- Work with unit chairs and directors to review offer letter to assure salary and other terms and conditions of employment (e.g., start-up package) are in alignment with offers made to other similarly ranked faculty at time of hire, unless there is an objective merit or market-based reason for doing so.

- Introduce yourself to new faculty, describe your role as FEA, and offer to be a resource to them.
GOAL 2: INCREASE THE RETENTION OF ALL FACULTY, INCLUDING WOMEN AND FACULTY OF COLOR WITHIN THE COLLEGE

Assess Annual Review & Tenure and Promotion Process

Annual Review

- **Meet with new faculty** intermittently before first annual review to see how they are acclimating (within the department/college/greater community), if they have unanswered questions or concerns (e.g., quarterly intervals), and if they are clear on the criteria and process for evaluation;

- **Encourage formal mentors to meet with new faculty** intermittently before first annual review to see how they are acclimating (within the department/college/greater community), if they have unanswered questions or concerns (e.g., quarterly intervals), and if they are clear on the criteria and process for evaluation.

- **Introduce** the Annual Review Tool Kit to the faculty members, particularly the checklist for new faculty.

- **Check-in** with chairs of new faculty to get their assessment of how new faculty are progressing. Introduce the Annual Review Tool Kit, especially the section on resources for unit administrators.

- **Determine** if new faculty have been provided mentors in accordance with departmental or college procedures or practice.\(^1\)

- **Work with unit administrators to verify** that annual evaluation criteria for new faculty are consistent with criteria used for job posting/description, offer letter.

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

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

- **Report** progress on or any concerns regarding the advancement of women/diverse faculty in the annual review process to the Chair and Dean.

Tenure and Promotion Process

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

\(^1\) If the department does not have a formal mentoring process in place, work with ADAPP grant management team (Clare Luz, co-PI) and refer to ADAPP Web site on mentoring program resources http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/resource/resources-faculty-mentoring
• **Introduce** the RP&T Tool Kit to unit administrators for use by faculty members, promote the use of the College/ Departmental Handbooks for RP&T, and be available to faculty to respond to questions regarding the process or timing of RPT events.

• **Report** annually on progress or any concerns about the advancement of women/diverse faculty in the promotion and tenure process to the Dean and Provost.
GOAL 3: INCREASE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN/DIVERSE FACULTY WITHIN THE COLLEGE

Promote and Assess Career Advancement Efforts within the College

- **Track** the extent to which women and diverse faculty are accessing developmental opportunities offered by or that exist within the college and university (e.g., ADAPP offered workshops, formal mentoring programs, faculty development through F&OD/AHR, research grant development, interdisciplinary research opportunities, faculty collaborations within and outside the department/college).

- **Track** the extent to which women and diverse faculty are accessing leadership\(^2\) and other developmental opportunities offered outside the college and university (e.g., discipline based conferences, external fellowship opportunities).

- **Create** opportunities to meet intermittently with women/diverse faculty to discuss how they view their trajectory within the department/college/discipline.

- **Explore** with women/diverse faculty ways to enhance their opportunities and reduce barriers for leadership within the department/college/discipline.

- **Assess and Report** annually on progress or concerns to Chairs, Dean and Office of the Provost utilizing ADAPP data or other internal data available through electronic employment portfolio (e-portfolio).

\(^2\) The Women’s Leadership component of MSU’s ADAPP-ADVANCE grant aims to develop a larger number and more effective group of transformational leaders for MSU who focus on inclusivity as a goal for quality (Tamara Reid Bush, co-PI can provide information on ADAPP resources) http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/project/womens-leadership
GOAL 4: IMPROVE THE WORK ENVIRONMENT (CLIMATE) FOR ALL FACULTY, INCLUDING WOMEN AND FACULTY OF COLOR WITHIN THE COLLEGE

Promote and Assess Work Environment Efforts within the College

- **Zealously advocate** for departments and college to implement revisions in policies and procedures to advance the goals of ADAPP and the university.

- Track the application of new policies and practices within the departments and college.

- **Review** ADAPP work environment survey data for the departments within the college, discuss questions or concerns with ADAPP executive team, discuss data with college administrators and faculty.

- **Recommend** approaches for improving, where necessary, college/department work environment.

- **Work** with ADAPP grant management team and project support offices to market and maximize faculty awareness of and involvement in efforts to create a supportive work environment. Ensure that unit administrators are a part of this process.

- **Review** data on department and college faculty hires, promotion and tenure, exit interviews, salary, work environment survey, or other data to determine degree of institutionalization of ADAPP and university efforts to improve the climate.

- **Report** annually to Dean and Provost regarding progress on or barriers to improved work environment (climate) for women/diverse faculty within the departments and college.
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REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION & TENURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES IN THE MSU FACULTY HANDBOOK

Operating Principles of the Tenure System:
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/TenurePrinc.htm

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

Granting Tenure
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/granttenure.htm

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

Faculty members appointed as Associate Professors without tenure and who have served previously at MSU are appointed in the tenure system for a probationary period of, generally, two to five (2-5) years.

A newly appointed Associate Professor can be granted tenure from the date of appointment.

Faculty members appointed as an Assistant Professor are appointed for an initial probationary period of four years and may be reappointed for an additional probationary period of three years.

