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Objectives

• Understand the
  • “evolution” of MSU’s university-wide Mentoring Policy (effective fall 2011)
  • role various offices & programs played in creating the foundation for the work “catalyzed” by NSF ADVANCE grant
Objectives

• Understand the
  • need to identify & achieve “stakeholder” buy-in to drive change & the way it was achieved
  • role of data in achieving university-wide policy
  • role of core principles to support unit variances in mentoring policies
Deep commitment to inclusion & quality

Various programs exist that play significant role in supporting and promoting these values, and the careers of faculty (Academic Human Resources, Women’s Resource Center, Family Resource Center, Office of Faculty and Organizational Development, Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives)

*Mentoring as a factor in faculty success (particularly for women and URMs) advocated by these various offices in the past and present*
MSU INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

- Despite these successes, MSU still struggles to improve gender & racial/ethnic diversity among its faculty in STEM

- A system that works most of the time for many individuals is not enough

- NSF ADVANCE/ADAPP (what could we do that would be different?)
ADAPP PROJECT OVERVIEW - GOALS

• Increase the number of diverse tenure system women faculty recruited and appointed

• Increase level of retention of diverse women faculty

• Increase the advancement of diverse women faculty

• Improve the work climate for diverse women
PROJECT OVERVIEW - APPROACH

- Research-Supported Strategy
- Data-Driven
- Policy Project
- Faculty Recruitment
- Annual Performance Review
- Promoting, Reappointment and Tenure
- Mentoring
- Leadership Development
RESEARCH-SUPPORTED STRATEGY

Promote diversity and quality by evaluating and modifying academic human resource policies and practices and applying six guiding principles regarding policies and practices:

-Align AHR policies & practices with institutional values
-Increase structure of AHR decision-making processes
-Develop/refine supportive policies & practices (examined the role that mentoring plays in faculty excellence & diversity—what did the literature and our own data tell us?)
Michigan State University’s Approach to Institutional Transformation: Advancing Diversity through Alignment of Policies and Practices (ADAPP)

**INTERVENTION STRATEGIES**

- Formative Evaluation
- Policy Assessment, Refinement, and Development
- Dissemination of Information and Practical Tools
- College-Based Faculty Excellence Advocates
- Faculty Education & Professional Development
- Development of Faculty Academic Data Warehouse

**GOALS / OUTCOMES**

**Initial**

- Supportive Policies and Practices
- Consistency & Transparency of HR Policies and Practices
- Clear Expectations
- Effective Communication
- Accountability
- Reduced Bias

**Intermediate**

- Improved Faculty Recruitment and Hiring
- Increased Retention of Women Faculty
- Increased Advancement of Women Faculty
- Improved Climate for All Faculty

**Ultimate**

- Increased Diversity of Faculty
- Sustained Positive Environment
- Increased Faculty Quality

**Theoretical Foundation:**

*Strategic Human Resource Management Model*

The model posits that institutions aiming to both build a high quality, diverse workforce, and create a sustained positive environment for women, should: (a) **align** academic human resource policies and practices with the institution’s values of quality and inclusivity; (b) **increase the structure** of human resource decision-making processes; and (c) further **develop and refine** supportive human resource policies and practices.
After 3 Years:

ACCOMPLISHMENTS – COMPREHENSIVE & INTEGRATED COLLECTION OF DATA

• Developed Instruments & Collected Data
  o Chair/Director Inventories
  o Work-Environment Survey
  o Focus Groups with Women Leaders
  o Leadership Questionnaire

• Identified gaps in Policies & Practices
  o Reported Practices / Faculty Perceptions
  o Policies / Policy Implementation
  o New policies that were needed
ACCOMPLISHMENTS – COMPREHENSIVE & INTEGRATED COLLECTION OF DATA

Work-Environment Survey
(2009-36% response rate)

• Does your unit have a formal mentoring program, is it effective, do you regard anyone as your mentor...

• People in my unit care about about my general satisfaction at work, my contributions are recognized/valued, I am treated with respect by chair, students, colleagues...

• I can voice my opinions openly, it is clear how resources are allocated, salaries raises are made, committee assignments made...
ACCOMPLISHMENTS – COMPREHENSIVE & INTEGRATED COLLECTION OF DATA

Years 1 & 2 Department Chair Inventory
3 Pilot Colleges (CNS, CSS, Egr)

Does your college have ... (Yes/No)

Mentoring

• Formal, college-wide mentoring program?
• Written expectations for dept-level programs?
• Department-level mentoring programs?
• A budget to support mentoring programs?
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 1a WORK-ENVIRONMENT SURVEY (ALL TENURE-STREAM FACULTY)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male (M/SD)</th>
<th>Female (M/SD)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Tenure</td>
<td>3.43 (.90)</td>
<td>3.11 (.84)</td>
<td>6.53**</td>
<td>1285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>3.52 (.84)</td>
<td>3.35 (.79)</td>
<td>3.62**</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Mentoring

