INITIATIVE-WIDE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Continued to develop and implement robust evaluation (formative and summative) plan. Over a two-day period this fall (9/8, 9/9), the team from the Ohio Center for the Evaluation and Assessment of Mathematics and Science Education visited East Lansing. Meetings were held to develop an agenda for the next stage of data collection and analysis of the ADAPP-ADVANCE project. Meetings were held on the following topics:
  - A statistical model that would serve to model indicators of retention at Michigan State.
  - The future of AHR data at Michigan State.
  - Data gathering strategy related to understanding the experience of underrepresented faculty at Michigan State University.

- Developed a new position, Assistant Director of ADAPP-ADVANCE for Research and Communications. The professional in this position will split his or her time between dissemination of ADAPP-ADVANCE innovations, and designing research projects to better understand the experience of under-represented faculty at MSU.

- Continued efforts to build a university-wide FEA Consortium at MSU. A meeting of this group was held on September 20, 2010. In January of 2011, each college at Michigan State (with the exception of the College of Law) will have a Faculty Excellence Advocate in place. Estelle met with the Deans and FEAs of two new colleges, Music (on 11-23) and Communication Arts and Science (on 11-24) to give an overview and current status of the ADAPP initiative, highlighting the resources available, and the development of the FEA Consortium and its role in continuing to provide an overview of current policies and best practices in AHR. Similar meetings with Deans of the remaining four new colleges (Education, James Madison, the Residential College in the Arts and Humanities, and Business) will occur in December and January. It should be noted that the Provost is funding 25% of the salaries of the FEAs in the non-ADVANCE colleges – a commitment of over $1M!

- Hosted an event that facilitated an integrated discussion (cross-units) about family-friendly policies on campus. (http://www.fod.msu.edu/lead/schedule.asp). The guests were Margaret Sallee and Jamie Lester.
• Communication / Dissemination

  o On October 28, 2010, Paulette Granberry-Russell, Mark Roehling and Terry Curry held a workshop for chairs entitled, *Climate and Culture at MSU – What the NSF ADAPP1 ADVANCE Grant Work-Environment Survey Tells Leaders and What Can be Done to Improve Climate and Culture*. 45 people attended. Dr. Sarah Woodruff (evaluator) participated as well, providing input on analysis of the data.

  o Project PI Kim Wilcox held a conversation with the university chairs/directors on October 20, 2010. Much of the presentation focused on issues related to diversity at Michigan State.

  o New web page and university-wide newsletter designed (http://adapp-advance.wwwdev.egr.msu.edu).

  o ADAPP Co-PIs and director attended the 2010 ADVANCE Co-PI meeting from November 7 through November 9. Presented poster (Attachment A) and participated in a breakfast meeting of the mid-west ADVANCE grant recipients.

  o Annual Review and RPT toolkits re-printed and will be distributed to all tenure-stream faculty.

• 3 project FEAs met with ACT on September 21, 2010 to discuss upcoming FEA Consortium meeting.

• Scholarly Outputs:

  o Melissa McDaniels developed and led a symposium at the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) meeting entitled, “The Reciprocity among Higher Education Scholarship, Practice, and Policy: The Potential Revealed through the National Science Foundation ADVANCE grant program”. Participants included: Adrianna Kezar (USC), Kelly Ward (Washington State), and KerryAnn O’Meara (Maryland). Alex McCormick (Director, National Survey of Student Engagement) was a respondent. Approximately 50 people in attendance. A provocative conversation about the role that organizational theory has in successful proposals and/or implementation was held.

• Preparation for 3rd Year Site Visit. Attended the session about preparing for the 3rd year site visit at the ADVANCE program PI meeting. The administrative team has scheduled rooms for meetings during the visit, scheduled sessions on senior administrators’ calendars, reserved laptop computers, and reserved housing for the site visit team. The outline of the visit is in draft form. The evaluation team will come to campus February 2-4 to facilitate a retreat to prepare the GMT for a visit, and to discuss the collection of
more data.

**COLLEGE-BASED ACCOMPLISHMENTS** (as reported by each FEA)

- **Engineering**
  
  - The College of Engineering Department Chairs and search committee chairs were encouraged to attend a new workshop on “Success in the Academic Hiring Process from Start to Finish: What Chairs and Search Committees Need to Know.” This workshop, held on September 16, 2010, was co-sponsored by the ADAPP ADVANCE Grant, the Office for Inclusion & Intercultural Initiative and MSU F&OD. The majority of faculty searches in the College of Engineering are currently frozen due to budget constraints. Nevertheless, the workshop was attended by the FEA, several Engineering Chairs and faculty, and the College administrator for budget and human resources.
  
  - The faculty were encouraged to attend seminars and workshops organized by the ADAPP ADVANCE Grant. They include the seminar “Overcoming Impostor Syndrome” by Valerie Young, and workshops on “Pathways to Success: Leadership in Professional Associations” and “Survive and Thrive in the MSU Tenure System.”
  
  - The FEA, the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, and four of the five Engineering Chairs participated in the workshop on “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.” The workshop was held on October 28, 2010.
  
  - The Annual Performance Review Toolkit and the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Toolkit were distributed to the junior faculty who attended the College of Engineering New Faculty Orientation at the beginning of fall semester.
  
  - The annual reporting of faculty activity in the College of Engineering is done through our web-based Faculty Activity Information System (FAIS). The system was recently modified to include a new category that specifically addresses participation in leadership and developmental opportunities within the college/university and outside MSU. This addition will allow us get a better picture of the extent our women and diverse faculty are accessing opportunities in these areas.
  
  - A mechanism was created to formally recognize exceptional faculty mentoring. As part of our existing annual College of Engineering Withrow Awards, faculty may now be nominated for a Withrow Exceptional Service Award for their exceptional work in mentoring faculty.
  