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

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

Stopping the Tenure Clock
Implementation Practices:
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/implementation.htm

Summary:
Provides reasons for automatic, one-year extension of probationary appointments and information about the process for requests of extensions for other reasons.
Post Tenure Review
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/posttenure.htm

Summary:
There is not a distinct process for post tenure review. Post-tenure review is implemented by monitoring performance through the annual performance evaluation process. The post tenure review process can result in a plan which leads to increased productivity or enhanced professional achievement by the faculty member. Depending on the outcome of the plan, the process can result in disciplinary action, including dismissal.

Faculty Handbook Policies:

- Policy and Procedure for Implementing Disciplinary Action Where Dismissal is Not Sought
  Provides causes for discipline, the process, and possible disciplinary actions.
  http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/Disciplinary.htm

- Dismissal of Tenured Faculty for Cause
  Provides grounds for dismissal and the stages of the process.
  http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/dismissal.htm

Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Recommendations Policies:
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/recommendations.htm

Summary:
Handbook outlines the process initiated at the unit level, based on both peer review of candidates and unit standards for performance. Candidates are reviewed at the college and university levels; these reviews are based on explicit unit criteria and quality evaluations, consistent with college and university policies and goals. Recommendations can be positive or negative for: reappointment of an Assistant Professor for a second probationary period; reappointment of a tenure-system, untenured Associate Professor with the award of tenure; promotion of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with the award of tenure; promotion of an Associate Professor to Professor. An overview of the standards for such recommendations is presented.

Tenure Action and Promotion:
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/tenureaction.htm

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

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

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

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

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

External Letters of Reference
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/refLetters.htm

Summary:
External letters of reference are required for all reviews involving the granting of tenure or promotion. Some units require external letters for reappointment. Practices may vary by unit, but the principles of soliciting letters of reference are outlined.

Policies regarding the Confidentiality of Letters of Reference:
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/tenureRecommend.htm

Summary:
In soliciting letters of reference a specific statement of confidentiality MUST be included in the request. The suggested wording of the statement is listed in faculty handbook reference above.
Evaluation of Non-Tenured Faculty in the Tenure System Policies:  
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/nontenured.htm

**Summary:**  
The above reference outlines the process for evaluating non-tenured, tenure-system faculty. The actions to be taken upon decision not to reappoint are outlined and the possible responses of the faculty member not reappointed are presented.

Faculty Guide for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure – An Overview:  
http://hr.msu.edu/promotion/facacadstaff/FacGuideTenure.htm

**Summary:**  
Provides overview of RP&T process including time table, early promotion & tenure, visa status, effective dates for various decisions and outcomes, Survive and Thrive workshop descriptions, University level review and tenure and promotion recognition dinners. Also presents data on RP&T processes from the last five years.
WORKSHOPS, PROGRAMS & RESOURCES ON REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION & TENURE
(For Faculty)

1. **Survive and Thrive in the MSU Tenure System**
   
   [http://fod.msu.edu/SurviveThrive/about.asp](http://fod.msu.edu/SurviveThrive/about.asp)
   
   Normally scheduled in Mid October – Half day Workshop
   
   The workshop has the following objectives:

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

2. **From Associate Professor to Professor: Productive Decision-making at Mid-Career**
   
   [http://fod.msu.edu/SurviveThriveII/about.asp](http://fod.msu.edu/SurviveThriveII/about.asp)
   
   For Recently Appointed Associate Tenure-System Professors
   
   This one-half day workshop is scheduled during the spring semester and has the following objectives:

   a. To clarify expectations for attaining the rank of full professor;
   b. To enable new associate professors to better anticipate the opportunities and challenges they will face and to inform their mid career decision-making and experiences; and
   c. To provide a venue for faculty members to ask questions about this new stage in their careers.

3. **Spring Institute on College Teaching and Learning**
   
   [http://fod.msu.edu/SpringInstitute/about.asp](http://fod.msu.edu/SpringInstitute/about.asp)
   
   Single and multi-day workshops are offered on topics related to active learning, inclusive teaching, and assessment.

4. **Online Instructional Resources**
   
   [http://fod.msu.edu/oir/index.asp](http://fod.msu.edu/oir/index.asp)
   
   Instructional resources on a large number of instructional resources that are available on the web are available from this site, organized by major topical areas.
5. **Orientation For New Tenure System and Health Programs Faculty, Continuing System Librarians and National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory Appointments**  
http://fod.msu.edu/orientation/TSHP_about.asp  
Orientation for all NEW tenure system faculty events occur in late August and includes, in addition to the general orientation, a research section and an additional *technology workshop*.

6. **Workshop for Faculty Leaders**  
http://fod.msu.edu/wfl/about.asp  
Workshops for Faculty Leaders (WFL), provide leadership development for faculty in their many roles in governance, search committees, research projects and large labs, and the myriad of contexts in which faculty rely on leadership skills.

7. **Support for Research**  
Office of Research Facilitation and Dissemination sponsors a variety of faculty research workshops, seminars and discussion groups.  
http://resfacil.msu.edu/

8. **Events and resources provided by the Women’s Resource Center:**  
http://wrc.msu.edu/events.php?events  
*Past programs have included:*  
“Letting Off a Little Self Esteem”  
“College to Career Transition”  
“Training for a Future in Political Office”
Orientation for New Administrators –  
Office of Faculty and Organizational Development  
http://fod.msu.edu/orientation/EXM_about.asp  
Three half-day sessions, mandatory orientations for department chairs, school directors, and deans, are held in early August.