**Table 2a WORK-ENVIRONMENT SURVEY (ALL TENURE-STREAM FACULTY)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male (M/SD)</th>
<th>Female (M/SD)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Unit Formal Mentoring</td>
<td>3.59 (.91)</td>
<td>3.28 (.88)</td>
<td>3.59**</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Personal Mentoring</td>
<td>4.22 (.72)</td>
<td>4.17 (.78)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Table 1b DEPARTMENT CHAIR INVENTORY – 3 PILOT COLLEGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your department have ... (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Natural Science</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering expectations incorporated into AR processes?</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-level expectations incorporated into AR processes?</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations transparent?</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal tool currently used during AR process?</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment, Promotion, &amp; Tenure (RP&amp;T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are RP&amp;T committee members formally prepared?</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are RP&amp;T guidelines included in each unit’s bylaws?</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies on stopping tenure clock included in RP&amp;T guidelines?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 Wilson (PI), Eszelle McCrorty (Lead Co-PI), Theodore Curry (Co-PI), Clare Luz (Co-PI), Tamara Reid-Bush (Co-PI), Mark Kuebler (Co-PI), Melissa McNamara (Director), Ilona Fesen (Research Assistant), Tiffiny St. Jean (Research Assistant), Gregory Lander (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
ACCOMPLISHMENT – POLICY DEVELOPMENT

- ADAPP Grant co-PI (Dr. Clare Luz) led efforts & conducted extensive review of mentoring programs nationally (Year 2)

- Grant management team and representatives from project support offices developed initial draft of policy

- Extensive consultation, rewrites, re-submission to various stakeholders (deans, FEAs, internal FAC reps, Women’s Advisory Committee to Provost)
ACCOMPLISHMENT – POLICY DEVELOPMENT

- Final draft submitted to Provost (PI) before consultation with Faculty Council & University Committee on Faculty Affairs (UCFA)
- President kept apprised of progress and supported the effort
- Policy issued by the Office of Provost March 1, 2011 (to be effective fall semester 2011); it reflects advice by the Faculty Council & UCFA
Highly Decentralized Nature of Units Recognized

• Each college “shall” implement a formal mentoring program by August 16, 2011
  ◦ College can require dept. or school develop its own

• Each college should develop a program that is relevant to its needs based upon “evidence based best practices”

• While practices and procedures may vary: all college programs “must” incorporate 9 principles
ACCOMPLISHMENTS – POLICY (continued)

Why 9 Principles?

- Incorporates evidence based best practices upon which to model programs

- Recognizes the existing realities of unit structures and relationships that present unique challenges or opportunities for mentoring

  - faculty joint appointments; tenure system v. non-tenure system appointments; confidentiality, mentoring across cultural differences; recognition and rewards for good mentoring; formative evaluation; and assessment of effectiveness of program
SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION

REVIEW THE 9 PRINCIPLES & ANSWER THE FOLLOWING:

Are the 9 applicable to your circumstances?

- Would you add anything new based on what you know about mentoring programs and your environment/culture?

- Select 3 of the Principles (or any you come up with), develop criteria that can be applied to each for purposes of evaluating whether a unit’s program addressed the selected Principle (e.g., confidentiality: “Plan defines and addresses how it will be handled by the unit”)
EXAMPLES OF UNIT MENTORING PROGRAMS
ACCOMPLISHMENTS – DEVELOPMENT & DISSEMINATION OF HIGH QUALITY RESOURCES

Academic Human Resource Toolkits

- Mentoring – Printed in November 2011 to be sent to all faculty and academic administrators
ACCOMPLISHMENTS-
TOOLKIT, PROGRAMS, WORKSHOPS,
NETWORKING ACTIVITIES

• Toolkit being distributed to all faculty/administrators; on ADAPP website & available electronically

• Along with FODs existing workshops & extensive on-line resources, grant management team designed new workshops on faculty mentoring with interactive theatre sketch on mentoring across differences (well received).
ACCOMPLISHMENTS- TOOLKIT, PROGRAMS, WORKSHOPS, NETWORKING ACTIVITIES

• Learning objectives of workshops include:
  ◦ Identify key characteristics of good formal mentoring; apply successful mentoring strategies to advance early career faculty; incorporate best practices into mentoring programs; identify appropriate strategies to use when mentoring across differences; identify MSU mentoring resources including the Faculty Mentor Toolkit and Resource Center (web-based)

• April 2012 workshop on assessment of mentoring programs
  ◦ Select units emphasizing assessment of their mentoring program to then be shared more broadly with units
**Strengths**

- Expansion of ADAPP-ADVANCE beyond three colleges led to engaging all colleges in mentoring discussions – *Buy-in*

- High-level administrative support – *Buy-in*

- Toolkits – *Mentoring Toolkit “respects” the need for variance = Buy-in*

- ADAPP as a catalyst to get things done – *New Policies (U-wide and Units), shifting culture*

- Evidence of Alignment – *Policy ➔ Excellence & Inclusion*
Areas of Concern Moving Forward

• Role & responsibility of FEA’s need clarity – *If not, can impact buy-in of faculty*

• Variability in implementation of policies & practices – *Respecting unit needs can impact success* (e.g., faculty perception of Dept. A’s program as compared to Dept. B’s in the same College & dissimilarities that dis/advantage)

• Metrics/Assessment/Accountability – *New terrain for units, particularly where formal mentoring program is “new”*
Areas of Concern Moving Forward

• Engagement with chairs/faculty at-large – Buy-in and trust in program among faculty requires attention – variability in their understanding of program (mentoring/ADAPP)

• Use of data to achieve targeted results – not as much an issue for establishing mentoring program, but assessment of programs is challenging for units

• Unique issues for faculty of color – Implicit bias; mentoring across cultural differences
QUESTIONS?
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