  - A new program was launched for child care support for faculty travel to conferences. This program provides financial support for our probationary tenure system faculty with
primary care responsibility who require child care by a child care provider, other than a family member, when the faculty needs to attend professional conferences to present research papers.

- A new program was launched for infant care support for graduate students. This program provides a one-time support for our graduate students with primary care responsibility towards cost sharing for an infant up to one year of age for child support by a licensed child care provider other than a family member.

- The College’s women faculty were invited to a luncheon meeting on November 18. Dean Udpa, the FEA, and the faculty discussed the current activities of the ADAPP project and other issues of concern to the faculty.

• Natural Science

- As described in our previous report, a major focus in the college this year is on the annual review process, and activities in this area are outlined below. Other activities related to new faculty searches are also described.

- Annual Review/Reappointment Promotion and Tenure (RPT)
  - The college held an RPT workshop for untenured faculty in the college on September 16. Dean James Kirkpatrick, Associate Dean Sekhar Chivukula, and FEA Susan Conrad were in attendance, along with several recently tenured faculty and members of the college RPT committee. In addition to an open question and answer period, the following three items were discussed and distributed: the Annual Review and RPT toolkits prepared by the ADVANCE team, a list of links to web sites with relevant college/university policies (Attachment B, prepared by S. Chivulkula), and a timeline to promotion and tenure (Attachment C, originally prepared by W. Esselman, Chair of MMG).
  - Associate Dean Chivukula prepared a draft of a template to be used for the annual review process in CNS (Attachment D). This draft was reviewed by Dean Kirkpatrick, S. Conrad and other associate deans, and the resulting document was discussed at a monthly Chairs/Directors meeting. Following those discussions and further revisions, the current draft was circulated to all faculty members in the college for comments. We expect it to be implemented this spring.

- Faculty Search
  - FEA Susan Conrad met with search committees in the college, or chairs of search committees in cases where the entire committee was not yet formed, in order to discuss ADVANCE activities relative to the search
process and to provide the draft Faculty Search Toolkit once it was available. Specific searches included the following:

- Science and Math Education (departmental home to be determined).
- Director of a new Institute for Research in Math and Science Education (joint between CNS and College of Education).
- Department of Statistics and Probability
- Department of Mathematics
- Physics/Chemistry joint search
- Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology

- Social Science

  - During this quarter, most of our college activities have focused on mentoring programs for junior faculty. We have communicated information about mentoring to Chairs and Directors by email and during biweekly meetings. This quarter’s focus on mentoring builds upon ongoing efforts in the CSS to enhance the mentoring programs in each of our units.

  - Specific actions taken this quarter include:

    - The Dean met individually with the Chair of Psychology and Director of Social Work to discuss the proposed College Mentoring Pilot and to develop next steps.
    - The Deans, FEA Team, and Chairs and Directors discussed the Provost’s draft Mentoring Policy at a Chairs and Directors meeting, and the Dean described the College Mentoring Pilot to the Chairs and Directors.
    - The Dean talked with ADAPP leaders to secure funding to support the Mentoring Pilot.
    - The Department of Psychology developed a document describing their department’s proposed Mentoring Pilot and requesting funding support.
    - The Director of Social Work has engaged in meetings with FOD to develop their unit’s program.
    - The College, as well as the units involved in the pilot programs, have committed to a careful evaluation of these programs. Experts within each unit will conduct this evaluation with consultation from Ohio Center for the Evaluation and Assessment of Mathematics and Science Education (the ADAPP evaluators). We expect that this evaluation will feed back to help improve each pilot in the future. We also expect that it will lead to program development in other units within our college and perhaps across the university.
    - In addition to the mentoring of junior faculty, the college also recognized another mentoring need. In conversations with Chairs and Directors, it became obvious that, with significant turnover in these positions, there
was need for some leadership mentoring. Dean Baba suggested that an ad hoc group of chairs/directors discuss a means by which new chairs/directors can talk to senior chairs/directors for informal mentoring. The chairs/directors agreed to bring this together.

- Although we are doing very limited hiring this year, members of the FEA team met with the chair of the search committee in Sociology. Also attending this meeting was a member of the ADAPP grant management team (Mark Roehling). We went over the toolkit developed by the ADAPP team in the area of faculty searches and integrated this information with applicable college procedures and policies. We stressed the importance of having all of the search committee members informed about the appropriate policy, procedures, and best practices as described in the toolkit.

- Finally, as one of the ADAPP core colleges, we continued to provide leadership in the expanded FEA group and to the larger group of university administrators. During this past quarter a member of our FEA team made short presentations about college-level activities to the expanded FEA group and to a university LEAD seminar.

**PROJECT-BASED ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

**Faculty Search**

- Phone conference with Cynthia Hudgins, University of Michigan ADVANCE grant, to discuss faculty search training (9/1)

- Meeting with search committee in the College of Human Medicine to review the faculty search process and answer questions (9/2)

- Success in the Academic Hiring Process from Start to Finish: What Chairs and Search Committees Need to Know (9/16/10) ([http://www.fod.msu.edu/wfl/schedule.asp](http://www.fod.msu.edu/wfl/schedule.asp)). 60 faculty members attended.
  - Theodore H. Curry, Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Human Resources
  - Paulette Granberry Russell, Senior Advisor to the President for Diversity, Director, Office for Inclusion & Intercultural Initiatives
  - Mark Roehling, Associate Professor, Human Resources and Labor Relations
  - Kristine Zayko, Deputy General Counsel

- Several conversations with Dr. Kathy Petroni Deloitte, head of search committee for the Michael Licata Professor of Accounting position. (9/23, 9/25, 9/27).
- Meeting with Steve Gold (search committee chair), Pam Gray, Bob Caldwell, and to
discuss the search for a new chair of the Sociology Department. Provided Steve and Pam
copies of the Faculty Search Toolkit, reviewed its lists with them, and solicited their
input (9/30)