*The program includes:*
1. Hiring, Promotion, Tenure and Performance Review  
2. University Research Policies and Procedures  
3. Survival Skills for New Administrators  
4. Conflict Resolution Resources  
5. Legal and Regulatory Environment

**LEAD programs – Office of Faculty and Organizational Development**  
http://fod.msu.edu/lead/about.asp  
LEAD workshops are offered for deans, chairs, directors and executive managers, sponsored by the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development in the Office of the Provost. These programs are designed to promote ongoing communication among academic administrators, provide leadership development opportunities, and support campus leaders (deans, chairs, directors, and executive managers) in their efforts to foster organizational change in their units. Past programs have included topics such as:

1. Making Joint Appointments a Success  
2. Tackling the Human Resources Challenges of the Chair/Director  
3. Study of Mid-Career Faculty: Implications for Practice  
4. Strategies for Advancing Diversity and Quality at MSU in a Post-Prop 2 Environment  
5. Success in the Academic Hiring Process from Start to Finish  
6. Faculty Performance Review and Development: Improving the Process and its Outcomes

**Resources from the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives**  
http://www.inclusion.msu.edu/  
1. Bias-Free Communication Brochure  
2. Sexual Harassment training programs  
3. Bias Incident Reporting and Training  
4. Brochure on Assuring Equity and Non-discrimination  
5. Annual Data Reports on Inclusion and Diversity at MSU
CHECK LIST OF
REQUIRED PRACTICES IN REAPPOINTMENT,
PROMOTION & TENURE
(For Units)

Below are guidelines regarding required practices for UNITS when reviewing Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures

____ The unit has written materials governing the appointment, promotion and tenure processes and the procedure for establishing a unit-level RP&T/merit review committee.

____ The unit has developed general guidelines and expectations for tenure-system faculty reappointment as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor with Tenure, and for promotion from Associate to Full Professor.

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

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

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

____ Description of the materials that must be submitted for the unit-level RP&T reviews for reappointment and promotion are readily available to all faculty members.

____ The process for evaluation of RP&T packages at the unit level is clearly defined and readily available to all faculty members.

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

____ The chair/director or designated person(s) uses the annual performance review process to inform and guide tenured Associate Professors regarding progress to promotion to full professor.

____ The unit guidelines regarding the number and type of external evaluation letters to be included in the performance review are clearly defined and readily available to all faculty.

____ The timeline for the unit-level RP&T process is made readily available to the faculty each year.

____ The guidelines for RP&T for faculty jointly appointed in multiple units are made readily available to all RP&T peer review committee members.

____ The multiple appointment memorandum is consulted when reviewing faculty members who are jointly appointed in more than one unit. (http://hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty_forms/FormInfoMam.htm).
The unit makes information regarding unit, college and university resources to assist faculty in preparing for RP&T readily available to all faculty members.

The Unit RP&T committee is given input and guidance regarding the review process so that evaluations are consistent, objective, and are aligned with the written unit-level expectations for the faculty.

The unit and college guidelines and expectations, as well as the university RP&T policies are reviewed by the unit RP&T committee prior to reviewing RP&T materials. Unit (and college) expectations should support the missions of MSU.

The chair/director meets with the unit RP&T committee and discusses each recommendation made by the committee.
CHECK LIST OF REQUIRED PRACTICES
IN REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION & TENURE
(For Colleges)

Below are guidelines regarding required practices for COLLEGE DEANS’ OFFICES to consider when developing, reviewing or revising Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures:

- The College has written materials governing the reappointment, promotion and tenure process and procedure for establishing a college-level RP&T review committee.
- Dean has informed the unit administrators about the procedures and criteria that the College will use regarding decisions about reappointment of Assistant Professors and untenured Associate Professors with the award of tenure.
- The College has developed general guidelines and expectations for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure and from Associate to Full Professor.
- All guidelines and expectations for reappointment, promotion and tenure are available to all tenure system faculty members in the College.
- Guidelines and expectations for RP&T are discussed on a regular basis with the unit chairs and directors.
- Guidelines and expectations for RP&T at the College level are reviewed to be consistent with the University guidelines and expectations.
- The process for evaluation of RP&T packages at the College level is clearly defined and readily available to all faculty members in the College.
- The College RP&T committee reviews (1) the unit and college criteria for reappointment or promotion prior to reviewing unit recommendations, and (2) the university policies and procedures regarding the RP&T process.
- The Dean meets with the College RP&T committee and discusses each recommendation from the committee.
- Information regarding unit and college evaluation criteria and expectations are included with the Dean’s recommendation to the Provost’s Office.
- The multiple appointment memorandum is consulted when reviewing faculty jointly appointed in more than one unit (http://hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty_forms/FormInfoMam.htm).
- For faculty jointly appointed in another college, input is sought from the secondary college when reviewing RP&T recommendations at the college level.
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IV. Academic Human Resources Policies – Faculty Review

All units must have procedures for written evaluation of tenure system faculty at all ranks to support the annual merit process and to provide a basis for a clear statement of performance expectations and accomplishments. It is recognized that provisions and practices in units may vary; however, all evaluation procedures must incorporate, at the minimum, the principles included in this model policy for regular faculty review, and must be applied uniformly to all faculty in the unit.

I. Principles

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

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

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

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

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

II. Guidelines for Implementation

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

B. Each faculty member shall submit a written summary of activities for the appropriate period of time to the unit administrator in a timely manner prior to the review. These materials will be shared with the faculty in accordance with unit bylaws and procedures.

