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Objective
The ADVANCE Program promotes faculty diversity in all fields. The ADVANCE Program aims to support University faculty in four general areas:

- Recruitment — focuses on development and use of equitable recruiting practices
- Retention — focuses on preemptive strategies to prevent the loss of valued faculty, in part by encouraging their promotion and advancement
- Climate — focuses on creation and maintenance of departmental work environments that support faculty satisfaction, promotion and retention
- Leadership — focuses on support for development of leadership skills and opportunities for all faculty as well as on support for development of skills among all appointed academic leaders to encourage positive work environments

Initiatives and Resources

Recruitment
- STRIDE Committee Faculty Recruitment Workshops (advance.umich.edu/stride.html)
- Friends and Allies of STRIDE Toward Equity in Recruiting (FASTER)
- Handbook for Faculty Searches and Hiring
- Candidate Evaluation Tool
- Positive and Problematic Practices in Faculty Recruitment
- Frequently-Asked Questions: Dual Career Issues
- Guidelines for Writing Letters of Recommendation

Retention
- How to Help New Faculty Settle In: Common Problems and Alternative Solutions
- Giving and Getting Career Advice: A Guide for Junior and Senior Tenure-track Faculty
- Giving and Getting Career Advice: A Guide for Junior and Senior Research-track Faculty
- Support to Department Chairs and Deans in Assessing Individual Salary Equity
- Frequently-Asked Questions: Retention of Science and Engineering Faculty who are Women and/or Members of Racial/Ethnic Minorities
- Faculty Career Advising
- Faculty development workshops on a variety of topics, including career planning, negotiation, work/life balance, teaching, grant writing, academic publishing, and managing a research group
- Launch Committees: Launch committees provide support and guidance to new faculty in science and engineering fields as they begin their careers at Michigan. Committees meet with the new faculty member from the time of hire until the end of the first academic year at Michigan.
- Writing groups for faculty who would like to increase their writing productivity.

Climate
- Departmental Climate Assessments: Survey and Interview Studies
- Faculty Leading Change (FLC) workshop
- Network to Advance Women Scientists and Engineers
- Elizabeth Caroline Crosby Research Fund
- Creating a Positive Departmental Climate: Principles for Best Practices
- CRLT Players: Interactive Theater Performances (http://www.crlt.umich.edu/theatre/index.php)

Leadership
- Faculty Development Programs for Newly Promoted Associate Professors and Full Professors: Leadership and Integration in Faculty Transitions (LIFT)
- Selective Coaching for Department Chairs and Senior Faculty
- Resource Toolkit for Deans, Chairs, and Other Administrative Leaders

Collaborations within the University of Michigan
- Advisory Board to ADVANCE in the Medical School
- College of Engineering
- College of Literature, Science & the Arts
- CRLT Players Theatre Program
- Intergroup Relations Program (IGR)
- Medical School
- MORE: Mentoring Others Results in Excellence
- NCID: National Center for Institutional Diversity
- Office of the Provost
- President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program
- WISE: Women In Science and Engineering

Resources available on the ADVANCE website (advance.umich.edu) are noted in italics.
Results
Since the beginning of the ADVANCE Program at the University of Michigan...

- 131 scientists and engineers have received Elizabeth C. Crosby research awards
- 20 women scientists and engineers have been appointed to administrative positions
- Over 980 faculty members have attended Faculty Recruitment Workshops presented by the STRIDE Committee
- The CRLT Players have presented five ADVANCE-sponsored sketches—The Faculty Meeting, Faculty Advising Faculty, The Fence: Dynamics in Tenure and Promotion Discussions, No Offense, and Institutional Change: The Musical—to more than 200 audiences of UM administrators and faculty
- 83 teams from the UM and other institutions have participated in the Strategies Toward Excellent Practices (STEP) in Departments workshop
- ADVANCE is able to report significant progress regarding the recruitment of women in each of the three colleges that employ the largest number of scientists and engineers at the University (Engineering, LSA, and Medicine-Basic Sciences): As a proportion of all science and engineering tenure-track hires, 13% (N=9) of all new hires were women in AY2001 and AY2002 (the ‘pre-ADVANCE’ years) as compared to 32% (N=135) in AY2003–AY2014
- Assessments of the work environment for all faculty in 2001, 2006 and 2012 suggest that it has improved for all groups of tenured/tenure track faculty on campus
- UM ADVANCE has published a number of papers reporting on ADVANCE data, and initiatives including campus-wide climate studies, annual institutional indicators of diversity for faculty at UM, research on policies and practices at UM
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ADVANCE Research and Evaluation

The ADVANCE Research and Evaluation staff provide support to the ADVANCE Program through assessment of institutional and unit-level data, evaluation of ADVANCE program initiatives, and direct investigation of specific research questions. Following is a brief summary of services available through and activities engaged in by the ADVANCE Research and Evaluation staff.

**Campus-wide Assessments**

*Indicator Reports*
Each year the Research and Evaluation staff report on several institutional indicators of faculty diversity (e.g., number by track and rank, average number of years in rank, named professorships, administrative appointments, service on tenure and promotion and executive committees by gender and race-ethnicity). These data are particularly useful for assessing change over time in each of three areas of focus: recruitment, retention, promotion and leadership. We report on all faculty with appointments on the instructional (tenure), research, and clinical tracks by gender and race/ethnicity and assess the faculty campus-wide as well as separately for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) faculty and non-STEM faculty. We can also tailor reports for individual schools.

Reports are available at: [http://advance.umich.edu/indicators.php](http://advance.umich.edu/indicators.php)

*Climate Surveys*
Every 5-6 years ADVANCE Research and Evaluation conducts a campus-wide climate survey to assess faculty experiences (e.g., job satisfaction, mentoring, department and University climate). To date we have completed three cross-sectional surveys (fall 2001, fall 2006, and fall 2012) that allow us to understand faculty views of the climate, (looking particularly at the experiences of women faculty and faculty of color) at each of these time periods and to assess change over time.

Reports are available at: [http://advance.umich.edu/climatestudies.php](http://advance.umich.edu/climatestudies.php)

**Support to Individual Units**

*Assessing Salary Equity*
At the request of chairs and deans, Research and Evaluation staff can assist in evaluating salary equity for individual faculty members or for the entire unit following the recommendations in the American Association of University Professors publication, *Paychecks: A Guide to Conducting Salary-Equity Studies for Higher Education Faculty*. In addition to identifying salary inequities, we strive to refine a method of analysis so that administrators may easily monitor the situation for faculty on an on-going basis.

*Climate Assessments of UM Departmental, School, or College Climates*
The Research and Evaluation staff work with UM departments, schools, and colleges to conduct survey or interview studies with faculty, post-docs, Ph.D. students and/or staff to assess how the school/college or departmental climate, or work and classroom environment, is perceived by the group(s) studied. Unit assessments are part of the regular external review process for departments in the Colleges of Engineering and Literature, Science and the Arts. They can also be arranged at the request of unit heads. The information obtained from these studies is used to identify areas in which things are going particularly well, as well as those that need improvement; the goal is to assist the unit to make appropriate policy and other changes to enhance the environment for all members of the department.

Program Evaluation
Research and Evaluation staff conduct formative and summative evaluations of all ADVANCE programs to determine the effectiveness of each initiative and provide feedback to programming staff. Particularly intensive evaluations are conducted for major initiatives including: STRIDE, Faculty Leading Change, and Launch.

Research Initiatives
Research and Evaluation staff periodically conduct research to investigate issues of interest to the ADVANCE Program or at the request of administrators. Examples of recent and current research studies include the following:

Exit Study: At the request of the Office of the Provost, Research and Evaluation staff conduct exit interviews with tenure track faculty who voluntarily leave their positions at the University of Michigan. The first exit study was conducted in 2008; since 2011 the study has been conducted annually with a report produced at the end of each academic year.

Turn Down Studies: In an effort to improve the success rate of new faculty hires, Research and Evaluation staff have conducted several interview studies at the college and department levels to learn about the hiring and interview experiences of job candidates who subsequently turned down a job offer, as well as the factors they considered in their decisions not to come to UM.

Study of Postdoctoral Fellows: In conjunction with six other U.S. academic institutions, the Research and Evaluation staff administered a survey to UM postdocs in 2011. The aims of the study were to better understand the postdoctoral experience at the University of Michigan and to allow for comparisons with other participating institutions, with the goal of improving the work environment for postdocs at the University of Michigan.

Department Change Study: This study by Research and Evaluation staff examines the process of institutional change at the department level over a thirteen-year period, aiming to identify the features of departments that responded to the programmatic institutional preoccupation with change by changing themselves.

Experience of Students’ Disruptive and Disrespectful Behavior: This survey study assessed faculty experiences of students’ disruptive and disrespectful behavior in both undergraduate and graduate level courses in the past year. A sample of tenure track faculty (excluding those in the Medical School) was surveyed including all women and underrepresented minority faculty and a random sample of white and Asian/Asian American men (stratified by rank and equal to the number of comparable white and Asian/Asian American women).
Support to Department Chairs and Deans in Assessing Individual Salary Equity

At the request of chairs and deans, ADVANCE Program staff can assist with analyzing faculty salaries at the departmental, school, and college levels, and with equity assessments of individual faculty members’ salaries, following the recommendations in the American Association of University Professors publication, *Paychecks: A Guide to Conducting Salary-Equity Studies for Higher Education Faculty*. Our approach involves the use of multiple regression models that include factors known to predict salary to a substantial degree. One of our key models allows for the assessment of possible inequities associated with gender and race/ethnicity. This model can be used to demonstrate what salaries would be for women and minorities if they were rewarded as white males are for the career attributes included in the model. We also generate additional models that allow departments and units to address other types of questions about faculty earnings.

As we analyze faculty salaries for evidence of potential inequities linked to factors such as race or gender, we note that additional factors, other than inequities, can lead to differences in faculty compensation. Such factors include differences in particular subfields’ average salaries, differences associated with specific types of research within a field, as well as differences in scholarly productivity. We discuss these types of issues when we meet with chairs and deans about the results of the salary analyses conducted for their units.

Our regression models involve the analysis of a variety of variables that are not widely used at departmental and even school and college levels. The ADVANCE staff is experienced in acquiring and analyzing these data, and in meeting with deans and chairs to assist with the interpretation of the results. The ADVANCE Program has recently conducted several salary studies for deans and chairs who requested analyses that were specific to their units. The feedback we received is that such analyses were quite useful to these unit leaders as salary equity issues were being considered. We are happy to offer this service to deans and chairs who request it. ADVANCE may assess fees for our salary analysis service; fees will vary based on factors such as the size of the unit being assessed and the number of statistical models that are requested.

For more information or additional copies of this resource, please contact the ADVANCE Program at (734) 647-9359 or advanceprogram@umich.edu, or visit the ADVANCE Program’s Web site at http://advance.umich.edu/.

---

1 The regression models used by the UM ADVANCE Program staff for predicting salary include variables such as: number of years at UM, number of years since highest degree at time of hire, years at UM prior to current rank, department, rank, race, and gender. Generally, our models have been found to account for 70% or more of the variance in faculty salary, indicating that these models are useful for predicting salary. Other performance-related variables that affect faculty salary levels (e.g., publications, grant awards) are often less readily available, and are not typically included in our models.
Support for Assessment and Improvement
of UM Departmental, School, or College Climates

The ADVANCE Program at the University of Michigan is pleased to work with UM departments, schools, and colleges that are interested in a systematic assessment of their particular climate for students, staff, and/or faculty. We can recommend external professionals who can perform assessments, ADVANCE staff can collect and analyze climate data for you, or we can arrange for an appropriate combination. Following the assessment, ADVANCE staff can provide programmatic activities aimed at improving the climate as well as free consultation about other campus resources that might be helpful in maintaining the resulting improvements.

Climate Survey and Interview or Focus Group Studies
The ADVANCE Program works with UM departments, schools, and colleges to conduct online survey studies with faculty, post-docs, Ph.D. students and/or staff to assess how the school/college or departmental climate, or work and classroom environment, is perceived. The information obtained from these studies is used to identify areas where things are going particularly well, as well as areas that need improvement; the goal is to assist the unit in making appropriate policy changes to enhance the environment for all members of the unit.

The ADVANCE Program also conducts interview and/or focus group studies with particular populations within a UM department, school, or college. Studies have included interviews with: graduate students to learn in detail about graduate student experiences; faculty who voluntarily left UM to understand why and to inform efforts at faculty retention; and faculty who accepted and/or turned down appointments at UM in an effort to improve hiring practices and success rates of new faculty hires.

Members of the ADVANCE professional staff, who are trained in social science research methods, analyze data and draft reports. Trained staff conduct interviews and focus groups to maintain complete confidentiality. A separate report is prepared for each survey and/or interview study conducted.

The fee structure for these studies is as follows:
Survey studies: $500 for data collection of all surveys
$500-$750 for each report

Qualitative studies: $30-$50/interview, depending upon length
$75/focus group
$75 for each report
We would be happy to consult with you about a climate assessment within your unit and develop a study that meets your needs.

**Leadership Coaching for Full Professors**
Professional coaching is provided to full professors in order to:
- develop individual leadership skills, styles and perspectives;
- assist with individual goal setting and career development;
- educate about academic culture, and leadership norms and models; and
- establish strategies and tactics to achieve specific outcomes.

The costs are funded jointly by the College of LSA, CoE, and ADVANCE.

Coaching for Department Chairs is available and can be requested through the Deans.

**LIFT – Leadership and Integration in Faculty Transitions**

LIFT is a faculty development resource at the University of Michigan focusing on mid-career faculty.

Tenure and promotion each represent a potent intersection of accumulated knowledge and experience with increasingly complex opportunities, roles, and demands. The LIFT Core Competency Seminar Series fosters skills to facilitate the success, empowerment, and satisfaction of individual faculty, while enabling and informing their contributions to their departments, disciplines, and other forms of academic community.

The LIFT Core Competency Seminar Series complements other LIFT programs including the LIFT transition programs: Two one-day transition seminars for new associate and new full professors.