- Revised Faculty Search Toolkit based on input from College of Social Sciences (10/1)

- Per request of Dean Ames and Dean Kirkpatrick I met with the search committee for a
permanent director of the Institute for Research on Math and Science Education to
discuss the faculty search process. The search committee members were provided
copies of the Faculty Search Toolkit and encourage to contact ADAPP if they had further
questions or would like additional assistance (11/15)

- Responded to follow-up request from Dr. Suzanne M Wilson, Chair Department of
Teacher Education, for copies of Faculty Search Toolkit, and again extended an offer to
meet to further discuss the toolkit. Input regarding the toolkit from Dr. Wilson was
solicited (11/23)

Leadership

- ADAPP Symposium Speaker Series

  - The GMT identified two individuals for the spring series - Dr. Ella Bell and Dr. Neena
Schwartz – both would focus on mentoring. The intent is to schedule both
individuals for spring 2011 semester in conjunction with the roll-out of the
University-Wide mentoring policy and program. Dr. Schwartz is being contacted by
Cheryl Sisk and Sue Conrad, both faculty in Natural Science. ADAPP is working with
these faculty to arrange her visit.

  - Unfortunately, we were unsuccessful in scheduling a speaker for fall 2010. However,
numerous other programs were conducted by ADAPP in fall 2010 as discussed in the
following section.

- Workshops

  - Overview –

    - The ADAPP leadership group co-planned and sponsored several
workshops/programs in fall 2010. Along with each of these workshops,
an ADAPP evaluation tool was developed around the objectives of the
session; these evaluations were developed in consolation with our Ohio
Evaluation Team. At the conclusion of each session, the evaluations were
administered and collected (Sample in Attachment E). In addition, to
document the level of impact of the workshop, a follow-up assessment
survey was sent 6 weeks post workshop. The purpose of this follow-up survey was to determine if the information/techniques/strategies taught or discussed in the session were used in the last 6 weeks by the faculty member.

- When available, the results of these evaluations are provided in the appendices.

- Project Management: Reconsidering Projects (9/21/2010)
  - Two sessions – mid-career/senior faculty (27 faculty) & early career faculty/grad students (22 faculty/grad students).
  - This seminar addressed 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). The rationale behind two sessions of this seminar, one for senior faculty and one for junior faculty/grads/post-docs, was that the early career faculty needs are focused more on lab management and smaller projects while the more senior established faculty were focused on management of large research grants or projects.
  - Evaluation attached (Attachment F)

- Pathways to Success: Leadership in Professional Associations (11/30/10)
  - Moderator/Presenter: Ann Austin, Director, Institute for Higher Education in the Global Context; Professor, Higher, Adult and Lifelong Education, MSU
  - Panel of faculty who have held leadership roles 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.
  - Evaluation: Not yet conducted.

- Overcoming Imposter Syndrome (10/1/2010)
  - Dr. Valerie Young
  - Workshop for Faculty
  - Collaboration with MSU’s Innovation through Institutional Integration grant.
• Her talk centered on understanding the common coping mechanisms "impostors" use to avoid being "found out," why they work, and at what cost. Coping mechanisms such as procrastination can result in not getting articles or grant applications submitted.

• Evaluation results attached (Attachment G)

  o Future Workshop for Early Career Faculty -- January 27, 2011
  How to make your disciplinary society work for you
  • Particular focus will be given to the role of the disciplinary society in the tenure process -- practical tips and techniques will be provided and practiced with regard to interactions and involvement in the disciplinary society. The goal was 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 their field through the use of their disciplinary society. Co-PI Bush has helped develop the presentation materials and the format of the session in conjunction with facilitators Drs. Butterfield and Tucker (they ran the negotiation session last year that received outstanding reviews).

• Building a Community of Women Leaders

  o A luncheon has been arranged for December 15th for the female faculty in the College of Natural Science. Co-PI Bush has been coordinating with Sue Conrad, the Faculty Excellence Advocate in Natural Science, to arrange this networking and informational forum. The meeting will provide an overview of the ADAPP activities thus far, dissemination of the toolkits and a time for the faculty to network informally. It is hoped that the faculty will continue with a brown bag luncheon at least once a semester. Such regular meetings will increase networking/mentoring opportunities for women in the college as well as create pathways for dissemination of ADAPP information and resources. A similar luncheon will be arranged with the College of Social Science women faculty next semester.

  o Dean Udpa held a luncheon with female faculty in the COE on November 17th, 2010. All but two of the EGR tenure stream women faculty were in attendance. In addition, Manooch Koochesfahani, the Faculty Excellence Advocate was in attendance. Discussion centered around the college activities including
    • The assignment of a space for women to nurse infants or express breast milk,
    • Support for childcare while faculty are attending a conference
    • The College’s commitment to diversity among faculty
    • The ADAPP RPT and AR toolkits were passed out along with a copy of the poster presented at the recent ADVANCE conference
Women faculty stated they would like EGR to have a “women faculty site” on the web page with the names of all female faculty in EGR and links to ADAPP, WRC, FRC, and FOD etc.

- The MSU Women’s Resource Center held an intensive two-day workshop entitled, “Sustaining Inclusive Leadership during Organizational Uncertainties” (October 25 & 26). The speakers included Kathy Wong (Lau), Western Michigan University; Linda Marchesani, UMass-Amherst; Sharon Washington, University of California-Berkeley. ADAPP-ADVANCE was a sponsor (vs. a developer) of this effort by our colleagues.