C. If unit bylaws or procedures provide for performance evaluation by peer review committees, unit administrators shall rely on the advice of this designated group, in addition to their own judgment.
D. Unit administrators or their designees, no later than 3 months after completion of the evaluation, shall provide to the faculty member a written evaluation of her/his overall performance. Whenever appropriate, such evaluations shall contain constructive and explicit recommendations and clarify expectations of what is needed to make additional scholarly progress in the tenure system.

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

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

G. Meetings between faculty members and unit administrators are encouraged prior to the written summary to provide feedback about expectations and evaluation. Each faculty member shall have the right to meet in person with the unit administrator or designee after the written review is received.
OVERVIEW OF RESOURCES AND POLICIES ON ANNUAL FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW

1. MSU’s Policy on Faculty Review: in the MSU Faculty Handbook (also found on pages 4 - 5 of this toolkit):
   http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/facultyreview.htm

2. Conducting and Writing Faculty Performance Reviews from the MSU Faculty Handbook:
   http://hr.msu.edu/performance/facacadstaff/format.htm
   - Writing Faculty Performance Reviews: General Guidelines
     http://hr.msu.edu/performance/facacadstaff/facultyreviewguidelines.htm
   - Writing Faculty Performance Reviews: A Suggested Format
     http://hr.msu.edu/performance/facacadstaff/format.htm
   - Sample Performance Review Letters
     http://hr.msu.edu/performance/facacadstaff/sampleLetters.htm
   - Performance Reviews
     http://hr.msu.edu/performance/facacadstaff/facreviews.htm
   - Strategies for Faculty Development
     http://hr.msu.edu/performance/facacadstaff/strategies.htm
   - Guidelines for Academic Unit Peer Review Committee Composition
     http://hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/peerReviewUnit.htm

3. Annual Evaluation of Chairpersons/Directors from the MSU Faculty Handbook:
   http://hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/annualeval.htm
   The policy states that a copy of the evaluation instrument (criteria) currently used by each dean (director) in annual evaluations MUST be filed with the Office of the Provost prior to each annual cycle of evaluations.

4. Post-Tenure Review Policy from the MSU Faculty Handbook:
   http://hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/posttenure.htm
   Michigan State University has not adopted a distinct separate policy on the review of faculty following the award of tenure. Post-tenure review is implemented through several existing policies and procedures (contained in the Faculty Handbook), including a clarifying interpretation by the University Committee on Faculty Tenure on the meaning of the term “incompetence” in the disciplinary and dismissal policies. Performance is monitored through the use of annual written performance evaluations as required by the policy on “Faculty Review.” Work performance, as determined in such reviews, is to be reflected in annual merit salary adjustments and as a basis for advice and suggestions for improvement. Although not triggered by a fixed number of years of low performance, discipline in a variety of forms may be invoked under the “Policy for Implementing Disciplinary Action where Dismissal is Not Sought.” In more serious cases, “the Dismissal of Tenured Faculty for Cause Procedure” can be invoked. This procedure involves notice and a
formal hearing involving review by peers. Interpretation of the term “incompetence” by the University Committee on Faculty Tenure includes an expectation for professional development support and review by peers before disciplinary or dismissal action is contemplated. More information is available on the history of post-tenure review deliberations.

* Note that information concerning the Post-Tenure review policies and practices can also be found in the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Toolkit.

5. **Faculty Career Advancement and Professional Development: A Special Affirmative Action Responsibility**
   
   [http://hr.msu.edu/documents/facadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/careeradvance.htm](http://hr.msu.edu/documents/facadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/careeradvance.htm)

6. **Programs and Workshops on Faculty Performance Evaluation and Faculty Orientation – Offered by the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development** [http://fod.msu.edu/](http://fod.msu.edu/)
CHECKLIST OF BEST PRACTICES FOR FACULTY ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW
(For Unit Chairs & Directors)

The critical prerequisites for effective faculty evaluation are:
- Unit goals and objectives related to University and college goals
- A fair and equitable faculty workload policy
- Performance standards that define excellence in teaching, research/creative activities, outreach, and service
- Performance expectations for each faculty member consistent with unit goals and objectives
- An effective annual activity reporting method

More specifically, chairs should consider the following:

- Develop a written set of unit goals to be used in annual performance evaluation that are shared with and made readily available to all faculty members.
- Consider having the faculty (or a subgroup) review and update these goals annually.
- Develop a faculty workload policy that is communicated to all faculty members.
- Communicate the workloads for annual evaluation to the faculty prior to submission of materials and make them readily available to all faculty members.
- Establish a set of performance criteria and standards for teaching, scholarly output, service, and outreach and engagement (where appropriate) that are clearly communicated to each faculty member.
- Consider the value and level of involvement in disciplinary/professional societies or organizations (e.g., research presentations, committee and/or leadership roles) that is appropriate for the faculty member’s career stage.
- Disseminate clearly described methods for evaluating excellence to the faculty prior to the submission of annual performance review materials.
- Involve faculty members in setting expectations for themselves during performance reviews.
- Discuss prior year performance review and goals with the faculty member during the annual performance review process.
- Use performance evaluation results in determining merit raises and indicate the relationship between performance evaluation results and a merit salary increase in the raise letter.
- Involve the faculty, directly or through department/school faculty advisory committee
- Utilize annual performance evaluations to develop career development plans (3 – 5 years) for all faculty members.
- Utilize annual performance evaluations to develop a program for career development for and with for a subset of the faculty.
Provide guidance on progress toward reappointment, promotion and/or tenure where appropriate.