The -seminars will be offered free to new associate professors in the fall term and to new full professors in the winter term. Annually, three Core Competency Seminars will be offered.

**Support provided in collaboration with The CRLT Players**

**Mentoring for Assistant Professors**
Mentoring for Assistant Professors is a set of special presentations of the CRLT Theater Program’s Faculty Advising Faculty sketch, designed for groups including both male and female assistant professors, within—rather than across—departments. The purpose of these presentations is to bring groups of men and women together to have a facilitated discussion about an issue that is important in the careers of both women and men, but has some differential features. These presentations and discussions are aimed not only at recognizing problematic gender and rank dynamics depicted in the sketch, but also at identifying the potential benefits of good career advising, and developing ideas about how to maximize the likelihood of getting it themselves.

**Career Development**
Using the CRLT Theater Program’s sketches, groups have an opportunity to work to build skills in areas including mentoring, hiring, and advisor-advisee relationships. Activities include focus groups and interactive theatre performances.

To explore how the CRLT Theater Program can assist you, and whether there will be costs associated, explore their web site for information and contacts: http://www.crlt.umich.edu

For more information or additional copies of this resource, please contact the ADVANCE Program at 734 647-9359 or advanceprogram@umich.edu, or visit the ADVANCE Program’s Web site at http://advance.umich.edu.
Committee on Strategies and Tactics for Recruiting to Improve Diversity and Excellence (STRIDE)

The STRIDE Committee is composed of sixteen senior faculty members, who are drawn broadly from across campus and who serve a five-year term. Committee members have studied the research literature on how cognitive schemas affect evaluation processes and may have an inappropriate influence on recruitment and retention of an outstanding, diverse faculty.

The committee provides information and guidance to peers about practices that will maximize the likelihood that diverse, well-qualified candidates for faculty positions will be identified, recruited, retained, and promoted at the University of Michigan. Every fall term the committee leads 5-6 campus-wide workshops for faculty and administrators involved in faculty search committees. Participation in these workshops has been required of search committee members in LSA and Engineering since 2008. Over 980 current faculty have attended at least one of the cross-campus workshops. The director of ADVANCE presents a brief, targeted version of the STRIDE workshop to search committees for deans and other upper-level administrators. In addition to these workshops, STRIDE also offers an annual presentation for departmental administrative staff involved in the faculty recruitment process.

Each spring, STRIDE offers a program called FASTER (Friends and Allies of STRIDE Toward Equity in Recruiting) for a group of about 20 faculty colleagues drawn from across campus and who focus on a single topic. In previous years, topics have included bias, race/ethnicity, climate, and faculty evaluation and retention. The purpose of FASTER is to expand the circle of senior faculty who are knowledgeable about the role that unconscious bias can play in recruitment and evaluation of faculty, as well as how it can contribute to an unpleasant and counterproductive work environment. The workshop provides each group of FASTER members with an opportunity to engage the relevant social science literatures and to discuss the topic with colleagues, including STRIDE committee members. STRIDE also uses the FASTER workshops as an opportunity to obtain feedback from colleagues about their ideas for changes in the STRIDE workshops.

ADVANCE has developed many materials that are included as resources to participants in the STRIDE workshops. They include a candidate evaluation tool for use in faculty searches, a faculty recruiting handbook, articles and reading lists, a mentoring handbook, and FAQs developed for particular issues. These materials are also posted on our website: http://http://advance.umich.edu/stride.php.
During the past couple of years, the ADVANCE program has developed new material aimed to help department chairs and faculty committee members who are charged with processes of evaluation of faculty colleagues. In developing these materials we were guided by discussions with and advice from the STRIDE committee and the participants in our 2012 FASTER program (both groups listed on the reverse side).

We have shared these materials with our Steering Committee, and they have encouraged us to disseminate them widely. For that reason, we are enclosing copies of Faculty Awards and Leadership Guidelines, Faculty Annual Review Guidelines, and Third Year, Tenure, and Promotion Review Guidelines for your use and discussion. If you would like additional copies of any or all of them, please let Shawn Beard (spbeard@umich.edu) know and we will be happy to supply them.
FASTER 2012 Participants

Ellen Arruda, Mechanical Engineering/Biomedical Engineering/Program in Macromolecular Science and Engineering
Kathy Babiak, Kinesiology
Mark Banaszak Holl, Chemistry
Jill Becker, Psychology
Mark Burns, Chemical Engineering
Ken Powell, Aerospace Engineering
Fiona Lee, Psychology
Kristy Martyn, Chair of Health Promotion and Risk Reduction
John Montgomery, Chemistry
Yin-Long Qiu, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
Stephanie Rowley, Psychology
Roseanne Sension, Chemistry/Physics
Mike Solomon, Chemical Engineering

2012 STRIDE Members

Mark Chesler, Sociology
Carol Fierke, Chemistry
Wayne Jones, Materials Science & Engineering
Jennifer Linderman, Chemical Engineering
Tim McKay, Physics
Juanita Merchant, Internal Medicine
Vijay Nair, Statistics/Industrial and Operations Engineering
Noel Perkins, Mechanical Engineering
Denise Sekaquaptewa, Psychology
Gretchen Spreitzer, School of Business
Abby Stewart, Psychology/Women's Studies
Levi Thompson, Chemical Engineering

ADVANCE Steering Committee

Sara Blair, Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs
Carol Fierke, Dean of Rackham Graduate School
Margaret Gyetko, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, Medical School
Jennifer Linderman, Chemical Engineering
Andrew Martin, Dean of LSA
David Munson, Dean of Engineering
Lori Pierce, Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs
Pamela Raymond, Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology
Abigail Stewart, Psychology/Women's Studies
James Woolliscroft, Dean of Medicine
From: Martha Pollack
Sent: April 2, 2015
Subject: Faculty Evaluation: Recognition of entrepreneurial, creative, and outreach activities

Dear Colleagues:

One of our most important responsibilities is the evaluation of faculty colleagues for tenure and promotion and as part of annual activity reporting. When carrying out this responsibility, I encourage you to give full recognition to the broad range of entrepreneurial, outreach, and creative activities in which faculty engage. These activities may enhance any of the criteria on which faculty are measured — teaching, research, and service. They may include involvement with other sectors including public and private organizations that have not traditionally been considered in faculty evaluations, or they may include creative activity that does not take the form of traditional scholarship.

Examples include:
• creating service learning and action-based learning opportunities for students,
• creating new instructional methods,
• engaging in community-based research,
• engaging in research funded by industrial, nonprofit, or other non-federal or foundation sources,
• creating a start-up company that enhances the broader scholarly, public service, or health care missions of the University,
• engaging in creative performance,
• creating new or enhanced practices, products, or services,
• working with to patent or license an invention,
• advising and instructing students in entrepreneurial and public service activities,
• developing collaborative approaches to solving complex world problems.

Activities like these strengthen the University and should be considered as contributions worthy of consideration, both at times of tenure and promotion and on an annual basis.

Sincerely,

Martha E. Pollack
Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
In May 2012, a small group of senior U-M faculty drawn from several different schools and colleges, including both members of the STRIDE and FASTER committees, met for two days to discuss both their own experiences with the selection of faculty for awards and leadership positions, and literature outlining best practices, pitfalls, and recommendations. They distilled their reading and discussion into the guidelines outlined here. We will use the term “awards” here to include internal awards, nominations for external awards, and selection of faculty for leadership positions of all types.

**PRINCIPLES**

Equity in access and opportunity for awards

Make sure the pool is as broad as possible. Without consideration of equity across groups, the “contenders” in the pool will likely be those at the top of the pyramid – mainly senior white men.

Inclusiveness

Distribute awards in ways that promote inclusiveness and broader consideration of accomplishments and their value.

Fairness

There should be a sense that both the outcome and process “feels” fair to all participants. Inclusiveness, equity of access, and review by those who take systematic steps to avoid the influence of implicit biases all contribute to fairness.

Awareness and education regarding potential for bias

Any institution that values its awards process should insist upon educating chairs and committee members to be conscious of potential biases in evaluation.

Service as a privilege

Evaluation of all employees, faculty included, requires many skills. Consider explicitly the characteristics that are needed in evaluators, and select evaluators with those qualities.

Accountability

The entities responsible for the award – the award selection and the nominating bodies – should be held accountable, and hold themselves accountable, both to the individuals being evaluated and to those to whom recommendations are being made.

There should be multiple pathways to nomination

To maximize the likelihood of diverse nominations, opening procedures to multiple nominators (including self-nomination) may be critical.

The committee should discuss the process and criteria before reviewing nominations

This ensures use of the publicly communicated criteria for the award. Research has shown that implicit bias can enter via inadvertent shifting standards after nominees are discussed.

The selection process should be fair

All who are eligible for the award should be given equal consideration during the review process and discussion. Ensure that every committee member’s voice is heard. Unconscious bias is lessened when committees have time for thoughtful reflection and discussion.

Promote equal discussion of each candidate

Use a systematic process and agreed upon criteria. Although this may be time consuming and dismissed by committees as not critical, this promotes a less biased, fair and inclusive process.

**PRACTICES**

Develop written criteria

Criteria should be developed prior to the beginning of any evaluation process. These criteria should be clearly stated, but not in terms of narrowly defined evidence.

The awards criteria and process for nomination should be transparent

The steps to request nominations, all supporting documents needed for the nomination, the timeline for evaluation, and past winners should be communicated publicly and widely. The request for nominations, along with the criteria, should be prominently displayed, such as on the award website.

Awards committee chairs educated to recognize potential for bias should ensure the following practices are in place:

Appoint diverse selection committee members

Several recent studies demonstrated that more diverse groups with a greater breadth of perspectives make better decisions. In addition, diverse committees provide access to a wider set of networks for cultivating nominations. Do not expect committee members from underrepresented groups to advocate for diversity – it is everyone’s responsibility.

To maximize the likelihood of diverse nominations, opening procedures to multiple nominators (including self-nomination) may be critical.

The committee should discuss the process and criteria before reviewing nominations

This ensures use of the publicly communicated criteria for the award. Research has shown that implicit bias can enter via inadvertent shifting standards after nominees are discussed.

The selection process should be fair

All who are eligible for the award should be given equal consideration during the review process and discussion. Ensure that every committee member’s voice is heard. Unconscious bias is lessened when committees have time for thoughtful reflection and discussion.

Promote equal discussion of each candidate

Use a systematic process and agreed upon criteria. Although this may be time consuming and dismissed by committees as not critical, this promotes a less biased, fair and inclusive process.

The selection process should be inclusive

The process should consider the historic tendency to draw awardees from a narrow demographic, and make provisions to avoid this. This includes expanding the demographic characteristics of the pool to be considered in the current round.

**RESOURCES**


**ADVANCE Program**

1214 S. University Avenue, 2nd Floor,
Suite C – Galleria Building
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
Phone: 734.647.9359
Fax: 734.647.6112

advance.umich.edu
advanceprogram@umich.edu
From: Martha Pollack  
Sent: April 2, 2015  
Subject: Faculty Evaluation: Recognition of entrepreneurial, creative, and outreach activities  

Dear Colleagues:  

One of our most important responsibilities is the evaluation of faculty colleagues for tenure and promotion and as part of annual activity reporting. When carrying out this responsibility, I encourage you to give full recognition to the broad range of entrepreneurial, outreach, and creative activities in which faculty engage. These activities may enhance any of the criteria on which faculty are measured — teaching, research, and service. They may include involvement with other sectors including public and private organizations that have not traditionally been considered in faculty evaluations, or they may include creative activity that does not take the form of traditional scholarship.  

Examples include:  
- creating service learning and action-based learning opportunities for students,  
- creating new instructional methods,  
- engaging in community-based research,  
- engaging in research funded by industrial, nonprofit, or other non-federal or foundation sources,  
- creating a start-up company that enhances the broader scholarly, public service, or health care missions of the University,  
- engaging in creative performance,  
- creating new or enhanced practices, products, or services,  
- working with to patent or license an invention,  
- advising and instructing students in entrepreneurial and public service activities,  
- developing collaborative approaches to solving complex world problems.  

Activities like these strengthen the University and should be considered as contributions worthy of consideration, both at times of tenure and promotion and on an annual basis.  

Sincerely,  

Martha E. Pollack  
Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
In May 2012, a small group of senior U-M faculty drawn from several different schools and colleges, including both members of the STRIDE and FASTER committees, met for two days to discuss both their own experiences with the annual review process and literature outlining best practices, pitfalls, and recommendations. They distilled their reading and discussion into the guidelines outlined here.

**PRINCIPLES**

**Fair outcomes**
There should be a sense that the outcome of the annual review process (merit raise, performance score) “feels” fair to the participants, i.e., that there is an equitable distribution of resources.

**Fair and transparent processes**
Participants in the annual review process should feel they have a voice and that standards are applied consistently, accurately, and without bias.

**Respectful and supportive interaction.** Faculty should be treated with sensitivity and respect, especially when they are being given feedback.

**Merit-based and mission-relevant review**
Well articulated and transparent review criteria should be developed (ideally with input by members of the unit) based on departmental and institutional goals, vision and values.

**Developmental feedback**
Reviews should assist in the guidance of junior faculty and encourage all contributing scholars during their careers.

**Accountability**
Faculty are responsible for timely preparation of any requested material based on their own accomplishments and, as appropriate, for conducting careful analyses of the work of others. Chairs are responsible for providing timely and well-justified analyses and recommendations to the dean and feedback to faculty in accordance with the principles outlined above.

**Service as a privilege**
Evaluation of all employees, faculty included, requires many skills. Consider explicitly the characteristics that are needed in evaluators, and select evaluators with those qualities.

**PRACTICES**

**Review of process**
Annual review procedures and criteria should be reviewed periodically with a representative group of faculty. Are the criteria clear and mission-relevant? Have the criteria and process been well-communicated to the faculty? Do the criteria incentivize the desired behavior? Did any issues crop up in the last annual review that need to be addressed?

**Communication of goals**
The goals of the annual review process, both developmental and salary-setting, should be discussed with the faculty before the process begins.

**Determination of criteria**
Criteria for the annual review should be developed, discussed, and communicated before the annual process begins. An effort should be made to create a process of evaluation that guards against shifting standards in evaluating different faculty members.