Mentoring

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

- At the University level, a University-wide faculty mentoring policy was drafted and is moving through the approval process. It has been approved by the University Committee on Faculty Affairs and is expected to be reviewed and approved by Faculty Council in January 2011 after which the Provost will formally adopt the policy, and it will be incorporated into the University Faculty Handbook. The policy establishes expectations that every college will implement a mentoring program based on evidence-based best practices. It provides latitude for implementing a program model that is most relevant to individual colleges but outlines nine abiding principles that must be followed including demonstration of sensitivity to different challenges faced by a diverse faculty. This major step forward in University policy underscores the commitment to building a stronger, more diverse faculty.

- In recognition that a policy alone will not ensure successful implementation, the University is taking further steps to demonstrate a commitment to mentoring on campus. We will build on existing programs by coordinating support units and initiating additional resources that will support colleges as they implement mentor programs at the college and unit levels. A list of two dozen strategies practiced at other major universities has been compiled and distributed to the GMT, ACT, FEA, and Deans for input regarding which central resources they would find most beneficial. These strategies will be discussed at the next FEA consortium meeting after which a plan for University-wide mentor resources, overseen from the Office of the Provost, will be drafted and submitted to the Provost for consideration.

- An important component of the University Mentor Resources will be a University Mentor Toolkit which has been under development for the last year and is now nearing final stages. Extensive resources have been compiled, many of which are now being modified for adoption at MSU. They have been categorized, and an outline for the toolkit has been drafted which is being reviewed by key informants prior to wider distribution to FEAs and Deans for their input. The goal is to complete an initial outline with basic content and tools
by the end of 2010 and launch it by early 2011. This web-based Toolkit will provide clear cut information on best-practices as well as samples, checklists, forms, instruments, links to other resources and more, all in very user-friendly downloadable format so that unit leaders and individual faculty members can access whatever resources most meet their needs.

- Arrangements are now underway for Mary Deane Sorcinelli, PhD, Associate Provost, University of Massachusetts-Amherst to be a guest speaker at an upcoming FEA Consortium meeting as well as to meet with the Provost and Deans about mentoring programming, assessment, challenges, and opportunities. A second guest lecturer who is an expert on Mentoring will be invited in early spring to address the entire university community.

- Mentoring initiatives at the University level were a major focus of the last FEA Consortium meeting. Following this meeting, Luz was contacted by the CANR FEA for assistance in developing a college-wide mentor program. The initial meeting was very productive in terms of beginning to identify the needs and challenges of the college as well as a plan for determining which models may be most relevant and ways in which to involve leaders and faculty in the process. Subsequent meetings are planned.

- Also at the college level – the College of Social Science is piloting the development of formal mentor programs in two units: the Department of Psychology and the School of Social Work. Luz is meeting with Gary Anderson, Director of the School of Social Work to conduct a needs assessment and begin to formulate a mentor program plan.

- These activities, at the University and College levels, were of central interest during the Annual Advance PI Meeting in Washington, D.C. The MSU team presented a poster featuring ADAPP achievements including progress toward institutionalizing mentor resources. The proposed University policy, as well as the previously developed one-page list of Best Mentor Practices for Leaders, was distributed to many attendees. Luz attended workshops and engaged in discussion with others across all Advance institutions to learn about and share practices that might be considered for the MSU community.

Again, all of these activities align with the objectives for mentoring initially set forth by the GMT and Mentor workgroup. They represent major progress in terms of the University adopting a clearer mandate for and culture of mentoring. As indicated by unit leader outreach for assistance in setting up mentoring programs and widespread acknowledgement at all levels of the importance of mentoring, support for such action also appears to be emerging from the ground up.

Plans for the next quarter include:

- Finalize a proposed plan for university mentor resource initiatives and submit to Provost.
- Finalize initial web-based Mentor Toolkit and launch.
- Finalize plans for two events featuring national experts on mentoring.
• Develop plan to widely disseminate information on the new University Mentor Policy, University Mentor resources, new web-site, new web-based Toolkit, and other mentor support activities.
• Continue to work with individual units to develop mentor programs.
• Conduct thorough review of mentor evaluation tools and compile evidence-based inventory of instruments that can be used at different levels. This is an area in which there is a gap in literature, which poses considerable challenges, and in which critical assistance to units is needed.
• Continue to establish ties to the national ADVANCE institution network on issues related to mentoring.
• Begin to develop scholarly work on mentoring that contributes to the evidence base for and evaluation of formal mentoring programs.

FIT – Faculty Information Tool

Continued the development of functional requirements of the Faculty Information Toolkit (Attachment H). The development team has reviewed commercial software products that could provide downloads of specific data to the FIT data warehouse to include publication information, grants, patents, honors and awards.

• On September 1, 2010, Marietta Baba, Dean of the College of Social Science, hosted a presentation by Academic Analytics
• On September 3, 2010 had a demonstration of Collexis + SciVal module that is being considered as a tool to download publications into the FIT data warehouse
• On September 7, 2010 had a demonstration by Brian Keys from Thomson-Reuters on their software product that could download publications into the FIT data warehouse
• On September 14, 2010 had a second demonstration on the Thomson-Reuters product to answer specific questions about the system.
• On September 23, 2010 had another demonstration of added features of Collexis.
• On Oct 12, 2010, the development team had a conference call with Andy Johns from the University of North Carolina to discuss how UNC is implementing Collexis on their campus – and ultimately for all public institutions in the state of North Carolina.
• Met with Bruce Alexander, Director of the Enterprise Business Systems Project (EBSP), on October 19 to discuss the status of the FIT initiative and interfacing the “replacement of Administrator’s Assistant” component of FIT with the Cognos reporting tool that is the reporting tool for the new business systems. Also discussed the issue of connecting the new system to the historic records, at least initially back 10 years. This is going forward and the funding for this part of FIT development is being shared with the EBSP.
• Meeting of the FIT development team on Oct 27 to outline next steps and begin to refine the system requirements of the program.
• Meeting of Vice President for Research, Ian Gray, with the representative from Collexis to review additional analytical features of their software that can be used for research planning.