Provide guidance related to expectations for RPT decisions in annual performance evaluation and clearly state these suggestions in the review letter where appropriate.

Use annual performance evaluations to identify training and mentoring opportunities to help faculty members reach career goals.

Include sabbatical leaves in discussions of career planning and development during the review process, as appropriate.

Encourage faculty members to self-appraise during the annual performance review process.

For faculty members with a joint appointment in another unit(s), seek input from the other unit(s) in the annual performance review and in performance management. Expectations of jointly appointed faculty provided in the Multiple Appointment Memorandum should be reviewed and applied during the performance evaluation.

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

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

When finalizing the appraisal, the primary evaluator should:

- Review the prior year’s performance
- Indicate areas needing improvement
- Indicate progress toward reappointment/promotion/tenure when relevant
- Indicate other developmental issues and identify opportunities and directions important in light of department needs and/or faculty performance.

Performance feedback meetings should be held with all faculty members.
As relevant to your unit, include discussions of the following in performance feedback meetings:

- Draft letter of appraisal that is provided before or at the beginning of the meeting
- Faculty performance (rather than personality)
- Specific issues
- Questions from the faculty member
- Coaches/mentors/ helpers, as necessary
- A positive plan for future development including leadership development, opportunities for new faculty members.

Final performance review letters should include the following (as relevant to context):

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

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

- Recognize and reward exemplary performance with merit raises and reappointment or promotion consideration
- Recognize and reward exemplary performance with differential assignments
- Address the needs of the underperforming faculty members and develop a plan for improvement
- Help with faculty development and concerns about teaching, scholarship, service, and outreach and engagement, where appropriate.
- Develop and refine a request for a sabbatical leave
CHECKLIST OF BEST PRACTICES FOR ADVANCEMENT OF MID-CAREER FACULTY (ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS)
(For Unit Chairs & Directors)

____ Discuss faculty members’ plans and goals and approaches for reaching the goals - Determine if working toward promotion to full professor.
____ Define clear expectations for achieving rank of full professor.
____ Review current projects and whether these projects will help with promotion.
____ Consider providing mentoring to assist in meeting expectations for promotion.
____ Develop a plan that is reviewed annually or more frequently.
____ Discuss and provide in writing specific performance expectations for the next academic year.
____ Consider having the mid-career faculty member join a new research team or collaboration.
____ Provide faculty member with a coach to assist with networking or needed
____ Encourage faculty member to participate in development workshops.
____ Nominate faculty member for professional development opportunities, e.g. CIC ALP, Disciplinary Fellowships, etc.
____ Encourage and promote opportunities for less productive faculty members to interact with higher performing faculty members.
____ Encourage sabbaticals when appropriate to “retool”
____ Consider course releases to allow faculty members to retool or refocus.
____ Consider new course assignments or adjusting teaching schedule to allow for retooling.
____ Encourage mid-career faculty members by nominating for awards and other recognition.
____ Consider providing bridge funding if a clear program for refocusing has been developed.
____ Provide incentives and additional resources for refocusing [new teaching assignments (e.g. online courses, clerical support, undergraduate assistants) as a way of helping faculty retool].
____ Provide opportunities for involvement in disciplinary societies, including leadership opportunities.
CHECKLIST OF BEST PRACTICES FOR CONSTRUCTIVE FEEDBACK DURING PERFORMANCE REVIEW
(For Unit Chairs & Directors)

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

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

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

_____ Provide SPECIFIC feedback.

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

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

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

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

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

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

12
Use feedback to both share information and solicit input from the faculty member receiving feedback.

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

Provide the appropriate amount and level of feedback. For example, there can be too much feedback at one time, so there may be a need to prioritize and schedule follow up sessions.

To ensure clear communication, explain or restate the feedback in multiple ways to make sure what you express is understood by the receiver to reduce chances of disagreement with the message you intended.

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

Discuss the consequences of the feedback with the faculty member.

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

Adapted from A Handbook for Faculty Development Volume I
The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975, pp. 224-225
CHECKLIST OF BEST PRACTICES FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW PROCESS
(For Individual Faculty Members - Modify as Appropriate for Department or Unit)

After Initial Appointment at the University:
_____ Upon initial appointment, if you are not provided with then, you should ask for information on the performance review process, including criteria that will be used in the annual review process and what materials must be submitted to evaluate performance.
_____ Make sure the expected workloads are clearly communicated to you prior to the start of the evaluation period.
_____ Make sure you are informed of the methods for evaluating excellence prior to the evaluation process.
_____ Make sure you are informed of any performance appraisal tool used during the annual performance evaluation process, including the expectations measured by the tool.
_____ Ask clarifying questions to ensure that you understand the evaluation criteria and take the time to restate the criteria you have heard in your own words to check that you have heard and understood the key information.

Prior to faculty review:
_____ If not scheduled by the chair/director, arrange a meeting to discuss performance evaluation with the department chair or unit head (or appropriate review committee).
_____ Update and submit an updated copy of CV prior to review meeting. Take copy of updated CV to the meeting.
_____ Review Annual performance review documentation submitted at time of the request for review materials.
_____ Review last written performance evaluation.
_____ Review the Unit bylaws.