**Collection of information using a consistent template**
In order to maximize the committee’s ability to use their criteria, a template should be designed that ensures uniform reporting of information for evaluation. A template that includes both specific and open-ended portions, as well as questions about goals, is recommended.

**Communication regarding the process**
A timeline and materials needed from the faculty should be publicized well in advance of the due date.

**Evaluation committee**
A carefully chosen committee that is inclusive and diverse should conduct the evaluation. These faculty should have a clear understanding of the evaluation review framework and criteria discussed above. Education about unconscious bias should be provided to the committee; this may be accomplished using reading materials or a presentation (e.g., from a STRIDE committee member).

**Articulation of philosophy regarding salarysetting**
Salaries affect faculty recruitment and retention. They also influence what faculty do while they are here. Department chairs should develop a framework for how they will balance local (within the department) and outside market forces for salary determination and should communicate this to the faculty. Similarly, the framework should address the tradeoff between “high performers take all” and sharing rewards more broadly across the faculty.

**Developmental feedback**
Developmental feedback should be provided to all faculty, but particularly to junior faculty, in a manner disconnected from the salary-setting portion of the process.
Dear Colleagues:

One of our most important responsibilities is the evaluation of faculty colleagues for tenure and promotion and as part of annual activity reporting. When carrying out this responsibility, I encourage you to give full recognition to the broad range of entrepreneurial, outreach, and creative activities in which faculty engage. These activities may enhance any of the criteria on which faculty are measured — teaching, research, and service. They may include involvement with other sectors including public and private organizations that have not traditionally been considered in faculty evaluations, or they may include creative activity that does not take the form of traditional scholarship.

Examples include:
• creating service learning and action-based learning opportunities for students,
• creating new instructional methods,
• engaging in community-based research,
• engaging in research funded by industrial, nonprofit, or other non-federal or foundation sources,
• creating a start-up company that enhances the broader scholarly, public service, or health care missions of the University,
• engaging in creative performance,
• creating new or enhanced practices, products, or services,
• working with to patent or license an invention,
• advising and instructing students in entrepreneurial and public service activities,
• developing collaborative approaches to solving complex world problems.

Activities like these strengthen the University and should be considered as contributions worthy of consideration, both at times of tenure and promotion and on an annual basis.

Sincerely,

Martha E. Pollack
Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

---

\[1\text{From: Martha Pollack}
\text{Sent: April 2, 2015}
\text{Subject: Faculty Evaluation: Recognition of entrepreneurial, creative, and outreach activities}

---

\[2\text{Evaluating Contributions to Diversity for Faculty Appointment and Promotion Under APM-210.}
\text{senate.ucsc.edu/committees/caad-committeeon-affirmative-action-and-diversity/Evaluating
diversity APM 210.pdf}
In May 2012, a small group of senior U-M faculty drawn from several different schools and colleges, including both members of the STRIDE and FASTER committees, met for two days to discuss both their own experiences with third year, tenure, and promotion review processes, and literature outlining best practices, pitfalls, and recommendations. They distilled their reading and discussion into the guidelines outlined here.

**P R I N C I P L E S**

**Develop well-articulated criteria that are:**
- discussed, established, published, and communicated prior to evaluations;
- broad, inclusive, and consistent with University expectations/goals (see, for example, the Provost’s message);
- quantitative whenever appropriate (in the interest of removing ambiguity);
- reviewed periodically.

**Use a well-articulated and transparent process.**
- Develop a “casebook” template to promote entering of complete and accurate information by the candidate and review committee.
- Provide the candidate with an opportunity to confirm that the review committee’s information is accurate and complete.

**Foster accountability.**
- Follow explicit criteria and record reasons for decisions based on criteria.
- Inform the candidate of decisions at each step of the process.
- Provide the candidate with information about recourse action(s) available for each step/decision.
- Identity U-M evaluators at each step of process (including Provost-level review).

**Promote respectful, supportive interaction.**
- Treat the candidate as a valued colleague regardless of decision outcome.
- Be cognizant of evaluation bias and ensure unbiased evaluation and judgment.
- Be consistent in application of explicit criteria.

**The criteria and evaluation process should**
- be articulated, restated, and emphasized at all stages of faculty development, including orientation of new hires, mentoring of junior faculty, third year review, and tenure and promotion reviews.

**Pertaining to Transparency and Accountability**
- Publish summary records/empirical evidence of successful candidates in redacted form. For example, provide quantitative data on research records (e.g., publication record) that include range, mean, and standard deviation.
- Consider practice employed at the U-M Medical School.
- Inform candidates of decisions at each step of the process.
- Remind committee of evaluation criteria prepared at each step/decision.
- Provide an opportunity for colleagues to give input where the principles outlined above are sometimes violated. At a minimum, U-M evaluators should be educated about evaluation bias prior to reading letters, for example by attending a STRIDE workshop or reading relevant literature. Consider including information about the role of unconscious bias when soliciting external letters and asking letter writers to take this into account.
- If letters are retained in the process, make the first decision without any reference to letters (that is, without reading them). This may reduce evaluation bias.
- No unsolicited letters should ever be considered at any stage of the process.
- Provide an opportunity for colleagues to give input at the start of the process.

**Practices**

**Pertaining to Evaluation Criteria**
- Establish clear, written evaluation criteria.
- Account for broader contributions, including diversity, outreach, and mentoring. As an example, consider the criteria developed by the University of California that integrate these broader contributions in the criteria for teaching, research and other creative work, professional activity, and university and public service.
- Determine how you will recognize and evaluate the contributions of members of a collaborative team. Consider collecting descriptive information about the roles of individuals in collaborative projects.
- Assess the value of translational projects, where relevant.
- Employ multiple data sources and multiple forms of evaluation to assess teaching.
- Recognize the unique value of faculty/peer assessments and require them for both developmental and evaluative purposes.
- Do not use letters from students in the evaluation process.
- Remind committee of evaluation criteria prior to discussion and evaluation of candidate.
- Base evaluations on evidence and be consistent with the written criteria. Avoid evaluations that are characterized by summary and/or vague discussion.

**Pertaining to Letters**
- Reduce reliance on external letters for decision making. These letters represent input where the principles outlined above are sometimes violated. At a minimum, U-M evaluators should be educated about evaluation bias prior to reading letters, for example by attending a STRIDE workshop or reading relevant literature. Consider including information about the role of unconscious bias when soliciting external letters and asking letter writers to take this into account.
- If letters are retained in the process, make the first decision without any reference to letters (that is, without reading them). This may reduce evaluation bias.
- No unsolicited letters should ever be considered at any stage of the process.
- Provide an opportunity for colleagues to give input at the start of the process.

**Resources**

AAUP (2000). Good Practice in Tenure Education: Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators: American Council on Education.


ADVANCE Program
1234 S. University Avenue, 2nd Floor, Suite C – Galleria Building
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
Phone: 734.647.9359
Fax: 734.647.6112
advance.umich.edu
advanceprogram@umich.edu
Guidelines for Writing Letters of Recommendation

The goal of a letter of recommendation for an academic position or promotion is to provide an overall assessment of the candidate’s potential to excel in a new position. In other words, what is the candidate’s professional promise and your evidence to support the assessment? Thus, your letter will identify the characteristics and achievements that are directly relevant to the candidate’s potential job performance. The key to effective and accurate letter writing is focusing your comments on criteria that are relevant for this evaluation. Traits that should be considered for discussion in a letter include past job/task performances, experience and expertise, intellectual ability, and personal attributes as they pertain to leadership quality, teambuilding, perseverance, and communication skills.

Useful letters of recommendation include the following elements:

1. Focus on the applicant
2. Description of the applicant’s record
3. Evaluation of accomplishments of the applicant
4. Discussion of personal characteristics only to the extent that they predict potential growth and job performance

Letters missing any or all of these elements provide the reader with only a limited understanding of the candidate’s qualifications.

Letters should be complete but concise, and they usually consist of three parts: introduction and background, specific assessments, and summary of recommendation. Letters from primary mentors, supervisors or close collaborators are generally somewhat longer than letters from others. The more detailed the narrative, the more persuasive the recommendation is. An excessively brief letter, even if giving high praise, is often viewed as a weak recommendation, at best interpreted to imply that the writer knows very little about the candidate or (worse) that the writer intends to convey doubt about the qualifications of the candidate without specifically making such statements.

Introduction and Background

A good letter identifies the candidate, the position for which she/he is applying, and the relationship between the recommender and the candidate. If the recommender wishes to write a strong and supportive letter for the candidate, it is often helpful to make it clear from the outset of the letter and then provide clear documentation of such a favorable recommendation. It is also helpful to describe the type of experience and length of time that the candidate has been known to the recommender.

---

1 These guidelines were drafted by the UM STRIDE committee in response to a request from a UM faculty member. We offer them in the hope that they may be helpful both to experienced faculty letter-writers concerned about writing fair letters, and to new letter-writers who value some guidance in the process.
Specific Assessments
This is the section of the letter that contains the "data" or evidence for your argument. It should provide specific information about the candidate. Generalizations will be much better received if specific examples can be cited. Ask yourself “how does the information I just wrote support my assertion that this person is a quality candidate?”

In this section, personal traits that are directly relevant to the job performance can be discussed. Characteristics such as motivation, dependability, patience, creativity, ability to troubleshoot, poise, listening skills, etc. can be discussed. Avoid personal statements that are not related to job performance (past or future). For example, avoid irrelevant statements such as "she is practically part of my family" or "he is very active in his church or other community organization." These may be true, but they decrease the professionalism and impact of the evaluation.

Other characteristics that can be discussed include problem-solving abilities, management skills, teaching abilities, knowledge of the subject area, and ability to work with colleagues. Avoid "doubt raisers." These include negative language such as "while not the best student I've had" or faint praise such as "she worked hard on projects that she accepted." Other types of doubt raisers include hedging statements such as "he appears to be highly motivated." (Avoid such words as "appears to" or “seems”—you are the one writing with concrete experience about the candidate). Finally, also avoid potentially negative or unexplained comments. Make your comments direct. For example, unexplained comments that could be open to negative interpretations include: "now that she has chosen to leave the laboratory," and "bright, enthusiastic, responds well to feedback."

Summary Recommendation
This section briefly summarizes the main points of the letter and clearly states (or re-states) that you recommend the candidate for the position. The language should be straightforward and to the point. Avoid using jargon, clichés, or language that is too effusive. These are all elements that can be lost on your readers, depending on their experiences, culture, and training. The most effective recommendation letters also include a comparison of the applicant to a reference pool. For example, “...ranks in the top 10% of all undergraduate students that I have ever taught.” You should avoid direct references to another individual: “she/he is better than Joe Smith” or “she/he is almost as good as Jane Chen.”

Reading Recommendation Letters
Finally, the suggestions in this document are recommendations that can be used to construct effective, fair recommendation letters. You can also apply criteria based on these suggestions when you read and evaluate recommendation letters. Did the letter writer present you with an honest, concise and fair document with which to evaluate the candidate?

Notes on Special Circumstances
How do you handle personal circumstances in the applicant’s history that may affect time-to-degree or productivity? It is generally better to address this issue than leave it unaddressed. However, talk to the applicant about it first. How do they want to address it? Do they prefer to not address it? Do they need help in deciding if and how to address it? Please keep in mind that if you, as a letter writer, address this situation but are too vague, it can leave a worse impression than not addressing it at all. To create the strongest letter, it is often helpful to present the situation as evidence that the applicant has faced adversity and overcome it, making him/her even stronger.

For additional reading:
Frequently-Asked Questions: Dual Career Issues

Can the dual career status of a candidate be discussed by the search committee?
Definitely not. The chairs of search committees (and search committee members) play an important role in helping all committee members ensure that dual career status is not a topic of discussion in evaluating a candidate. It is important to recognize that committee members may have good ideas about potential dual career solutions, but these should NOT play any role in the discussion of the merit or suitability of candidates.

When is the best time to encourage a candidate to raise a dual career concern?
It is counterproductive (and illegal) at any time to ask candidates direct questions about their partner situation. Such questions often cause candidates to conclude that partner situations are relevant job considerations, which of course they must not be. However, it is very important to provide all candidates with information about the dual career program very early in the process—ideally before they even visit. Once a candidate is invited for a visit, chairs and other administrators typically want the maximum amount of time possible to try to address dual career issues. On the other hand, if a candidate raises the issue early, this may prompt more attention to the issue than is advantageous to the candidate in the department’s deliberations. Because any individual cannot guarantee the effect of raising the issue early, candidates should not be given specific advice about what to do. Instead, it is appropriate, if they ask about the issues, to point out the advantages and disadvantages to raising it earlier or later.

How does a candidate actually get help with dual career issues?
Ordinarily a department chair contacts the dean’s office, which may contact an internal dual career office, or may request dual career services from the Office of the Provost. Department chairs should be informed about the specific procedures used in their school or college. Search committee chairs and members should not make direct contact with the dual career, dean’s, or Provost’s offices. Contact with the dean’s office, and potentially a request from the dean for assistance from the Provost’s dual career services, may occur before an offer is extended, but it is important that the department chair is clear about the current status of the search process.

Are dual career services from the Provost’s office only available for spouses of faculty?
No. Dual career services from the Provost’s office are not limited to spouses, but are available to those described by a faculty candidate as a partner. They are not available to partners of post-doctoral fellows, graduate students, or staff.

Are dual career services from the Provost’s office only available when a candidate is first considering the University?
No. Under certain circumstances faculty already at the University can receive dual career services, when recommended by a department chair or dean and subject to approval by the Provost’s office.

Exactly what will the University do to support a dual career hire? I’ve heard about many different arrangements, and I don’t understand what I should tell candidates and partners about how they work.
First, University funding can be used to directly support jobs only for employees of the University of Michigan. Placement assistance for partners who are looking for jobs in the community is also available.

Second, prudent practice suggests that candidates and partners should not be told about specific funding arrangements for partners. Information of this sort tends to undermine the partner’s sense of being a valued member and contributor in the unit where they are hired. Moreover, the specific funding arrangements inevitably depend on the nature of the position and the source of funding. Although individual arrangements have many forms, in all cases the partner’s position must eventually be funded...
entirely within the unit (or units) based on the need for the position and the performance of the individual.