**Annual Review and RPT**

• On September 30, 2010 a subgroup of the GMT met to discuss concept of merging the Annual Review and RPT inventories of current practice. Revised inventory is under development.
• Annual Review Toolkit has been published, is on line and has been sent to all faculty.
• The Reappoint, Promotion and Tenure Toolkit has been revised to include more detailed information for the early career faculty. The final product will be delivered on December 1, 2010.
• ADAPP is a co-sponsor of Survive and Thrive Workshop scheduled for December 2, 2010. This year’s program will include a session on writing reflective essays.
• Discussed RPT policies and best practices and the RPT Toolkit at the FEA consortium meeting on September 20, 2010.

**CHALLENGES FOR THE ADAPP-ADVANCE INITIATIVE**

• There are on-going normative tensions that we continue to negotiate as we move forward. Questions related to conflicts of accountability vs. autonomy and centralization vs. decentralization continue to be at the forefront of our discussions as initiatives are promoted at the unit level.

• What part of the data collection effort undertaken during ADAPP will be continued post-grant and how will this be done?

• Challenge of developing a FIT data warehouse that will document the faculty information important to all disciplinary areas. In discussions with the College of Music, it was apparent that information needed to evaluate faculty in this college is rather unique. It will be a challenge to gather input across the University so that important data elements are part of the warehouse structure.

**BEST IDEA YET**

• Policy analysis of annual review and RPT policies, especially at the unit level. This analysis will be initiated next quarter
Begin to train the FEAs to oversee the Faculty Search processes in their colleges and train search committee members regarding policies and best practices. We will need to consider if such FEA-lead faculty search committee training is mandatory.
**ADVANCING DIVERSITY THROUGH THE ALIGNMENT OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES**  
Establishing a Foundation for the Institutionalization of Michigan State University’s NSF ADVANCE Program

The focus of ADAPP-ADVANCE is on the alignment of academic human resource (AHR) policies and practices at the unit and college levels with MSU’s values of quality and diversity. Here we present a summary of statistically different responses (from university-wide Work Environment Survey) between men and women regarding their perceptions of the critical attributes of the annual review and the RP&T processes, as well as the faculty mentoring programs. We also present responses from Department Chair inventories (pilot colleges only) regarding the critical attributes of these same processes and related policies in their units. We will collect more data in the next year to better understand the perceptions of underrepresented male and female faculty on our campus.

### Faculty Performance Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1a WORK-ENVIRONMENT SURVEY (ALL TENURE-STREAM FACULTY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Performance Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01; *5-point response scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1b DEPARTMENT CHAIR INVENTORY – 3 PILOT COLLEGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your department have … (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review (AR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit-level expectations incorporated into AR processes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-level expectations incorporated into AR processes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations transparent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal tool currently used during AR process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment, Promotion, &amp; Tenure (RP&amp;T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are RP&amp;T committee members formally prepared?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are RP&amp;T guidelines included in each unit’s bylaws?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies on stopping tenure clock included in RP&amp;T guidelines?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2a WORK-ENVIRONMENT SURVEY (ALL TENURE-STREAM FACULTY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Unit Formal Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (M/SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Personal Mentoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01; *5-point response scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2a WORK-ENVIRONMENT SURVEY (ALL TENURE-STREAM FACULTY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Unit Formal Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (M/SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Personal Mentoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.001; *5-point response scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree)**

### Changes Implemented with regard to the above findings

- Annual Review and RP&T toolkits developed (explicit statements of university policy, as well as check-lists for faculty at all career stages)(university-wide)
- Written, college-wide policy for RP&T and annual review instrument for reporting results of annual reviews of faculty to the college (Natural Science).
- Written guidelines for RP&T that include sponsored research expectations across the faculty life cycle (Social Science).
- Web-based annual review instrument providing a consistent basis for recording and measuring faculty performance metrics, and is currently developing web-based instrument for the RP&T process to enhance consistency and transparency (Engineering)
- University-wide mentoring policy submitted to Council of Deans and University Committee on Faculty Affairs.
- College-wide mentoring policy was voted on and approved by faculty in mid-2009 (Engineering)
- Mentoring policy under development (Natural Science).
- Inventory of mentoring programs across the College of Social Science identified areas providing robust mentoring. College is piloting a formal mentoring program in two academic departments during 2010-11. After assessing the effectiveness of the pilot unit-level formal mentoring program, the College will modify the program as needed and widen participation to all departments in successive years.

Kim Wilcox (PI), Estelle McGroarty (Lead Co-PI), Theodore Curry (Co-PI), Clare Luz (Co-PI), Tamara Reid-Bush (Co-PI), Mark Roehling (Co-PI), Melissa McDaniel (Director), Jillian Hrnurovic (Research Assistant), Tiffany Jimenez (Research Assistant), Gregory Larnell (Research Assistant), Ohio Center for the Assessment and Evaluation for Mathematics and Science Education (Evaluators)

Advancing Diversity through the Alignment of Policies and Practices is an NSF ADVANCE Program at Michigan State University, Award No. 0811205

---

**Table 2b DEPARTMENT CHAIR INVENTORY – 3 PILOT COLLEGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your college have … (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Natural Science</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal, college-wide mentoring program?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written expectations for dept-level programs?</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department-level mentoring programs?</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A budget to support mentoring programs?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 2b DEPARTMENT CHAIR INVENTORY – 3 PILOT COLLEGES**
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your college have … (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Natural Science</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal, college-wide mentoring program?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written expectations for dept-level programs?</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department-level mentoring programs?</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A budget to support mentoring programs?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Links to Important MSU and CNS Faculty RPT Policies and Resources