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

Scholarly Output (STEM example):
- What is expected in terms of scholarly output? (examples include numbers of papers, books, performances, grants proposals submitted, grants awarded etc.)
- How is the quality of scholarly work evaluated? (examples include: quality of journals published, critical reviews of books or performances, awards received, invitations to speak at meetings/other universities, awarding of external grants, etc.)
How is this work evaluated in relationship to other faculty members in the unit? (examples include: average number or range of proposals accepted; average dollar amount of each proposal)

What will be expected of me regarding scholarly output in the next year and at the time of reappointment or for promotion? Scholarship quality? As compared to others in the unit?

Teaching:
- What is the average SIRS score for a same level course in this department (i.e. 200 level, 300 level, graduate level)?
- Where can I obtain assistance to help develop my teaching skills?
- How is the quality of my teaching evaluated?
- What changes are expected in my teaching load and quality of my teaching in the future?
- Would you be supportive of me attending courses to develop my teaching, such as those sponsored by FOD? Ask about other opportunities for development of teaching skills.
- Ask about department and college views regarding teaching with technology.
- Ask about goals for student learning, how they are valued by the unit and how they are supported.

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

Clinical Activities:
- For clinical faculty what are the expectations related to my clinical activities and how will they be evaluated?

Leadership:
- What are the expectations for faculty members to pursue leadership within the discipline and/or within academia and how are they evaluated?
- What opportunities are there to develop leadership skills and would they be encouraged and supported?

Areas for improvement:
- Do you have suggestions for how to improve in specific areas that were identified as needing improvement?
Can we discuss a plan for professional development?
What are your future expectations of me? (Make sure you provide input into setting future expectations.)
How might we continue these discussions throughout the year to make sure I am on track?

Does your evaluation letter include:

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

After reviewing the evaluation letter:

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

“...if, after receiving the written review, the faculty member disagrees with its content or chooses to provide additional documentation or comment, the faculty member shall have an opportunity to respond to the review. Any additional written faculty comment and/or documentation which is submitted within one month of receipt of the written review shall become part of the documentation for the review. The full documentation for this written review, including the faculty member’s response, shall be placed in the faculty member’s unit personnel file.”
CHECKLIST OF BEST PRACTICES
FOR MID-CAREER FACULTY MEMBER ADVANCEMENT
(For Individual Faculty Members)

- Develop career goals as well as plans and approaches for reaching the goals
- Request from unit administrator or appropriate unit committee the expectations for achieving rank of full professor.
- Meet with unit administrator(s) and review career plans and current projects; discuss whether these projects will help with promotion and with meeting career goals
- Perhaps in consultation with unit administrator consider identifying mentor(s) to assist in meeting expectations for promotion
- Consider identifying a coach to assist with networking or with needed skills
- Participate in development workshops. Ask unit administrator for information about college and University workshops
- Participate in other professional development opportunities, e.g., those offered by disciplinary societies, funding agencies, etc.
- Consider department and college leadership opportunities
- Consider joining a new research team or collaboration
- Consider a sabbatical to “retool”*
- Request a course release to retool or refocus.
- Request new course assignments (especially a graduate course to stay fresh or online teaching) or adjusting teaching schedule to allow for retooling.
- Request bridge funding after developing a clear program for refocusing.
- Request incentives and additional resources for refocusing (e.g., clerical support, undergraduate assistants)
- Consider specific shorter term projects that will assist in reaching career goals (e.g., short courses, short visits with potential collaborators)
- Evaluate priorities with increased demands made for university service and professional activities (e.g., service on editorial boards, offices in professional organizations, service on grant review panels, etc.)

Other advice:

- Be open to new approaches – listen to graduate students.
- Participate in unit/college/university committees
- Pursue and/or request leadership roles and participate in leadership development opportunities, e.g., Workshops for Faculty Leaders, Academic Governance, Assistant/Associate Chair Roles, Task Force Activities, etc.

*Note that a sabbatical leave is intended for the mutual benefit of the university and the faculty member and is not granted automatically (see faculty handbook: http://www.hr.msu.edu/timoffleave/facacadstaff/SabblImplementation.htm)
EXAMPLES OF FACULTY ANNUAL SELF-REVIEW FORMS
USED BY DEPARTMENT OF PHYSIOLOGY
AND DEPARTMENT OF PLANT BIOLOGY
The questions listed below are designed to help prepare for an effective performance evaluation by the Chair and the Physiology Advisory Committee (PAC). The following questions are intended to stimulate a dialog. Depending on whether the questions are relevant to your current situation, please feel free to respond or not respond. Please return this form to Carolyn Fleck (fleckc@msu.edu) prior to your scheduled appointment. Feel free to reference attached material (e.g. CVs and bibliography) if appropriate.

RESEARCH

1. List publications giving complete citation and including numbers.

2. List publications accepted but not yet published giving publisher or journal and scheduled publication date.

3. List other scholarly and research activity (e.g. editorships, referee of research articles, study-sections, invited talks, consultantships, etc.)

4. Please list current and pending grant support.
TEACHING
1. List course number, title and number of lecture hours for each term.
   (Note: Scheduled discussion, review or laboratory (but not examinations)
   count as one lecture equivalent per two hours of activity).

2. List number of students whom you advise (e.g. undergraduate, graduate,
   professional).

3. List other teaching activity (including course and curriculum development).

SERVICE
1. List relevant service activities outside the university.