What is the role of department and search committee faculty members in addressing dual career issues?
Depending on the partner’s skills and interests, the department faculty may be key resources in identifying career possibilities both on and off campus. Moreover, department faculty can be encouraging or helpful in social and professional settings with the partner. It is crucial that the partner is treated as an independent individual with career needs, rather than as an appendage to a much-desired colleague. Partners are likely to be sensitive to all cues (in language, tone, and approach) that might suggest that departments and individuals are interested not in their qualifications and talents, but only in recruiting the faculty candidate who is their partner.

Does the department have an obligation to support administrative aspects of the dual career services?
The Provost’s Dual Career office works with the school or college and/or the department’s administrative staff to assist with dual career issues. The department should be prepared to commit the necessary time.

How can we be positive about the University’s commitment to dual career needs and not over-sell the possibilities for a successful outcome?
Members of a search committee or other faculty involved in recruiting must balance two needs: the desire to be encouraging to candidates about the University’s and the department’s commitment to working on dual career issues, and the need to avoid creating the perception that we can guarantee the partner a job.

What happens if the dual career arrangement that is worked out is only temporary?
Apart from tenure-track faculty appointments, employment arrangements for partners within the University are sometimes temporary and may be subsidized for a limited period (often three years). It is important to balance the candidates’ inevitable preference for permanent solutions and the reality that partners must in fact perform in a competitive job market. At the same time, it is important that the initial appointment be one in which the partner has a realistic chance of success, and that partners and candidates be informed about the long-term prospects of short-term arrangements. It is crucial that departments monitor the success of the dual career arrangement for the partner and identify difficulties as early as possible.

Additional information can be found at the following links from the Office of the Provost:
This page provides information for administrators, including department chairs:
http://www.provost.umich.edu/programs/dual_career/administrators.html

This page provides information for Dual Career Couples:
http://www.provost.umich.edu/programs/dual_career/

These pages provide helpful handouts for couples:
http://www.provost.umich.edu/programs/dual_career/Dual_Career_Services%20Jan%202011.pdf

For more information or additional copies of this resource, please contact the ADVANCE Program at (734) 647-9359 or advanceprogram@umich.edu, or visit the ADVANCE Program’s Web site at http://advance.umich.edu.
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How to Help New Faculty Settle in: Common Problems and Alternative Solutions

During the academic years 2005–12, the director of the UM ADVANCE Program, Professor Abigail Stewart, has met with many newly-hired women faculty, at all ranks, from the science and engineering fields. These faculty members were affiliated with the College of Engineering, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, Medical School, and the smaller schools that have scientists on the faculty. Although many of these faculty members recounted positive experiences, issues that potentially could have been avoided were raised. These problems increased difficulties in adjusting to their new professional environment and even resulted in attrition. Over the years, some of these issues appeared to be recurrent problems and do not pertain only to the fields of science and engineering.

Based on these conversations, the list below identifies some common difficulties; in italics we suggest alternative approaches. In most cases, these approaches were actually offered by other new faculty members who had also directly experienced the issues. Some of the problems (e.g., associated with setting up a lab) are specific to faculty depending on their research needs; others (e.g., relating to teaching; dependent care organization) are much more general. We offer this list in the hope that it will assist departmental chairs, mentors, and new faculty themselves to anticipate and respond to issues that might arise early in their appointment at UM.

Access to Mentors

Some new faculty report that although there is a formal mentoring program in their department, they have not found it easy to access advice or help. Others report that there is not a formal mentoring program and they too do not find it easy to access advice or help.

In some (but not all) instances, the junior faculty have been advised by senior faculty not to accept these students. The junior faculty members must balance this advice against their growing anxiety about identifying student help.

It is important to develop a strategy for identifying students to work with new faculty that provides less risk to the new faculty member; if hired early enough they may participate in graduate recruitment and identify a new student; alternatively, they may take joint responsibility for a more advanced student along with a mentor who will provide advice and help with already-identified difficulties. Finally, temporary arrangements may be set up at the department’s (not the new faculty member’s) expense, and these arrangements can be explicitly identified as having no long-term implications. Conversations with more advanced faculty suggest that these poor initial decisions often end up wasting vast amounts of time during the tenure probationary period, when faculty have little time to waste.

On-line Resources

ADVANCE Program: http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance

Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) http://www.crlt.umich.edu/


Work/Life Resource Center: Child Care Resources http://hr.umich.edu/worklife/childcare/index.php

Additional Resources


Making the Right Moves; A Practical Guide to Scientific Management for Postdocs and New Faculty, (2006). The Howard Hughes Medical Institute and Burroughs Wellcome Fund (This document can be downloaded from the University of Michigan Library on-line resources.)
Consider providing all new faculty with ADVANCE’s handbook (available online at the ADVANCE website or in hard copy from the ADVANCE program) on “Giving and Getting Career Advice,” which provides faculty with suggestions about strategies for getting their needs for advice met. If your department or school does not have a formal mentoring program, consider implementing one. Finally, many junior faculty find peer mentoring groups very helpful in addressing their needs for both advice and colleagueship. Consider facilitating the establishment of a peer mentoring group (outlined in the ADVANCE Handbook) in your unit or jointly with other related units.

Course Assignments
New assistant professors have raised the issue of having been assigned to teach courses in areas they do not know well and do not feel equipped to teach. New assistant professors do not know what the norms are about resisting or refusing teaching assignments. Since the tenure probationary period is so short, it is potentially devastating to a faculty member’s workload to manage extensive preparation for a course for which s/he is unprepared, quite apart from the added anxiety. In addition to the extra preparation time, there is an additional likelihood that the course will be less well-received and therefore become a barrier to demonstrating teaching competence.

New faculty teaching assignments can and should be made in the best interest of the new faculty member, and it should be made clear that the new faculty member plays an important role in this decision-making process.

Classroom Authority and Teaching Evaluations
Many new faculty are not aware of the resources provided by the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT), and do not understand the need to address teaching issues as early as possible. For all new faculty, difficulties in the classroom can result in anxiety, lower teaching evaluations, over-preparing for class sessions, and little pleasure in teaching. Women and underrepresented minority faculty are challenged by students in the classroom more often than other faculty. Because new faculty have

This sense of disparate treatment becomes more critical and anxiety-provoking when they feel they have not received some element in their package (e.g., support for graduate students, summer salary, etc.) that others have and that they feel is necessary for their success.

Avoid these disparities. Assume that the details of start-ups will be public knowledge and that, therefore, all new faculty at comparable career stages with comparable needs should be brought in on comparable terms.

Establishing a Lab
Faculty experience significant delays in receiving necessary lab equipment and setting up a fully functioning lab. The following three scenarios appear to be most prevalent: they have insufficient information about procedures and university practices; they have difficulties with vendors who are unhelpful; their arrival has not been sufficiently anticipated. When they come to campus at their own expense in the summer before they are starting, often without their families, it is particularly distressing to be faced with serious delays in setting up a lab.

Since most new assistant professors have no experience setting up a lab, it is important for this process to be as supported and transparent as possible both before they arrive and once they are on campus. Key support staff and a knowledgeable and sympathetic senior faculty member assigned to be helpful can make this process go much more smoothly. When serious delays are unavoidable, seek ways to minimize the impact on the new faculty member’s research program (e.g., by setting up arrangements for sharing, supporting them spending time in collaborators’ labs elsewhere during this period, etc.). Encourage new faculty to participate in the annual campus-wide workshop on running a research group.

Lack of System for Assigning or Identifying Students to Collaborate / Work in Lab
In several instances, new assistant professors have taken on students who were known in the department to be problematic.
little and sometimes no teaching experience, they are not prepared to address the derailing effects of these persistent challenges.

Chairs or their designates could meet with new faculty early in the first term of teaching, to discuss in an open-ended and non-evaluative way some of the difficulties many new faculty have, and the resources available to address them. New faculty can be provided access to a senior faculty member who takes more than a pro forma interest in understanding the teaching experiences of new faculty members and who might be able to provide advice and/or assistance.

Child Care and Education Needs for Dependents

Newly arrived faculty need to identify child care options without much, if any, knowledge of the Ann Arbor community. In some instances, this leads to unsatisfactory child care arrangements, requiring time, energy, and resources to correct. Faculty with special needs children must identify specific education options which requires additional time, energy, and resources. This situation contributes to great anxiety and to expenditure of substantial time.

At a minimum it is important to be sure the faculty member is aware of on-campus resources like the child care resource office and the family-friendly policies.

In addition, this set of concerns is often experienced as “extra,” something quite outside the official life of the university and therefore off limits for discussion with senior colleagues. This perception is isolating and detrimental since senior colleagues often have information or advice that would be helpful. In addition, the opportunity to openly discuss an important, distracting, and time-consuming issue may, in itself, help an individual feel more “at home.” Facilitating open discussion of the issue with senior colleagues in any department is important.

Dual Career

Some faculty members arrive in the summer to get an early start on setting up their lab, and often face a situation in which they are...
waiting for equipment and/or renovation for much of the summer. This common situation quickly becomes very stressful if they have a partner who has not found local employment. They are often covering the cost for two households, possibly before their UM salary has begun. In addition to the anxiety of this situation, there is also real financial hardship.

When faculty with dual career expectations arrive on campus with these needs unaddressed, the situation may persist. Ignoring the situation does not make it disappear. The chronic situation can mean that a partner who has joined the faculty member is unemployed and unhappy, or has actually remained at the previous household. Both circumstances create significant complications. Maintaining two households on an assistant professor salary is difficult, especially when travel to partner and children is also needed. Lack of attention to these situations strands a new faculty member in a stressful situation with few supports.

Make early and active use of the dual career program services. In addition, regular inquiry into the situation can surface problems that can be addressed. At a minimum, unavoidable protracted separations can be supported with some discretionary travel funds.

Loneliness and Isolation
New faculty who arrive without any partner or family may experience a protracted period of substantial isolation and loneliness. This can compound isolation for those faculty different from most faculty in their department in other ways (e.g., gender, race or ethnicity, country of origin, sexuality). This experience can definitely affect their productivity and integration into a social network and community. Some faculty who have busy lives of their own simply assume that these issues are not important to know about or address; as a result, new faculty members’ isolation and loneliness can persist for a long period.

Be sure you are aware of the presence or absence of others making the move with new faculty, and inquire regularly into their integration. Identify people for them to meet, provide information about University resources, and facilitate connections. ADVANCE staff are always happy to work with faculty on these issues.

Departmental Environment
Some new faculty report that some department members try to immediately bring them into longstanding, ongoing senior faculty tensions or conflicts. Newcomers are always uncomfortable about these efforts, because they recognize that their own best interest cannot be served by getting involved with interpersonal conflicts that did not involve them. But they worry about how to address these pressures without offending potentially powerful senior colleagues who are new to them.

Consider discussing with senior faculty the value of avoiding perpetuating longstanding conflicts in this way. In any case try to be sure that new faculty have people to talk with (mentors, departmental chair, more experienced colleagues) who can advise them about how to handle this sort of pressure, without seeming like just another such pressure!

Environment for Women and/or Minorities
Some white women and minority faculty members had heard negative stories about the climate for women and/or minorities in their department. Once they arrived and began to experience negative situations, they felt that their new experiences fit into the pattern recounted in received stories. This may create serious anxiety about their future here and a rapid decision to go back on the job market.

Ideally, the negative climate issues should be addressed. At the very least, it is important for chairs and other senior faculty to be aware of the situations that are occurring; this is more likely if they maintain frequent sympathetic contact with new faculty, overtly inquiring into their experience and taking direct steps to intervene with faculty members creating a negative climate.

Writing
Academic writing can be a difficult and lonely process. Junior faculty members must have regular feedback on their drafts from
about University resources, and facilitate connections. ADVANCE staff are always happy to work with faculty on these issues.

Departmental Environment
Some new faculty report that some department members try to immediately bring them into longstanding, ongoing senior faculty tensions or conflicts. Newcomers are always uncomfortable about these efforts, because they recognize that their own best interest cannot be served by getting involved with interpersonal conflicts that did not involve them. But they worry about how to address these pressures without offending potentially powerful senior colleagues who are new to them.

Consider discussing with senior faculty the value of avoiding perpetuating longstanding conflicts in this way. In any case try to be sure that new faculty have people to talk with (mentors, departmental chair, more experienced colleagues) who can advise them about how to handle this sort of pressure, without seeming like just another such pressure!

Environment for Women and/or Minorities
Some white women and minority faculty members had heard negative stories about the climate for women and/or minorities in their department. Once they arrived and began to experience negative situations, they felt that their new experiences fit into the pattern recounted in received stories. This may create serious anxiety about their future here and a rapid decision to go back on the job market.

Ideally, the negative climate issues should be addressed. At the very least, it is important for chairs and other senior faculty to be aware of the situations that are occurring; this is more likely if they maintain frequent sympathetic contact with new faculty, overtly inquiring into their experience and taking direct steps to intervene with faculty members creating a negative climate.

Writing
Academic writing can be a difficult and lonely process. Junior faculty members must have regular feedback on their drafts from
colleagues in their fields. It helps them not only develop and reorganize their thoughts, but also establish a productive and realistic writing schedule. At the same time, they are often reluctant to seek out feedback from busy senior colleagues.

Be sure your senior faculty are aware of the obstacles to seeking and getting feedback junior faculty face. Encourage them to be quickly responsive and attentive to requests. If not already underway, consider the possibility that voluntary writing groups—organized by particular interests, rank, or other means—might help. Circulate information about writing and publishing workshops offered through the University, as well as the assistance offered by Rebecca Sestili, Author-Publisher Liaison for UM Faculty, 734 647-9824, rsestili@umich.edu

**Collaboration**

Newly arrived faculty often struggle with making productive connections with collaborators. The new assistant professors are sometimes assigned to senior faculty who actually act as “gatekeepers,” preventing connections, or who do not actively assist in creating connections. There is a pervasive sense among the junior faculty that their senior colleagues are too busy to assist with the interventions necessary for helping them launch successful collaborations.