MSU Policy Documents and Resources:

1. Faculty Handbook:
   a. University Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines
      i. MSU Form “D”
   b. Faculty Evaluation Policies
2. Office of Faculty and Organizational Development
      i. Part I: Overview of Process and Expectations, 8:30-12
      ii. Part II: Writing Reflective Essays, 12:45-2:30
3. MSU ADVANCE Grant Website
   a. Annual Performance Review and RP&T Toolkits

CNS Policy Documents and Resources:

1. CNS Homepage
2. Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure
   a. CNS Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
3. Teaching Evaluation Guidelines
4. Faculty Development Policy
5. Work Load Policies
Summary of the tenure timeline for Assistant Professors

First probationary appointment (4 years)

First appointment: tenure clock starts: Aug. 15

Fall of third year: reappointment review begins: due in Dean’s office by ~12/15

Spring of third year: reappointment results announced by about April

Second probationary appointment (3 years)

Fall of sixth year: reappointment review begins: due in Dean’s office by ~12/15

Spring of sixth year: tenure results announced by about April

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting year</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date

- 8/15

Termination date if not reappointed

- 8/15

Termination date if not awarded tenure

- 8/15

Note: For occasional faculty appointed on dates other than August 15th: Generally their tenure clock starts on the August 15th following their appointment.
CNS Tenure-Stream Faculty Annual Evaluation Form and Outside Work for Pay Disclosure Form

Objectives and Requirements:

The CNS Tenure-Stream Faculty Annual Evaluation Form is intended to provide a summary of the annual evaluations of tenure-stream faculty undertaken by all CNS units, to facilitate reporting the results of these evaluations, and to document that each faculty member has been provided the results of his/her evaluation. Signatures of both the Chair (or Chairs, in the case of jointly appointed faculty) and the faculty member under review are required, and all forms should be kept on file in the Department. Copies of the signed form (and any attachments) should be forwarded to the CNS Dean’s Office for all Assistant and Associate Professors.

The CNS Outside Work for Pay Disclosure Form is intended to provide an annual check of compliance with the MSU Policy on Outside Work for Pay, and should be completed in conjunction with the annual faculty review.

Forms should be completed every year for each faculty member by June 15th, evaluating the activities of the previous calendar year and disclosing plans for outside work for pay during the next fiscal year.

Background:

MSU Faculty Review Policy contained in the Faculty Handbook states that “each tenure system faculty shall be evaluated on an annual basis and informed in writing of the results of his/her review by the unit administrator”, and that each unit shall have “clearly formulated and relevant written performance criteria ... to clarify expectations.” CNS has articulated general faculty performance expectations in the Faculty Workload Policy, Guidelines for Faculty Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and the CNS Faculty Development Policy, and MSU has specified the criteria for appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations. CNS relies on all units to apply these expectations for faculty in the formulation of unit-specific faculty annual review performance criteria.

Chairs and Directors are expected to carry out annual faculty evaluations using departmentally approved procedures, to do so in collaboration with joint appointment Departments (if appropriate), and to provide feedback to individual faculty. The results of these annual reviews are also input to the faculty raise process, are critical in determining faculty assignments and access to space and other resources, and are important in determining appropriate mentoring and faculty development opportunities. MSU performance review guidelines and resources may be found on the MSU ADVANCE grant website.

Instructions:

The CNS Tenure-Stream Faculty Annual Evaluation Form should be filled out each year, summarizing the evaluation of each faculty member in the areas of research, teaching/student engagement, and leadership/service or outreach. Evaluations should reflect unit goals, and should be within the context of full-time effort during the current year under review. Attach additional documentation, such as a faculty annual report or evaluation letter, as appropriate.

In each of the three areas, provide a summary judgment of faculty performance, as well as a brief analysis of strengths/weaknesses and a description of any recommendations. Give specific examples supporting the evaluation, based on current or planned achievement or activity. Provide an evaluation of performance relative to rank, position, and workload expectations appropriate to MSU and peer institutions, and not
relative to other faculty in the same unit. Examples of evidence of activity and achievement in each of the areas of evaluation are given below, and should be reviewed and modified as necessary by the unit.

In the “Summary and Outlook” section, as appropriate: summarize progress since last review, future plans, and professional development objectives; review or revise current responsibilities, mentoring plans, and allocation of space or other resources. Specifically comment on steps to be taken to address any areas found to be "below expectations” or “minimally acceptable”, and progress toward next reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

Faculty should review and sign the CNS Outside Work for Pay Disclosure Form yearly as part of the annual evaluation process and, if necessary, should fill out and submit the MSU Outside Work for Pay/Overload Pay form for Department and CNS approval.

**Examples** of Possible Evidence of Activity or Achievement:

**Research Activity:** Grant proposals submitted, manuscripts submitted for publication, laboratory/instrument construction, experiments underway, study section or editorial board membership, reviews for high-impact journals, or participation in or organization of workshops, short courses, seminars, institutes, symposia, etc., documented completion of a self-assessment of research status and a plan for the future.

**Research Achievement:** Grants funded, (peer-reviewed) articles, technical reports, books, or book-chapters published, documented completion of experiment or instrument, citation survey or other measure of scholarly impact, service as an editor of a professional journal, leadership of a research group, center, or institute, successful organization of a multi-PI/group grant submission, or scholarly recognition by university, government, or professional organization.

**Teaching Activity:** Teaching load, course enrollment, TA or laboratory supervisory responsibility, or adequate in- and out-of-classroom availability to students; graduate student advising or mentorship, or thesis committee membership; participation in FOD, CNS, or other workshops on teaching, advising, or mentoring; participation in study abroad program; documented completion of self-assessment of teaching and a plan for improvement.