2. List department, college, university committees and other activities.

3. Did you have any departmental, college or university administrative activity
during 2008?
SELF-APPRaisal

1. What are your most significant accomplishments for the past year?

2. Are there areas in which you feel you need to improve?

3. Do you feel that you need assistance in your professional development in the next year; and if yes, how? Can the chair and departmental staff assist in your development?

4. Do you have any suggestions or other comments regarding the chair, the departmental staff or other matters related to department operations?
DEPARTMENT OF PLANT BIOLOGY

FACULTY SELF-APPRAISAL FORM 2006
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

The questions listed below are designed to help prepare for an effective performance evaluation. The questions are only a mechanism to stimulate a dialog for our meeting.

1. What are your most significant accomplishments for the past year?

2. Are there areas in which you feel you need to improve?

3. Do you feel that you need assistance in your professional development in the next year, and how?

4. Do you have capabilities or capacity that are/is not being utilized in your present situation?

5. How can you prepare yourself for this work?

6. How can the department assist in your development?

7. Additional comments:
This document provides a summary of University policies but does not replace University Policies which are referenced by web addresses for the relevant sections in the Faculty Handbook.

This a working draft. Please send any feedback to adapp@msu.edu or complete the on-line feedback form at www.adapp-advance.msu.edu. It is expected that units/departments could modify this guide to meet the unique needs of their contexts.
WACP Committee Members:

I am pleased to share with you a list of ADAPP-ADVANCE sponsored & co-sponsored events for Fall 2010. I have attached detailed descriptions of each event, along with the date/time, location and registration information.

The ADAPP-ADVANCE team looks forward to being in communication with your committee with you throughout the academic year.

Sincerely,
Title: Success in the Academic Hiring Process From Start to Finish
Date: Thursday, September 16th, 2010
Time: 8:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. (Registration at 8:00 a.m., Program starts at 8:30 a.m.)
Location: Kellogg Center, Red Cedar Rooms
For: Department Chairs and Search Committees
Presenters: Theodore H. Curry II, Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Human Resources, MSU; co-PI on NSF ADVANCE grant.
Paulette Granberry Russell, Senior Advisor to the President for Diversity, Director, Office for Inclusion & Intercultural Initiatives, MSU; Member, Grant Management Team, NSF ADVANCE grant.
Mark Roehling, Associate Professor, Human Resources and Labor Relations, MSU; co-PI on NSF ADVANCE grant.
Kristine Zayko, Deputy General Counsel, MSU

The search process demonstrates the University’s institutional values and its quest for excellence. There are few activities that can have a more powerful public impact than a search. If done well, it reflects on the institution and leaves in its wake hundreds of candidates whose impression of the University will be based on its timeliness, courtesy and professionalism. MSU’s academic hiring procedures are intended to ensure that colleges and departments hire the best complement of faculty and academic staff, and advance diversity of the University’s academic workforce. This workshop will identify (1) the role that administrators and search committees play in achieving these goals; 2) the procedures to be followed; 3) where the breakdown in the process often occurs, the resulting delays, and their impact on new hires; and 4) negative consequences of bad searches. Appropriate use of search procedure waivers and spousal/partner appointment support will also be discussed. Particular attention will be given to the challenges and opportunities in the recruitment of a more diverse tenure system faculty at MSU.

Through the use of case studies, participants will have an opportunity to explore proven strategies and systemic planning for successful and inclusive hiring. The case studies build on the University’s academic hiring procedures and will include discussions on effective preparation of the search committee, drafting the position description, recruiting candidates, evaluating curriculum vitae, conducting interviews, evaluating candidates, and how a range of factors, including bias, impact institutional goals. Search committee members are encouraged to attend this workshop along with school directors and department chairs.

Co-sponsored with Faculty & Organizational Development.
Register at http://fod.msu.edu/wfl/registeronline.asp
Imposter Syndrome refers to the belief that achievements are the result of luck, charm, or other external factors despite substantial evidence to the contrary. Described as “more than ordinary self-doubt and more complex than simply faking it until you make it,” it’s identified as a chronic feeling “related to areas of achievement and feeling undeserving of success” (Falcon, 2009). And, it’s a topic that almost everyone can relate to, particularly graduate and professional students.

In this interactive workshop, Dr. Valerie Young will help participants:

- Understand the common coping mechanisms “impostors” use to avoid being “found out,” why they work, and at what cost. Some of these coping mechanisms include procrastination, not getting articles/grant applications out the door.

- How race, class and gender can and do contribute to feelings of fraudulence (hint: it’s not “all in your head”)

- How to stop the perfectionism, procrastination, and chronic self-doubt standing between you and your goals

Dr. Young touches on the very real professional and personal consequences of imposter syndrome including procrastination, self-doubt, and fear, and strategies for overcoming it.

Co-sponsored with The Graduate School.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Establishing the Family-Friendly Campus: Models for Effective Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: Thursday, October 14, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 1:45 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Registration at 1:45 p.m.; program begins at 2:00 p.m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Kellogg Center, Red Cedar Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For: All faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Presenters: Jaime Lester, Assistant Professor, Higher Education, George Mason University  
Margaret Sallee, Assistant Professor, Higher Education, University of Tennessee |

Although colleges and universities have implemented a variety of policies to help faculty members balance their personal and professional lives, little attention has been given to determining which are the most effective, and which can be deemed "best practices". Moreover, little research has been conducted on the need for family-friendly policies for students and administrators in higher education. Most of the current practices are being developed in isolation with little evidence of their effectiveness.