Choose faculty career advisors carefully; ensure that faculty career advisors understand that they are expected actually to take concrete steps to facilitate networks and collaborations. Seek feedback from new faculty within the first semester about whether this is happening and step in to create these connections other ways if it is not.

**Start-ups**

Once on campus, some faculty members learn that they received a lesser start-up package than colleagues they view as quite comparable to them (that is, at the same rank, with similar research needs, etc. Most faculty fully understand that there is variation in start-ups due to different kinds of equipment, space, and renovation needs; these kinds of differences are not at issue.) little and sometimes no teaching experience, they are not prepared to address the derailing effects of these persistent challenges.

**Child Care and Education Needs for Dependents**

Newly arrived faculty need to identify child care options without much, if any, knowledge of the Ann Arbor community. In some instances, this leads to unsatisfactory child care arrangements, requiring time, energy, and resources to correct. Faculty with special needs children must identify specific education options which requires additional time, energy, and resources. This situation contributes to great anxiety and to expenditure of substantial time.

At a minimum it is important to be sure the faculty member is aware of on-campus resources like the child care resource office and the family-friendly policies.

In addition, this set of concerns is often experienced as “extra,” something quite outside the official life of the university and therefore off limits for discussion with senior colleagues. This perception is isolating and detrimental since senior colleagues often have information or advice that would be helpful. In addition, the opportunity to openly discuss an important, distracting, and time-consuming issue may, in itself, help an individual feel more “at home.” Facilitating open discussion of the issue with senior colleagues in any department is important.

**Dual Career**

Some faculty members arrive in the summer to get an early start on setting up their lab, and often face a situation in which they are...
Consider providing all new faculty with ADVANCE’s handbook (available online at the ADVANCE website or in hard copy from the ADVANCE program) on “Giving and Getting Career Advice,” which provides faculty with suggestions about strategies for getting their needs for advice met. If your department or school does not have a formal mentoring program, consider implementing one. Finally, many junior faculty find peer mentoring groups very helpful in addressing their needs for both advice and colleagueship. Consider facilitating the establishment of a peer mentoring group (outlined in the ADVANCE Handbook) in your unit or jointly with other related units.

Course Assignments
New assistant professors have raised the issue of having been assigned to teach courses in areas they do not know well and do not feel equipped to teach. New assistant professors do not know what the norms are about resisting or refusing teaching assignments. Since the tenure probationary period is so short, it is potentially devastating to a faculty member’s workload to manage extensive preparation for a course for which s/he is unprepared, quite apart from the added anxiety. In addition to the extra preparation time, there is an additional likelihood that the course will be less well-received and therefore become a barrier to demonstrating teaching competence.

New faculty teaching assignments can and should be made in the best interest of the new faculty member, and it should be made clear that the new faculty member plays an important role in this decision-making process.

Classroom Authority and Teaching Evaluations
Many new faculty are not aware of the resources provided by the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT), and do not understand the need to address teaching issues as early as possible. For all new faculty, difficulties in the classroom can result in anxiety, lower teaching evaluations, over-preparing for class sessions, and little pleasure in teaching. Women and underrepresented minority faculty are challenged by students in the classroom more often than other faculty. Because new faculty have

This sense of disparate treatment becomes more critical and anxiety-provoking when they feel they have not received some element in their package (e.g., support for graduate students, summer salary, etc.) that others have and that they feel is necessary for their success.

Avoid these disparities. Assume that the details of start-ups will be public knowledge and that, therefore, all new faculty at comparable career stages with comparable needs should be brought in on comparable terms.

Establishing a Lab
Faculty experience significant delays in receiving necessary lab equipment and setting up a fully functioning lab. The following three scenarios appear to be most prevalent: they have insufficient information about procedures and university practices; they have difficulties with vendors who are unhelpful; their arrival has not been sufficiently anticipated. When they come to campus at their own expense in the summer before they are starting, often without their families, it is particularly distressing to be faced with serious delays in setting up a lab.

Since most new assistant professors have no experience setting up a lab, it is important for this process to be as supported and transparent as possible both before they arrive and once they are on campus. Key support staff and a knowledgeable and sympathetic senior faculty member assigned to be helpful can make this process go much more smoothly. When serious delays are unavoidable, seek ways to minimize the impact on the new faculty member’s research program (e.g., by setting up arrangements for sharing, supporting them spending time in collaborators’ labs elsewhere during this period, etc.). Encourage new faculty to participate in the annual campus-wide workshop on running a research group.

Lack of System for Assigning or Identifying Students to Collaborate / Work in Lab
In several instances, new assistant professors have taken on students who were known in the department to be problematic.
In some (but not all) instances, the junior faculty have been advised by senior faculty not to accept these students. The junior faculty members must balance this advice against their growing anxiety about identifying student help.

It is important to develop a strategy for identifying students to work with new faculty that provides less risk to the new faculty member; if hired early enough they may participate in graduate recruitment and identify a new student; alternatively, they may take joint responsibility for a more advanced student along with a mentor who will provide advice and help with already-identified difficulties. Finally, temporary arrangements may be set up at the department’s (not the new faculty member’s) expense, and these arrangements can be explicitly identified as having no long-term implications. Conversations with more advanced faculty suggest that these poor initial decisions often end up wasting vast amounts of time during the tenure probationary period, when faculty have little time to waste.

**On-line Resources**
ADVANCE Program: http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance
Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) http://www.crlt.umich.edu/
Work/Life Resource Center: Child Care Resources http://hr.umich.edu/worklife/childcare/index.php

**Additional Resources**
Making the Right Moves; A Practical Guide to Scientific Management for Postdocs and New Faculty, (2006). The Howard Hughes Medical Institute and Burroughs Wellcome Fund (This document can be downloaded from the University of Michigan Library on-line resources.)

**How to Help New Faculty Settle in: Common Problems and Alternative Solutions**

During the academic years 2005–09, the director of the UM ADVANCE Program, Professor Abigail Stewart, has met with many newly-hired women faculty, at all ranks, from the science and engineering fields. These faculty members were affiliated with the College of Engineering, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, Medical School, and the smaller schools that have scientists on the faculty. Although many of these faculty members recounted positive experiences, issues that potentially could have been avoided were raised. These problems increased difficulties in adjusting to their new professional environment and even resulted in attrition. Over the years, some of these issues appeared to be recurrent problems and do not pertain only to the fields of science and engineering.

Based on these conversations, the list below identifies some common difficulties; in italics we suggest alternative approaches. In most cases, these approaches were actually offered by other new faculty members who had also directly experienced the issues. Some of the problems (e.g., associated with setting up a lab) are specific to faculty depending on their research needs; others (e.g., relating to teaching; dependent care organization) are much more general. We offer this list in the hope that it will assist departmental chairs, mentors, and new faculty themselves to anticipate and respond to issues that might arise early in their appointment at UM.

**Access to Mentors**
Some new faculty report that although there is a formal mentoring program in their department, they have not found it easy to access advice or help. Others report that there is not a formal mentoring program and they too do not find it easy to access advice or help.
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How to Get the Mentoring You Want: A Guide for Graduate Students at a Diverse University.
http://www.provost.umich.edu/mentoring/index.html

Providing Faculty with Career Advice or Mentoring: Principles and Best Practices, UM. College of LSA
August 2007.
http://www.lsa.umich.edu/lsa/faculty/staff/academic_affairs/policies/
Select on this page: Faculty Career Advising (Mentoring) - 8/07 Version

The University of Michigan Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs has
links to articles and other information on mentorship.
http://www.provost.umich.edu/mentoring/index.html

The Center for the Education of Women offers free counseling to University of Michigan faculty (as
well as to staff, students and residents of surrounding communities; call 989-7210). Faculty may
wish to discuss career goals, job fit, negotiation strategies, work/life issues, problems affecting career
progression or other needs. CEW also supports two professional development networks for faculty
women: the Women of Color in the Academy Project and the Junior Women Faculty Network. In
addition, CEW offers other kinds of programs addressing, for example, salary negotiation, grant
proposal writing, parenting in the academy, financial planning, and research presentation. For more
information contact the Center at 989-7050, or visit www.umich.edu/~cew.

Other resources and bibliography
http://www.womensurgeons.org/aws_library/PocketMentor.pdf

Collegiality. The Department Chair’s Role in Developing New Faculty Into Teachers and Scholars
(chapter 10), Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.

Medicine. Washington, DC: AAMC.


Black Americans in the academy. In A.J. Murrell, F.J. Crosby, & R. Ely (Eds.), Mentoring dilemmas:
Developmental relationships within multicultural organizations (pp. 21–46), Mahway, NJ: Erlbaum.

Management for Postdocs and New Faculty. Howard Hughes Medical Institute.

of Women in Science.

Portable Mentor for Scholars from Graduate School through Tenure. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.


1) Why is career advice important?
Faculty careers develop over time. Along the way, and more than in most occupations, individuals are
free to make decisions and choices about how they spend their time and about what they do. Making
those decisions requires information and judgment about consequences, since the decisions you make
now are likely to matter for the long term. With limited information, individuals lack the basis needed to
make informed judgments. That’s not likely to lead to the best decisions! And since time is finite, “yes”
to a new commitment today also means “no” to a current activity or future opportunity. Career advice
from people with information and experience can provide a crucial context for decision-making and
career development.

Lack of access to career advice—often because of few opportunities for informal interactions in which
information is conveyed casually—is one of the most widely reported barriers to career advancement.
Moreover, there is evidence that all women and men of color are particularly likely to suffer career
setbacks from lack of career guidance (see e.g., Bowman, Kite, Branscombe & Williams, 1989). In one
study (Preston, 2003), one third of women interviewed who exited science cited a lack of guidance as
the major factor leading to the exit decision, while none of the men interviewed identified this as a factor
influencing exit.

2) What exactly is career advising? Is it the same thing as “mentoring”?
Many people think of “mentoring” as something that is part of the graduate school relationship between
an advisor and an advisee, and one in which the advisor sets relatively strong and clear limits on the
advisee’s range of choices. To avoid confusing this type of mentorship with the kind of interactions that
junior faculty—who should proactively pursue their own career development—need to have with more
senior colleagues, we are using the term “career advising” instead of mentoring.

There are many different forms of career advising and all of them are valuable to junior faculty. Some
of them may, in fact, be similar to the mentoring of graduate students; but many are not. For example,
Zeidlich (1990) pointed out that junior faculty need several different kinds of people to help them:
“Advisers, people with career experience willing to share their knowledge; supporters, people who give
emotional and moral encouragement; tutors, people who give specific feedback on one’s performance;
masters, in the sense of an employer to whom one is apprenticed; [and] sponsors, sources of
information about, and aid in obtaining opportunities.” In a similar vein, the University of Michigan
Gender in Science and Engineering Subcommittee on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Leadership’s
April 2004 Final Report broadly defined a mentor as a person who “facilitates the career and
development of another person, usually junior, through one or more of the following activities: providing
advice and counseling; providing psychological support; advocating for, promoting, and sponsoring the
career of the mentee.”

Senior faculty can provide some or all of these forms of career advice to their junior colleagues.
However, it is not feasible or desirable to single out one individual to fulfill all possible mentoring roles or
provide all possible kinds of career advice.2 For example, a particular faculty member may be a great
example of a programmatic research approach and successful external funding, but may not be a
particularly constructive citizen of the department; another may work in an area very distant from junior
collegues’ interests, but be a marvelous teacher and beloved mentor of graduate students; still a third
may simply seem to radiate good judgment and a balanced and humane approach to life. Each of

2 While this guide is particularly aimed at the needs of untenured faculty, tenured faculty also need, and should
seek, career advice—about the next career stage (e.g., promotion to full professor), or about taking on leadership
roles or choosing not to, or about their next project, or next life stage (e.g., the period after children are grown,
or retirement).
these people have valuable things to offer to junior colleagues, but no one of them is likely to be able to help with all aspects of someone else’s career development.

3) What is the goal of providing career advice?

The ultimate goal of giving career advice to junior faculty is to enhance their chances of career success in earning tenure (for instructional faculty) or advancement and promotion (i.e., for research or clinical track faculty) through achievements in scholarship, success in obtaining external funding, teaching, and/or service. Thus, senior faculty can offer information and assistance not only by providing advice about one’s area of scholarship, but by:

- Providing information about promotion and tenure processes
- Demythifying departmental, research center, college, and university culture
- Providing constructive and supportive feedback on specific work or on career progress
- Providing encouragement and support
- Helping to foster important connections and visibility
- Looking out for junior faculty interests

Junior and senior faculty alike should consider these topics for their discussions:

- Inside story on departmental culture
- How to navigate department and institution
- Grant sources: strategies for funding
- Publishing outlets and processes
- Teaching
- Research
- Key conferences to attend
- Service roles inside and outside the University, including work on committees
- Relationships to cultivate
- How to recruit students or post-doctoral fellows to your research group
- Advice about the career ladder and alternative tracks
- How to plan a career trajectory
- External visibility
- Tenure and promotion processes
- Family issues
- National sources of support
- Publishing outlets and processes

4) What are the different forms of career advising?

Where will junior faculty find career advice? We believe they may find it in many kinds of interactions and relationships, including with peers. The following identifies several types of career advising:

Specific (one-on-one) advising: This kind of advice depends on conferring with someone very familiar with specific issues unique to the junior faculty member’s field, or involves direct and specific feedback from a supervisor such as a department chair. Types of specific advising include:

- Review of current activities and future plans. These may include:
  - research activity, including publishing, grant activity, etc.
  - service activity, on campus and nationally
  - teaching activity, both in formal courses and mentoring students
  - clinical assignments
- Review of documents, like curriculum vitae, annual reports, required professional statements
- Critical feedback in the crucial years prior to tenure reviews or promotions, with delineation of the exact criteria by which that faculty member will be evaluated at the annual or third year review
- Personal advice on sensitive issues that individuals do not feel comfortable discussing in groups

How do I deal with sticky situations or problems with students?
Do I have enough graduate students?
How are teaching evaluations handled and weighted?