**Teaching Achievement:** Classroom performance as assessed by SIRS/SOCT scores, teaching portfolio review, peer teaching evaluations, or demonstrated student-learning outcomes (assessed relative to the nature of the course); advisee completion of MS or PhD degrees; leadership in course or curriculum design, study abroad program, or implementation of a scholarly approach to teaching. Publications, grants, or presentations in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, if not included above as research.

**Engagement Activity:** Service on unit, College, University, professional organization, or government agency committees or panels (as member or officer), advisor to a student organization, acting as a mentor to colleagues, review of manuscripts or grants (if not included in research), or as a consultant for external agencies or stakeholders, or as an external evaluator for another University; participation in FOD, CNS, or other leadership workshops, or in recruiting or fund-raising, outreach, lifelong-learning, or other engagement activities.

**Engagement Achievement:** Documented accomplishments from leadership on a panel or committee for a unit, college, university, professional organization or government agency. Organization of recruiting or fund-raising, outreach, lifelong-learning, or other engagement activities

---

1 This list is not exhaustive, nor is it expected that a single individual will engage in all the activities listed.
### CNS Tenure-Stream Faculty Annual Evaluation Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department(s)</th>
<th>Review Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research ____% Teaching ____% Service ____%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Research

- **Below Expectations**
  - Insignificant scholarly or creative activity, or activity of a quantity or quality below expectations given rank, position, and workload expectations.

- **Minimally Acceptable**
  - Minimally acceptable amount of peer-reviewed scholarship and grant funding, or research productivity of low quantity or quality relative to rank, position, and workload expectations.

- **Good**
  - Good scholarly productivity relative to rank, position, and workload expectations; peer-reviewed publication in good journals; future plans with high likelihood of successful completion. Appropriate research funding.

- **Excellent**
  - Excellent scholarly achievement relative to rank, position, and workload expectations; publication in high-impact journals; completion of important research projects in accordance with long-term plans. Evidence of disciplinary leadership.

- **Outstanding**
  - Extremely significant and rigorous scholarship with demonstrable disciplinary impact, published in prestigious venues. Major scholarly achievements relative to rank, position, and workload expectations.

#### Research: Strengths/Weaknesses of Activities/Achievements, and Recommendations

- 
- 
- 

#### Teaching/Student Engagement

- **Below Expectations**
  - Problematic classroom or other teaching performance; unreliable advising or mentoring, and frequent unavailability; indifference toward or unreasonable resistance to meeting teaching standards.

- **Minimally Acceptable**
  - Fulfills all teaching responsibilities; meets minimal qualitative expectations in the classroom. Some unreliable availability or mistakes in advising or mentoring; title or no curricular development; minimal efforts at improvement; one or more problematic elements in the area of teaching.

- **Good**
  - Fulfills all teaching responsibilities. Evidence of solid work in the classroom; some successful effort to improve; good reliable student mentoring and academic advising.

- **Excellent**
  - Fulfills all teaching responsibilities well. Evidence of overall excellence in teaching, advising, student mentoring; curriculum or program development.

- **Outstanding**
  - Fulfills all teaching responsibilities very well. Demonstrable overall excellence in teaching, advising, and mentoring; leadership in course or curricular improvement, sharing of expertise.

#### Teaching: Strengths/Weaknesses of Activities/Achievements, and Recommendations

- 
- 
- 

---

* Adapted from measuredreasons.com, MSU ADVANCE grant faculty performance review toolkit, CNS RPT guidelines, MSU RPT recommendation guidelines, and LBC faculty annual evaluation materials.
### Engagement in Leadership/Service/Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
<th>Minimally Acceptable</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or no meaningful or useful activity in serving department, College, or University in important ways. Or, behavior of a professionally unacceptable kind or harmful effect.</td>
<td>A minimal level of useful activity, relative to rank and seniority, in serving the program, department, College, University or profession.</td>
<td>Consistently effective service at multiple organizational and professional levels appropriate to rank and seniority; shows initiative; responsive to needs of students, colleagues, and department.</td>
<td>Excellent initiative and effort with consistently beneficial results on important projects, appropriate to rank and position at multiple organizational and professional levels.</td>
<td>Uniformly excellent effort and results in important projects; generosity of spirit in volunteering; effective leadership appropriate to rank and position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Engagement: Strengths/Weaknesses of Activities/Achievements, and Recommendations

- 
- 
- 

### Allocation of MSU space and resources: (attach description if modification is necessary)

- Space or resources should be reallocated.
- Space or resources appropriate.
- More space or resources required.

### Summary and Outlook: Progress, Plans, and Future Promotions


### Signatures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- I have a written response to this review, and the response is attached.
- I do not have a written response to this review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Chair(s)/Administrator(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
CNS Outside Work for Pay Disclosure Form*

All faculty members (tenure system and fixed term) at the rank of instructor through professor who hold appointments of at least 50% time are required to obtain approval of all outside work” for pay with the following exceptions (these activities are not regulated by the outside work for pay policy):

- presentations at professional meetings and other similar gatherings
- peer review of articles and grant proposals
- leadership positions in professional societies
- preparation of scholarly publications
- editorial services for educational or professional organizations
- service on advisory committees or evaluation panels for government funding agencies, nonprofit foundations, or educational organizations
- Musical and other creative performances and exhibitions, if there is an expectation in the faculty member’s discipline that he/she will engage in such performances or exhibitions.

Pay includes:
Anything of value received in consideration for work (except reimbursement of expenses, indemnification, or insurance coverage for claims arising out of or occurring in connection with the work). Examples of pay include, but are not limited to, any salary, fee, honorarium, stock, stock option, monetary gift or contribution beyond actual expense, or the promise of any of these in the future. Work for any business or other for-profit enterprise owned or operated by a faculty member or by his/her relative(s), shall be considered “pay” (whether or not the faculty member receives anything of value in consideration for the work).