This interactive workshop will be based on the presenters’ recent book, entitled, Establishing the Family-Friendly Campus (2009), that examined the need for family-friendly policies and documented the "best practices" currently being implemented.

By participating in this session, attendees will be able to identify:

- Characteristics of a family-friendly campus;
- "Best practices" and how these practices can be implemented; and
- How campuses promote the use of these policies and create more family-friendly environments.

Co-sponsored with Faculty & Organizational Development
Register at [http://fod.msu.edu/lead/registeronline.asp](http://fod.msu.edu/lead/registeronline.asp)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Conversation with Provost Kim A. Wilcox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: Wednesday, October 20, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 8:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Kellogg Center, Big Ten C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For: All MSU academic learners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This session will provide an occasion for Provost Kim Wilcox (PI of NSF ADVANCE Grant) to interact with MSU academic leaders about current issues, challenges, and opportunities.

Register at [http://fod.msu.edu/lead/registeronline.asp](http://fod.msu.edu/lead/registeronline.asp)
**Title:** Project Management: Reconsidering Projects  
**Date:** Thursday, October 21, 2010  
**Time:** 2:00 p.m. – 5 p.m.  
**Location:** MSU Union, Lake Superior Room  
**For:** Mid-career and senior faculty*  

OR

**Date:** Friday October 22, 2010  
**Time:** 8:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.  
**Location:** MSU Union, Gold Room  
**For:** Early career faculty, post docs and graduate students*  
**Presenter:** David A. Schmaltz, Author, The Blind Men and the Elephant-Mastering Project Work (Berrett-Koehler 2003)

Early career faculty are welcome to attend the first session if they are unable to attend the second. Mid-career and senior faculty are welcome to attend the second session if they cannot attend the first.

Project work is widely misunderstood. “Best practices” in project management routinely fail to effectively regulate research and other information-intensive efforts, frustrating everyone involved. How might you resolve this dilemma? In this workshop, you will reconsider what project work means in the context of your particular assignments and develop a shared model for deriving useful alternatives. Expect to leave with immediately applicable insights for resolving your current project challenges and new perspectives for considering future ones.

**Key Topics:**
- Discovering the “real” objective related to your research goals
- Finding YOUR project within your project assignment—OK for grad students and postdocs, but not for faculty
- Getting the most out of those who work with you
- What do you do when you don’t know what to do?
- Creating robust communities
- The ethical responsibilities of project work
  
Copies of The Blind Men and the Elephant-Mastering Project Work will be distributed at the seminar.

This program is co-sponsored by Faculty & Organizational Development and the NSF CAFFE grant (#0931823) and F&OD.

Register at [http://fod.msu.edu/wfl/registeronline.asp](http://fod.msu.edu/wfl/registeronline.asp)
Title: Climate and Culture at MSU – What the NSF ADAPP - ADVANCE Grant Work-Environment Survey Tells Leaders and What Can be Done to Improve Climate and Culture

Date: Thursday, October 28, 2010
Time: 8:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. (Registration starts at 8:00 a.m., program starts at 8:30 a.m.)
Location: Kellogg Center, Red Cedar Rooms
For: MSU faculty and leadership
Presenters: Theodore H. Curry II, Associate Provost and Associate Vice President, Academic Human Resources, Co-PI, MSU NSF ADAPP ADVANCE Grant, MSU
Paulette Granberry Russell, Senior Advisor to the President for Diversity, Director, Office for Inclusion & Intercultural Initiatives, MSU
Mark Roehling, Associate Professor, Human Resources and Labor Relations; Co-PI, MSU NSF ADAPP ADVANCE Grant, MSU

A positive work environment is essential for the recruitment, retention and advancement of the highest quality faculty at MSU. In Spring 2009, a work environment survey was completed by MSU tenure system and fixed term faculty. This survey, supported by MSU's ADVANCE grant, provides MSU with concrete data about faculty perceptions regarding MSU as a place to work and advance. The survey results are being used to inform strategic program and policy discussions and decisions at MSU and will help MSU administrators and faculty leaders understand and improve the climate and culture of their units. Participants in the program will learn key findings from the MSU survey, their implications, and approaches to creating and sustaining a supportive climate and culture at MSU.

Register at http://fod.msu.edu/lead/registeronline.asp
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Pathways to Success: Leadership in Professional Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Tuesday, November 30, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>8:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. (Registration at 8:00 a.m., Program begins at 8:30 a.m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Kellogg Center, Red Cedar Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For:</td>
<td>All faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator:</td>
<td>Dr. Ann Austin, Director, Institute for Higher Education in the Global Context; Professor, Higher, Adult and Lifelong Education, MSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Holding a leadership role in a professional association is productive and often assists career success, especially in the STEM disciplines. This finding is supported by research conducted both at MSU as part of the NSF ADAPP ADVANCE grant and national surveys. The purpose of this program is to provide examples from among our MSU colleagues who have held leadership roles in their professional associations and who feel that it has served them well. The presenters will share:

- Why and how they became involved with their professional associations;
- What roles they held;
- The leadership skills they needed to succeed in these roles and the leadership skills they developed as a result of their engagement;
- The impact of their leadership roles on their professional lives; and
- Their lessons learned with regard to holding leadership roles.

Session format involves a panel of faculty who have held leadership roles in professional associations. This session will include time for discussion and questions and answers.

Register at [http://fod.msu.edu/lead/registeronline.asp](http://fod.msu.edu/lead/registeronline.asp)