Service
What are the important committees to serve on?
How can I get nominated to be on them?
Are there committees to avoid?
How is this work documented?

Promotion and Tenure
What are the department’s formal and informal criteria for promotion and tenure?
What or who can clarify these criteria?
What would you have wanted to know when you began the tenure process?
How does one build a tenure file?
Who sits on the tenure committee and how are they selected?
How should I prepare for the annual review?
What can I negotiate when I get an outside offer?
How should I prepare for the third year review?
Is my job description matching the work I do?
Are my research, teaching, service and grants of an appropriate level?
Who should I meet in the institution, in the discipline and even worldwide?

11) Additional resources on career advising and mentoring

Web and institutional resources
http://www.nap.edu/read/12383/html

The Association of Women in Science is a non-profit association which works to promote women’s activities in all scientific fields, from mentoring to scholarships to job listings.
http://www.awis.org/careers/mentoring.html

The Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) website provides a bibliography and links to online resources on mentoring. Topics covered include: institutional mentoring programs, mentoring women faculty and faculty of color, discipline-specific mentoring, and training materials for mentors and mentees.
http://www.crlt.umich.edu/publications/mentor/index.html

How to Mentor Graduate Students: A Guide for Faculty at a Diverse University.
Identification and facilitation of specific opportunities for faculty members to grow into leadership positions

Group advising: Not all career advice requires one-on-one interaction. “Group advising” refers to advising that can be accomplished for the benefit of multiple individuals simultaneously. Sessions can be led by one or by a few senior faculty and address broad issues such as a collegial conversation about the intellectual concerns of the department or program, developing new courses, teaching evaluations, time management, or policies on tenure.

Zone advising: This refers to interactions with individuals with particular areas of expertise (zones) such as successful grant funding, university service assignments, or teaching and learning resources such as the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT). In this variation on the group advising idea, one senior leader can serve as a resource on a particular topic for multiple junior faculty members.

Peer advising: Another variation on group advising is provided by facilitating career-relevant interactions among peers. Junior faculty can assist one another by sharing information, strategies, knowledge about resources, and general moral support. Types of peer advising activities include:

- Dissemination of information on institutional policies similar to the packages provided to all junior faculty/new hires. Topics may include dual career programs, modified duties, delays of the tenure review, leave policies, and work-family resources.
- Guidance in preparation of annual reports and tenure and promotion dossiers.
- Discussion of the level of achievement expected for promotion in various areas (e.g., research, teaching, success at obtaining external funding).
- Communication of eligibility for internal awards and external national and international recognition.

In general, career advising activities can take many forms and do not have to occur in formal settings. In addition, they can include both on-campus and national resources. The following list of potential locations or settings for career advising activities is adapted from the Association for Women in Science (AWIS) website on mentoring: http://www.awis.org/resource/mentoring.html.

Career advising contacts can be through:

- Informal office visits
- Email
- Campus Events
- "Shadowing" a senior faculty member by agreement
- Touring a lab or workplace
- Recreational activities
- Travel support
- Lectures
- Phone calls
- Meals and coffee breaks
- Professional society meetings
- Poster sessions or other special presentations
- Symposia
- Conferences
- Workshops

5) Common issues for junior and senior faculty regarding career advising

1. Think of yourself as establishing a respectful collegial relationship. Try to engage in ongoing conversations with one another. Try to meet at least once each semester to discuss professional development and progress in all key areas. Don’t be invisible or cancel meetings unless absolutely necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or Research Unit Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who are the key people in the department or research unit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are appropriate ways to raise different kinds of concerns or issues and with whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who can help me set up an email account, find out about resources like copying or processes like grading?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do people find out about and get nominated for awards and prizes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What organizations are important to join?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can you tell me about the Institutional Review Board, which provides approval for human and animal subject experiments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do I set up my lab?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do I get grants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are my grant proposals appropriate for this department or unit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there research or equipment projects being developed by other faculty in the department that I can or should get involved with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May I read some successful grant proposals, as close to my research area as possible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What conferences should I attend?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there people that I should collaborate with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you get on professional association panels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the journals to publish in? Have any colleagues published there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am I publishing enough?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can I increase my visibility in the field?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What classes do I need to teach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do I get a good teaching schedule?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do I get to teach important classes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Work together to define your roles and to set goals. Remember that the career advising process is a two-way street, and you both have to establish the ground rules. This may include agreeing on what you will ask of each other. Things to consider regarding career advising may include:

- Reading drafts of grants or papers
- Helping create opportunities or connections
- Providing feedback about progress
- Providing advice about teaching issues
- Providing information about the department
- Meeting yearly. Every semester. Or monthly

You can avoid letting each other down, or surprising each other, if you have an explicit sense of the nature of your expectations. And of course you both need to listen and be respectful, and recognize that both of you can benefit from these interactions.

3. Don’t expect career advising to be a panacea for every academic and career problem; it can’t address every issue, and no one relationship can encompass all aspects of anyone’s career. Sometimes there are problems or issues that cannot be solved through the career advising process, although often the process can help redirect efforts to other sources of assistance (other faculty, colleagues at other institutions, or even institutional assistance, such as the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching). It’s also true that sometimes you may give or be given genuinely bad advice (usually unintentionally!). A good way to guard against taking bad advice is to gather advice from multiple sources and compare what you hear. And never feel that just because someone gave you advice you have to take it; it’s your career! You’re interested in other people’s perspectives, because they may help you understand or see things you otherwise wouldn’t. But in the end you make the decisions.

4. Finally, like all other human relationships, relationships between junior and senior faculty may produce discomfort, despite everyone’s best intentions. For example, some people (junior or senior) may feel that career advising requires them to expose vulnerabilities they are more comfortable concealing (a frequent concern of academics, who are occupationally subject to “impostor” anxieties) or to permit another person some degree of “control” over their decisions. A career advising relationship may even lead someone to feel more grateful, or more nurturant, than is comfortable in a professional relationship. If these uncomfortable feelings arise, they should not provoke alarm; instead, they are signs that the relationship may need some adjustment or fine-tuning. It is often possible to gain perspective on uncomfortable feelings like these from another colleague, preferably one not too directly involved with the other faculty member.

6) Tips for senior faculty

As a senior faculty member, you can help shape careers and encourage successful outcomes. You know and can explain the system, pointing out pitfalls, shortcuts, and strategies. Often, junior faculty need to learn what they may not even know to ask.

Think of your own experiences as a junior faculty member and how you achieved your current status. Giving valued advice is usually rewarding for the senior faculty member, as well as for her or his more junior colleague—in part because it can be an invigorating connection with people in touch with the most recent advances in the field you share. But recognize that it is often difficult and intimidating for junior colleagues to articulate their questions and needs, and to approach more senior faculty. Recall that things you say may—without you intending it—lead them to feel more anxious, more inadequate, or hopeless about their own future. It’s important to contextualize your feedback so it is actually constructive rather than undermining, and offers direction rather than simply criticism.

to judge if your effort and priorities are aligned; be a proactive manager of your own career portfolio. This will greatly assist you, while evaluating new opportunities, and as you prepare for career advancement or tenure.

7. Determine if there are publications that you should avoid publishing in because they are not valued. Try to not waste your time serving on committees that are not valued, or teaching courses that do not strengthen your case for advancement or for tenure. Be sure to seek advice from senior faculty members about what committees to serve on, and then volunteer for those committees.

8. Seek information, advice, and assistance in developing, implementing, and revising your strategy; do not make major decisions without talking to other people.

9. Actively seek feedback from colleagues, senior faculty, department chair, or unit director. Recognize that other junior faculty—both at the University of Michigan and elsewhere—are often sources of valuable advice and help too. For example, another junior faculty member may have developed a teaching module that you can adapt for your purposes; or, as a group, junior faculty in a department or across a couple of departments may be able to provide one another peer mentoring; or ask specific administrators or senior faculty to discuss particular issues.

10. Do not assume that no feedback means there are no problems.

11. If your position was defined in specific terms when you were hired, be sure you have a copy of the job description. You want to be sure there are no aspects of the job you are expected to do that you don’t recognize.

12. An annual review should be in writing. If it is negative and you believe the comments are legitimate, you should discuss them with your career advisors, including your chair or director, and plan what you need to do to improve. If you believe a comment is not accurate, provide written materials to refute the evaluation.

13. Develop your own networks with junior faculty colleagues and others in your field.

14. Read and discuss any written policies about tenure and/or promotion with your career advisor(s).

15. Let your career advisors, chair or director, and colleagues know when you have done good work. Be sure that professional information is put into your personnel folder.

16. Communicate. Failing to communicate is the biggest pitfall for all relationships. Remember that face-to-face meetings can often clear up misunderstandings better than email. Problems need to be discussed as soon as possible.

9) Integrating work and personal life: University policies

In March 2004, the University of Michigan Gender in Science and Engineering Report of the Subcommittee on Family Friendly Policies and Faculty Tracks published recommendations to modify policies related to work-family issues. The policies being examined for revision include more flexible and extensive coverage for leave without pay, modified duties, and stopping the tenure clock. The report also discusses the need for additional on-campus daycare. The report and all UM policies are available online at the links listed below.
1. Let your junior colleagues know that they are welcome to talk with you—just on one occasion or on a frequent basis. The gift of your full attention is often the most important one you can give a less experienced colleague.

2. Clarify expectations about the extent to which you can, or will, offer guidance concerning personal as well as professional issues. If you are not comfortable assisting in some areas, suggest another faculty member who may be able to assist. Recognize and evaluate what you can offer, and keep in mind that you cannot be expected to fulfill every function.

3. Inform junior faculty about how frequently you will be able to meet with them. Be explicit if you have a heavy travel schedule, are about to take a sabbatical, or will be assuming an administrative position. Discuss alternative means of communication (e.g., email or telephone) and encourage them to consult others who have proven to be reliable advisors. Try always to keep appointments you do make.

4. Provide specific information about as many topics as you can, such as the informal rules of the profession and of navigating the department and institution. Help junior faculty learn what kinds of available institutional support they should seek to further their own career development. Tell them about funds to attend a workshop, for example, or release time for special projects.

5. Recognize that sometimes your own experience is relevant and useful to colleagues who are more junior; hearing accounts of how you accomplished something (or failed to), including obstacles you faced, can help normalize and contextualize experiences for them. At the same time, it’s good to bear in mind that circumstances change in academia, in the various colleges, units, and in departments. So it’s good to underscore the need for junior colleagues to look into specific rules, policies and practices as they currently exist rather than relying on information passed on anecdotally.

6. Share the “tacit” rules of being successful in the business of research and within the relevant unit with junior colleagues.

7. Provide opportunities for junior colleagues. For example, suggest his/her name to be a discussant at national meetings or other such opportunities that will increase his/her visibility. Generally, take opportunities to promote the junior faculty member’s research.

8. Ask your junior colleague to develop and share a work plan that includes short-term and long-term goals as well as a time frame for reaching those goals.

9. Give criticism as well as praise when warranted. Always present criticism in a private and non-threatening context with specific suggestions for improvement in the future. Rather than emphasize past problems or mistakes, focus on future actions that may remedy or redress those problems.

10. Tell junior faculty where they stand—how they are doing, whether they are meeting your expectations, and if they are showing what it takes to move up. Be specific. Don’t just tell a junior faculty member that it’s necessary to publish more in high-quality journals, but suggest which journals those are, and give guidelines about approximately how many papers to shoot for in those journals before tenure.

11. Take responsibility to encourage junior faculty to be proactive about asking questions, seeking feedback, and making connections with senior colleagues. Take the time to make sure junior faculty are doing so.

---

3 The ADVANCE Program at the University of Michigan (ADVANCE) began as a five-year, grant funded project promoting institutional transformation with respect to women faculty in science and engineering fields. With the University’s commitment to continue funding through June 2016, the program will gradually expand to promote other kinds of diversity among faculty and students in all fields.
12. Communicate. Failing to communicate is the biggest pitfall for all relationships. Remember that face-to-face meetings can often clear up misunderstandings better than email. Problems need to be discussed as soon as possible.

There are a number of specific areas in which you may be in a good position to help, or you may feel it is best to point the junior colleague toward someone who might be a better source of advice. These include:

1. Grantwriting. There are many features of the process of obtaining external funding that are unwritten or vague. Advisors can help by clarifying funders’ “referees’” criteria for successful grant proposals. Sharing negative experiences you have had in trying to secure outside funding, and how you managed or overcame them, may also be helpful.

In some fields, junior faculty may be well-served by including senior colleagues as Co-PIs, Co-investigators or consultants in grant proposals. Give junior faculty advice about who might be helpful to include. Also, encourage junior faculty to apply for one of several “early career” grants (e.g., K01-Mentored Career Development Award [NIH]; Young Investigator Award [NSF]) and be available to provide substantial feedback on their early efforts.

2. Fostering networks for your junior colleagues. Whether or not you can provide something a junior colleague needs, suggest other people who might be of assistance: other UM faculty or colleagues from other universities. Introduce your junior colleagues to those with complementary interests within your unit or department, elsewhere on the UM campus, or at other universities. For example, at conferences, a simple introduction at a coffee break or an invitation to join your table for lunch may be sufficient to initiate a lasting advising relationship for a junior colleague.

3. Providing forthright assessments of their research through close readings of their work and trying to provide these assessments in a timely manner.

4. Providing opportunities for junior colleagues. For example, suggest his/her name to be a discussant at national meetings or other such opportunities that will increase his/her visibility. Generally, take opportunities to promote the junior faculty member’s research.

7) Tips for department chairs and directors

Department chairs and program directors set the tone for how many faculty in the unit—senior and junior—will view the issue of career advising. If the chair or director does not appear to truly value the practice, or merely gives it lip service, it will be clear to all concerned that it is not a valued activity in the unit. By taking career advising seriously, and consistently communicating that it is part of the responsibility of all faculty, chairs and directors can help create a climate in which better career advising takes place.