☐ I do not anticipate having any outside work for pay this from July 1- June 30th, 20____, but will request and obtain written approval from my unit administrator and dean or director before engaging in outside work for pay during this period.

☐ I anticipate receiving pay for outside work and have attached the MSU Outside Work for Pay/Overload Pay form.

_____________________________________
Signature/Date

_____________________________________
Name

* Based on the MSU Policy on Outside Work for Pay.

** N.B. MSU policy also requires disclosure of outside work for pay during the summer.
Thank you for participating in the Pathways to Success Leadership panel with Dr. Ann Austin. Please take a moment and respond to the following questions.

Please reflect upon the panel and indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

1. This panel met my expectations.
   
   If not, why? ____________________________________________

2. I found the information useful.
   
   If not, what could have been more useful? ___________________ 

3. Prior to this panel I understood how leadership in professional associations plays a role in career success.

4. Attending this panel increased my understanding of how leadership in professional associations plays a role in career success.

5. Prior to this panel, I knew what skills are needed to succeed as a leader in a professional association.

6. This panel increased my understanding of what skills are needed to succeed as a leader in professional associations.

7. I attended the seminar based on the reputation of the speaker.

8. I attended the seminar based upon my knowledge of the ADAPP-ADVANCE project.

9. I attended the seminar based upon my interest in the topic.

10. Please list (at least) two things you will take away from today’s panel:

   ____________________________________________
   ______________________
   ____________________________________________

11. Additional Comments:

   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

Please provide your email address for a brief 3 minute follow-up survey:

__________________________________________

We request the following information so that we can match this questionnaire with one you may be asked to complete in the future. Your responses will be completely confidential. No identifying information will be used in any report or paper.

1. Enter the first letter of your FIRST name: ______

2. Enter the first letter of your LAST name: ______

3. Enter your date of birth:   
   
   Month Day
Attachment F – Evaluation Results from Project Management Workshop

Junior Faculty & Mixed Group Summary of Evaluations

- 14 evaluations were collected
- Most participants felt the workshop met their expectations and found the information useful
- Results were mixed regarding whether participants felt the workshop increased their understanding of project management but more agreed that it did
- Most participants were undecided as to whether they increased their understanding of the ethical issues associated with project management
- All participants were attending the workshop because of their interest in the topic

Evaluation responses immediately after workshop:

Open-ended Overall Take Points

- Project management is difficult
- Learn how you manage projects
- Provide space for creative input
- Enjoy the messiness of the work
- A new approach for how to think about projects
- Ideas for how to do things differently
- Teamwork important
- Legacy effects may be the best you can do
- There’s no one way to project manage
- Have fun

Additional comments

- Thank you for a very engaging and informative workshop! I will certainly plan to apply the insights it offered in managing my future projects.
- Thank you, this was incredibly helpful. David was also a very engaging speaker.

Senior Faculty Summary of Evaluations

- 17 evaluations were collected
- Most participants felt the workshop met their expectations and found the information useful
• Most were undecided of whether they had prior knowledge of project management
• Most participants were unsure whether they learned anything about the ethical issues involved in project management
• Many participants were not attending the workshop based on the reputation of the speaker or the host groups
• Better format done with a project team
• Almost all participants were attending the workshop because of their interest in the topic

Evaluation responses immediately after workshop:

Open-Ended Overall Take Home Points

• Projects are messy but try to enjoy it
• Accept and trust the project parameters.
• Maintain responsible commitment
• Help team members find their space within the project work
• One-on-one conversation important working with others

Additional Comments

• Couple of people really liked his approach.
• Better format done with a project team
• One person offended by comments made
• This was an alternative approach to considering projects
• An observation that there were mostly women present.
Attachment G – Imposter Syndrome Workshop Evaluation Results

Evaluation responses immediately after workshop:

*Two things participants took away from the workshop:*

- All participants identified with the impostor syndrome.
- Most participants learned that these thoughts of being an impostor were normal.

*Additional comments and questions:*

- One person wondered if me were invited and felt they should have been.
- One participant wanted more recommendations for how to resolve the syndrome.
- All enjoyed the workshop.

Impact of workshop based on 6 week follow-up:

*Ways participants found the workshop helpful over time*

- Many were able to identify the impostor syndrome in themselves and in students.
- Discussions with colleagues have helped identify how some behaviors are in alignment with the impostor syndrome.
- Able to identify the impostor syndrome in students.
- Acknowledging the impostor syndrome in self allowed one person to feel more comfortable with asking for help and completing a “good enough” grant application.
- Helped combat self-defeating attitudes they’ve been experiencing.
- Acknowledged impostor syndrome in self and created alternative patterns of behaviors.

*Whether participants used the “personality types” information over time*

- One person felt the workshop was least helpful in assisting them on how to change behaviors.
- One used personality info in general to try to identify the positives to take away from them.
• One wanted more time on personality info.

Ways the workshop could have been more helpful

• Having more concrete practical suggestions for how to change behaviors would have been more helpful to some. Speaker was too vague.
• Would have like more discussion about personality types in workshop.
• More information about how to deal with the problem rather than just identify it.

Participant perspectives on the utility of the workshop

• Many of the participants thought the workshop was extremely helpful.
• One person was asked to pass on workshop info to co-workers who did not attend. Peers may not have attended because they do not want to admit they feel like an impostor.
• The issue of impostor syndrome should be framed as a common problem among academia not among individuals with certain characteristics.
• A couple of attendees thought the workshop should be made available to everyone regardless of individual characteristics (e.g. race, gender).

Suggestions for future workshops

• Some did not like talking about syndrome with others in workshop.
• Would like to have seen more of a workshop format.
• Would like more recommendations on how to promote research productivity and balance academic work load.