1. Build into the evaluations of senior faculty a share of responsibility for mentoring new colleagues. For example, during reviews for merit increases, chairs and directors can take into account the quality and quantity of career advising by asking explicitly for this information on the annual review forms. Have senior faculty document in their annual report their efforts to assist junior faculty in getting research grants, establishing themselves as independent researchers, and having their work published in peer-reviewed outlets. Collaborative research—especially when the junior scientist is the lead author—may also be a sign of a productive career advising relationship. You may also want to ask junior faculty to indicate which senior faculty have been helpful to them, as a sort of check on these self-reports.

2. Take multiple opportunities to communicate to senior colleagues the importance of providing career advice to junior faculty.

3. Ensure that the procedures and standards involved in the tenure and promotion processes are clear to junior faculty.

4. Ensure that all junior faculty know about University policies intended to ease the work-family conflict such as stopping the “tenure clock” and modified duties.

5. Create opportunities that encourage informal interaction between junior and senior faculty. You might create a fund for ordering pizza, a lunch budget, a gift card for a local coffee shop for them to share, etc.

6. Provide a “tip sheet” for new arrivals. A tip sheet would include items such as contact people for key services around the Department or unit. More broadly, check to ensure that the newly-arrived faculty have access to the information, services, and materials (e.g., computing or lab equipment) needed to function effectively in the environment.

7. Recognize that senior faculty may not be completely certain how best to engage in career advising. Help them! For example, sponsor a lunch for senior faculty in which the topic of discussion is career advising and faculty can exchange information and ideas on the subject.

8. Provide the junior faculty member with a yearly review—in addition to a formal interim (3rd year) review—of her/his accomplishments and discuss goals for the future. Recognize that junior faculty may find it difficult to assess the significance of criticism; be careful to frame criticism in a constructive way, but also be as clear as possible. Be sure to provide some written follow-up, summarizing the discussion (or to ask your junior colleague to do that, so you can review it).

9. Use email as a mechanism to ensure the entire faculty has equal access to key decisions, information, and career opportunities.

8) Tips for junior faculty

Many units or departments will formally assign one or more senior faculty members to assist junior faculty. Sometimes, however, these relationships never develop or additional people are needed. In the worst case, the relationships set up formally may actually be destructive. More benignly, but still seriously, sometimes senior faculty appear to have no available time; then junior faculty feel they are either not getting what they need or fear they are intruding.

Junior faculty should feel that they are in charge of establishing and maintaining mentoring relationships. If a relationship is destructive or unhelpful, allow it to languish. It is much better to avoid interaction with a senior colleague who is not helpful than to continue it. However, avoidance alone is not enough. At the same time that you let one relationship dwindle, be sure to seek alternative relationships that are more helpful.

Despite appearances, most senior faculty are committed to the development of junior faculty and will readily provide career advice, if asked. Try to identify senior faculty in your department—or even in
12. Communicate. Failing to communicate is the biggest pitfall for all relationships. Remember that face-to-face meetings can often clear up misunderstandings better than email. Problems need to be discussed as soon as possible.

There are a number of specific areas in which you may be in a good position to help, or you may feel it is best to point the junior colleague toward someone who might be a better source of advice. These include:

1. Grantwriting. There are many features of the process of obtaining external funding that are unwritten or vague. Advisors can help by clarifying funders’/referees’ criteria for successful grant proposals. Sharing negative experiences you have had in trying to secure outside funding, and how you managed or overcame them, may also be helpful.

In some fields, junior faculty may be well-served by including senior colleagues as Co-PIs, Co-investigators or consultants in grant proposals. Give junior faculty advice about who might be helpful to include. Also, encourage junior faculty to apply for one of several “early career” grants (e.g., K01-Mentored Career Development Award [NIH]; Young Investigator Award [NSF]) and be available to provide substantial feedback on their early efforts.

2. Fostering networks for your junior colleagues. Whether or not you can provide something a junior colleague needs, suggest other people who might be of assistance: other UM faculty or colleagues from other universities. Introduce your junior colleagues to those with complementary interests within your unit or department, elsewhere on the UM campus, or at other universities. For example, at conferences, a simple introduction at a coffee break or an invitation to join your table for lunch may be sufficient to initiate a lasting advising relationship for a junior colleague.

3. Providing forthright assessments of their research through close readings of their work and trying to provide these assessments in a timely manner.

4. Providing opportunities for junior colleagues. For example, suggest his/her name to be a discussant at national meetings or other such opportunities that will increase his/her visibility. Generally, take opportunities to promote the junior faculty member’s research.

7) Tips for department chairs and directors

Department chairs and program directors set the tone for how many faculty in the unit—senior and junior—will view the issue of career advising. If the chair or director does not appear to truly value the practice, or merely gives it lip service, it will be clear to all concerned that it is not a valued activity in the unit. By taking career advising seriously, and consistently communicating that it is part of the responsibility of all faculty, chairs and directors can help create a climate in which better career advising takes place.

1. Build into the evaluations of senior faculty a share of responsibility for mentoring new colleagues. For example, during reviews for merit increases, chairs and directors can take into account the quality and quantity of career advising by asking explicitly for this information on the annual review forms. Have senior faculty document in their annual report their efforts to assist junior faculty in getting research grants, establishing themselves as independent researchers, and having their work published in peer-reviewed outlets. Collaborative research—especially when the junior scientist is the lead author—may also be a sign of a productive career advising relationship. You may also want to ask junior faculty to indicate which senior faculty have been helpful to them, as a sort of check on these self-reports.

2. Take multiple opportunities to communicate to senior colleagues the importance of providing career advice to junior faculty.

3. Ensure that the procedures and standards involved in the tenure and promotion processes are clear to junior faculty.

4. Ensure that all junior faculty know about University policies intended to ease the work-family conflict such as stopping the “tenure clock” and modified duties.

5. Create opportunities that encourage informal interaction between junior and senior faculty. You might create a fund for ordering pizza, a lunch budget, a gift card for a local coffee shop for them to share, etc.

6. Provide a “tip sheet” for new arrivals. A tip sheet would include items such as contact people for key services around the Department or unit. More broadly, check to ensure that the newly-arrived faculty have access to the information, services, and materials (e.g., computing or lab equipment) needed to function effectively in the environment.

7. Recognize that senior faculty may not be completely certain how best to engage in career advising. Help them! For example, sponsor a lunch for senior faculty in which the topic of discussion is career advising and faculty can exchange information and ideas on the subject.

8. Provide the junior faculty member with a yearly review—in addition to a formal interim (3rd year) review—of her/his accomplishments and discuss goals for the future. Recognize that junior faculty may find it difficult to assess the significance of criticism; be careful to frame criticism in a constructive way, but also be as clear as possible. Be sure to provide some written follow-up, summarizing the discussion (or to ask your junior colleague to do that, so you can review it).

9. Use email as a mechanism to ensure the entire faculty has equal access to key decisions, information, and career opportunities.

8) Tips for junior faculty

Many units or departments will formally assign one or more senior faculty members to assist junior faculty. Sometimes, however, these relationships never develop or additional people are needed. In the worst case, the relationships set up formally may actually be destructive. More benignly, but still seriously, sometimes senior faculty appear to have no available time; then junior faculty feel they are either not getting what they need or fear they are infringing.

Junior faculty should feel that they are in charge of establishing and maintaining mentoring relationships. If a relationship is destructive or unhelpful, allow it to languish. It is much better to avoid interaction with a senior colleague who is not helpful than to continue it. However, avoidance alone is not enough. At the same time that you let one relationship dwindle, be sure to seek alternative relationships that are more helpful.

Despite appearances, most senior faculty are committed to the development of junior faculty and will readily provide career advice, if asked. Try to identify senior faculty in your department—or even in
another department—who you think might have helpful advice for you; be the one to initiate a meeting. Alternatively, ask for an introduction from a colleague if you are uncomfortable introducing yourself.

The ADVANCE Program at the University of Michigan offers advice and help connecting faculty with career advisors, or your chair or director can assist in identifying someone who would be an appropriate career advisor.

Additionally, don’t limit your search for career advisors to your own institution. To establish a relationship with senior faculty in your research area from other institutions, ask them if they would be willing to meet with you on the phone, over email, at a conference, or invite them to present a seminar or talk in your department.

One person might serve as an advisor or mentor on departmental matters, another might provide information about and assistance with career opportunities, and another might serve as a role model.

Meet with you on the phone, over email, at a conference, or invite them to present a seminar or talk in your department. Additionally, don’t limit your search for career advisors to your own institution. To establish a relationship with senior faculty in your research area from other institutions, ask them if they would be willing to meet with you on the phone, over email, at a conference, or invite them to present a seminar or talk in your department.

One person might serve as an advisor or mentor on departmental matters, another might provide information about and assistance with career opportunities, and another might serve as a role model.

Read the faculty handbook (http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/handbook/), and become familiar with the research and background of your advisors’ research and career. Read their CVs whenever you can.

Get the unwritten information. There are unwritten organizational structures, rules and customs defining the departmental and institutional culture. Respect and become acquainted with the staff clerical workers and treat them like the professional colleagues they are; they can be valuable sources of information about informal structure. Learn what services are available from the department and institution such as clerical help, release time, research assistance, and financial support.

Recognize the influential people in the department. Be observant and find out which behaviors are valued and which are not.

Be active and energetic. Do not assume that anyone else will look out for your interests. For example, in some departments teaching assignments are scrupulously fairly assigned, in others not. Equally, in some departments, junior faculty are encouraged only to develop a few new courses during the tenure probationary period, and they are encouraged to repeat them. If you feel that any of your teaching assignments is either unfair or unwise for you, be sure to seek out advice from other faculty about the issue, and about how to get it addressed. It is not best to simply suffer in silence; it is best to get the situation remedied and senior faculty in the department or even in the dean’s office will be able to advise you about it.

For those on tenure track, develop a strategy that will guide your progress as a scholar, teacher, and colleague over the next five years. A lot of information about the tenure process is not written down. Make it your responsibility to find out by asking questions. Share the information and your strategies with your peers as a way to build camaraderie and to develop additional sources of information and support. For those not on a tenure track, develop a strategy for promotion and advancement. Again, ask questions about how to achieve your career aims.

Keep careful records of your activities (e.g., research and scholarship, grants written and funded, service activities, teaching and/or mentoring). Scrutinize your own record regularly.

1. Let your junior colleagues know that they are welcome to talk with you—just on one occasion or on a frequent basis. The gift of your full attention is often the most important one you can give a less experienced colleague.

2. Clarify expectations about the extent to which you can, or will, offer guidance concerning personal as well as professional issues. If you are not comfortable assisting in some areas, suggest another faculty member who may be able to assist. Recognize and evaluate what you can offer, and keep in mind that you cannot be expected to fulfill every function.

3. Inform junior faculty about how frequently you will be able to meet with them. Be explicit if you have a heavy travel schedule, are about to take a sabbatical, or will be assuming an administrative position. Discuss alternative means of communication (e.g., email or telephone) and encourage them to consult others who have proven to be reliable advisors. Try always to keep appointments you do make.

4. Provide specific information about as many topics as you can, such as the informal rules of the profession and of navigating the department and institution. Help junior faculty learn what kinds of available institutional support they should seek to further their own career development. Tell them about funds to attend a workshop, for example, or reserve time for special projects.

5. Recognize that sometimes your own experience is relevant and useful to colleagues who are more junior; hearing accounts of how you accomplished something (or failed to), including obstacles you faced, can help normalize and contextualize experiences for them. At the same time, it’s good to bear in mind that circumstances change in academia; in the various colleges, units, and in departments. So it’s good to underscore the need for junior colleagues to look into specific rules, policies and practices as they currently exist rather than relying on information passed on anecdotally.

6. Share the “tacit” rules of being successful in the business of research and within the relevant unit with junior colleagues.

7. Provide opportunities for junior colleagues. For example, suggest his/her name to be a discussant at national meetings or other such opportunities that will increase his/her visibility. Generally, take opportunities to promote the junior faculty member’s research.

8. Ask your junior colleague to develop and share a work plan that includes short-term and long-term goals as well as a time frame for reaching those goals.

9. Give criticism as well as praise when warranted. Always present criticism in a private and non-threatening context with specific suggestions for improvement in the future. Rather than emphasize past problems or mistakes, focus on future actions that may remedy or redress those problems.

10. Tell junior faculty where they stand—how they are doing, whether they are meeting your expectations, and if they are showing what it takes to move up. Be specific. Don’t just tell a junior faculty member that it’s necessary to publish more in high-quality journals, but suggest which journals those are, and give guidelines about approximately how many papers to shoot for in those journals before tenure.

11. Take responsibility to encourage junior faculty to be proactive about asking questions, seeking feedback, and making connections with senior colleagues. Take the time to make sure junior faculty are doing so.

The ADVANCE Program at the University of Michigan (ADVANCE) began as a five-year, grant-funded project promoting institutional transformation with respect to women faculty in science and engineering fields. With the University’s commitment to continue funding through June 2016, the program will gradually expand to promote other kinds of diversity among faculty and students in all fields.
2. Work together to define your roles and to set goals. Remember that the career advising process is a two-way street, and you both have to establish the ground rules. This may include agreeing on what you will ask of each other. Things to consider regarding career advising may include:

- Reading drafts of grants or papers
- Helping create opportunities or connections
- Providing feedback about progress
- Providing advice about teaching issues
- Providing information about the department
- Meeting yearly. Every semester. Or monthly

You can avoid letting each other down, or surprising each other, if you have an explicit sense of the nature of your expectations. And of course you both need to listen and be respectful, and recognize that both of you can benefit from these interactions.

3. Don’t expect career advising to be a panacea for every academic and career problem; it can’t address every issue, and no one relationship can encompass all aspects of anyone’s career. Sometimes there are problems or issues that cannot be solved through the career advising process, although often the process can help redirect efforts to other sources of assistance (other faculty, colleagues at other institutions, or even institutional assistance, such as the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching). It’s also true that sometimes you may give or be given genuinely bad advice (usually unintentionally). A good way to guard against taking bad advice is to gather advice from multiple sources and compare what you hear. And never feel that just because someone gave you advice you have to take it; it’s your career! You’re interested in other people’s perspectives, because they may help you understand or see things you otherwise wouldn’t. But in the end you make the decisions.

4. Finally, like all other human relationships, relationships between junior and senior faculty may produce discomfort, despite everyone’s best intentions. For example, some people (junior or senior) may feel that career advising requires them to expose vulnerabilities they are more comfortable concealing (a frequent concern of academics, who are occupationally subject to “impostor” anxieties) or to permit another person some degree of “control” over their decisions. A career advising relationship may even lead someone to feel more grateful, or more inadequate, than is comfortable in a professional relationship. If those uncomfortable feelings arise, they should not provoke alarm; instead, they are signs that the relationship may need some adjustment or fine-tuning. It is often possible to gain perspective on uncomfortable feelings like these from another colleague, preferably one not too directly involved with the other faculty member.

6) Tips for senior faculty

As a senior faculty member, you can help shape careers and encourage successful outcomes. You know and can explain the system, pointing out pitfalls, shortcuts, and strategies. Often, junior faculty need to learn what they may not even know to ask.

Think of your own experiences as a junior faculty member and how you achieved your current status. Giving valued advice is usually rewarding for the senior faculty member, as well as for her or his more junior colleague—in part because it can be an invigorating connection with people in touch with the most recent advances in the field you share. But recognize that it is often difficult and intimidating for junior colleagues to articulate their questions and needs, and to approach more senior faculty. Recall that things you say may—without you intending it—lead them to feel more anxious, more inadequate, or hopeless about their own future. It’s important to contextualize your feedback so it is actually constructive rather than undermining, and offers direction rather than simply criticism.

to judge if your effort and priorities are aligned; be a proactive manager of your own career portfolio. This will greatly assist you, while evaluating new opportunities, and as you prepare for career advancement or tenure.

7. Determine if there are publications that you should avoid publishing in because they are not valued. Try to not waste your time serving on committees that are not valued, or teaching courses that do not strengthen your case for advancement or for tenure.

Be sure to seek advice from senior faculty members about what committees to serve on, and then volunteer for those committees.

8. Seek information, advice, and assistance in developing, implementing, and revising your strategy; do not make major decisions without talking to other people.

9. Actively seek feedback from colleagues, senior faculty, department chair, or unit director. Recognize that other junior faculty—both at the University of Michigan and elsewhere—are often sources of valuable advice and help too. For example, another junior faculty member may have developed a teaching module that you can adapt for your purposes; or, as a group, junior faculty in a department or across a couple of departments may be able to provide one another peer mentoring; or ask specific administrators or senior faculty to discuss particular issues.

10. Do not assume that no feedback means there are no problems.

11. If your position was defined in specific terms when you were hired, be sure you have a copy of the job description. You want to be sure there are no aspects of the job you are expected to do that you don’t recognize.

12. An annual review should be in writing. If it is negative and you believe the comments are legitimate, you should discuss them with your career advisors, including your chair or director, and plan what you need to do to improve. If you believe a comment is not accurate, provide written materials to refute the evaluation.

13. Develop your own networks with junior faculty colleagues and others in your field.

14. Read and discuss any written policies about tenure and/or promotion with your career advisor(s).

15. Let your career advisors, chair or director, and colleagues know when you have done good work. Be sure that professional information is put into your personnel folder.

16. Communicate. Failing to communicate is the biggest pitfall for all relationships. Remember that work. Be sure that professional information is put into your personnel folder.

9) Integrating work and personal life: University policies

In March 2004, the University of Michigan Gender in Science and Engineering Report of the Subcommittee on Family Friendly Policies and Faculty Tracks published recommendations to modify policies related to work-family issues. The policies being examined for revision include more flexible and extensive coverage for leave without pay, modified duties, and stopping the tenure clock. The report also discusses the need for additional on-campus daycare. The report and all UMI policies are available online at the links listed below.
Identification and facilitation of specific opportunities for faculty members to grow into leadership positions

Group advising: Not all career advice requires one-on-one interaction. “Group advising” refers to advising that can be accomplished for the benefit of multiple individuals simultaneously. Sessions can be led by one or by a few senior faculty and address broad issues such as a collegial conversation about the intellectual concerns of the department or program, developing new courses, teaching evaluations, time management, or policies on tenure.

Zone advising: This refers to interactions with individuals with particular areas of expertise (zones) such as successful grant funding, university service assignments, or teaching and learning resources such as the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT). In this variation on the group advising idea, one senior leader can serve as a resource on a particular topic for multiple junior faculty members.

Peer advising: Another variation on group advising is provided by facilitating career-relevant interactions among peers. Junior faculty can assist one another by sharing information, strategies, knowledge about resources, and general moral support. Types of peer advising activities include:

- Dissemination of information on institutional policies similar to the packages provided to all junior faculty/new hires. Topics may include dual career programs, modified duties, delays of the tenure review, leave policies, and work-family resources.
- Guidance in preparation of annual reports and tenure and promotion dossiers.
- Discussion of the level of achievement expected for promotion in various areas (e.g., research, teaching, success at obtaining external funding).
- Communication of eligibility for internal awards and external national and international recognition.

In general, career advising activities can take many forms and do not have to occur in formal settings. In addition, they can include both on-campus and national resources. The following list of potential locations or settings for career advising activities is adapted from the Association for Women in Science (AWIS) website on mentoring: [Link](http://www.awis.org/resource/mentoring.html).

Career advising contacts can be through:

- Informal office visits
- Email
- Campus Events
- “Shadowing” a senior faculty member by agreement
- Touring a lab or workplace
- Recreational activities
- Travel support
- Lectures
- Phone calls
- Meals and coffee breaks
- Professional society meetings
- Poster sessions or other special presentations
- Symposia
- Conferences
- Workshops

5) Common issues for junior and senior faculty regarding career advising

1. Think of yourself as establishing a respectful collegial relationship. Try to engage in ongoing conversations with one another. Try to meet at least once each semester to discuss professional development and progress in all key areas. Don’t be invisible or cancel meetings unless absolutely necessary.
these people has valuable things to offer to junior colleagues, but no one of them is likely to be able to help with all aspects of someone else's career development.

3) What is the goal of providing career advice?

The ultimate goal of giving career advice to junior faculty is to enhance their chances of career success in earning tenure (for instructional faculty) or advancement and promotion (i.e., for research or clinical track faculty) through achievements in scholarship, success in obtaining external funding, teaching, and/or service. Thus, senior faculty can offer information and assistance not only by providing advice about one's area of scholarship, but by:

- Providing information about promotion and tenure processes
- Demystifying departmental, research center, college, and university culture
- Providing constructive and supportive feedback on specific work or on career progress
- Providing encouragement and support
- Helping to foster important connections and visibility
- Looking out for junior faculty interests

Junior and senior faculty alike should consider these topics for their discussions:

- Inside story on departmental culture
- How to navigate department and institution
- Grant sources: strategies for funding
- Publishing outlets and processes
- Teaching
- Research
- Key conferences to attend
- Service roles inside and outside the University, including work on committees

4) What are the different forms of career advising?

Where will junior faculty find career advice? We believe they may find it in many kinds of interactions and relationships, including with peers. The following identifies several types of career advising:

Specific (one-on-one) advising: This kind of advice depends on conferring with someone very familiar with specific issues unique to the junior faculty member's field, or involves direct and specific feedback from a supervisor such as a department chair. Types of specific advising include:

- Review of current activities and future plans. These may include:
  - research activity, including publishing, grant activity, etc.
  - service activity, on campus and nationally
  - teaching activity, both in formal courses and mentoring students
  - clinical assignments
- Review of documents, like curriculum vitae, annual reports, required professional statements
- Critical feedback in the crucial years prior to tenure reviews or promotions, with delineation of the exact criteria by which that faculty member will be evaluated at the annual or third year review
- Personal advice on sensitive issues that individuals do not feel comfortable discussing in groups

- Relationships to cultivate
- How to recruit students or post-doctoral fellows to your research group
- Advice about the career ladder and alternative tracks
- How to plan a career trajectory
- External visibility
- Tenure and promotion processes
- Family issues
- National sources of support
- Publishing outlets and processes

11) Additional resources on career advising and mentoring

Web and institutional resources


http://www.nap.edu/readingroom/books/mentor/index.html

The Association of Women in Science is a non-profit association which works to promote women's activities in all scientific fields, from mentoring to scholarships to job listings.

http://www.awis.org/careers/mentoring.html

The Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) website provides a bibliography and links to online resources on mentoring. Topics covered include: institutional mentoring programs, mentoring women faculty and faculty of color, discipline-specific mentoring, and training materials for mentors and mentees.

http://www.crlt.umich.edu/publinks/facment.html

How to Mentor Graduate Students: A Guide for Faculty at a Diverse University.

How do I deal with sticky situations or problems with students?

Do I have enough graduate students?

How are teaching evaluations handled and weighted?

Service

What are the important committees to serve on?

How can I get nominated to be on them?

Are there committees to avoid?

How is this work documented?

Promotion and Tenure

What are the department’s formal and informal criteria for promotion and tenure?

What or who can clarify these criteria?

What would you have wanted to know when you began the tenure process?

How does one build a tenure file?

Who sits on the tenure committee and how are they selected?

How should I prepare for the annual review?

What can I negotiate when I get an outside offer?

How should I prepare for the third year review?

Is my job description matching the work I do?

Are my research, teaching, service and grants of an appropriate level?

Who should I meet in the institution, in the discipline and even worldwide?

Who should I meet in the institution, in the discipline and even worldwide?
1) Why is career advice important?

Faculty careers develop over time. Along the way, and more than in most occupations, individuals are free to make decisions and choices about how they spend their time and about what they do. Making those decisions requires information and judgment about consequences, since the decisions you make now are likely to matter for the long term. With limited information, individuals lack the basis needed to make informed judgments. That’s not likely to lead to the best decisions! And since time is finite, "yes" to a new commitment today also means "no" to a current activity or future opportunity. Career advice from people with information and experience can provide a crucial context for decision-making and career development.

Lack of access to career advice—often because of few opportunities for informal interactions in which information is conveyed casually—is one of the most widely reported barriers to career advancement. Moreover, there is evidence that all women and men of color are particularly likely to suffer career setbacks from lack of career guidance (see e.g., Bowman, Kite, Branscombe & Williams, 1989). In one study (Preston, 2003), one third of women interviewed who exited science cited a lack of guidance as the major factor leading to the exit decision, while none of the men interviewed identified this as a factor influencing exit.

2) What exactly is career advising? Is it the same thing as “mentoring”?

Many people think of “mentoring” as something that is part of the graduate school relationship between an advisor and an advisee, and one in which the advisor sets relatively strong and clear limits on the advisee’s range of choices. To avoid confusing this type of mentorship with the kind of interactions that junior faculty—who should proactively pursue their own career development—need to have with more senior colleagues, we are using the term “career advising” instead of mentoring.

There are many different forms of career advising and all of them are valuable to junior faculty. Some of them may, in fact, be similar to the mentoring of graduate students; but many are not. For example, Zeidlich (1990) pointed out that junior faculty need several different kinds of people to help them: “Advisers, people with career experience willing to share their knowledge; supporters, people who give emotional and moral encouragement; tutors, people who give specific feedback on one’s performance; masters, in the sense of an employer to whom one is apprenticed; [and] sponsors, sources of information about, and aid in obtaining opportunities.” In a similar vein, the University of Michigan Gender in Science and Engineering Subcommittee on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Leadership’s April 2004 Final Report broadly defined a mentor as a person who “facilitates the career and development of another person, usually junior, through one or more of the following activities: providing advice and counseling; providing psychological support; advocating for, promoting, and sponsoring the career of the mentee.”

Senior faculty can provide some or all of these forms of career advice to their junior colleagues. However, it is not feasible or desirable to single out one individual to fulfill all possible mentoring roles or provide all possible kinds of career advice.2 For example, a particular faculty member may be a great example of a programmatic research approach and successful external funding, but may not be a particularly constructive citizen of the department; another may work in an area very distant from junior colleagues’ interests, but be a marvelous teacher and beloved mentor of graduate students; still a third may simply seem to radiate good judgment and a balanced and humane approach to life. Each of

2 While this guide is particularly aimed at the needs of untenured faculty, tenured faculty also need, and should seek, career advice—about the next career stage (e.g., promotion to full professor), or about taking on leadership roles or choosing not to, or about their next project, or next life stage (e.g., the period after children are grown, or retirement).
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Giving and Getting Career Advice: A Guide for Junior and Senior Faculty

1 This Guide was prepared by Pamela J. Smock and Robin Stephenson, with assistance from Janet E. Mailey and Abigail J. Stewart. An early draft was reviewed by several colleagues, who provided valuable advice: Rebecca Bernstein, Aline Cotel, Danielle LaVaque-Manty, Mika LaVaque-Manty, Marvin Parnes, Martha Pollack, Michelle Swanson, Janet Weiss and Nicholas Winter.

For more information or additional copies of this resource, please contact the ADVANCE Program at (734) 647-9359 or advanceprogram@umich.edu or visit the ADVANCE Program’s Web site at http://www.sitemaker.umich.edu/advance
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Welcome to the University of Michigan. As one of our nation’s great public universities, Michigan is most proud of its astonishing breadth and depth of academic excellence.

At the very core of our excellence is our longstanding commitment to build and nurture a campus community characterized by a diversity of people, heritage, academic disciplines and scholarly pursuits. We know that a broad spectrum of perspectives leads to richer educational experiences and intellectual engagement for everyone. Our many and varied voices must all be heard and equally valued. They help us challenge one another’s preconceived notions and expand our understanding. The fabric of our community is simply more vibrant when it is a diverse one.

We know, too, that as a public university we must strive to promote the diversity reflected in the state, the nation and the world we serve.

We cherish the value expressed by the University’s first president, Henry Philip Tappan: “We must take the world as full as it is.” All of us have a responsibility to recruit, welcome and retain the finest faculty, as well as the most talented students and staff, of all backgrounds, so we can further enhance Michigan’s academic distinction as well as the vitality of our campus.

The U-M Senate Assembly, the governing body representing faculty from the Ann Arbor, Flint and Dearborn campuses, has voiced its “commitment to the value of diversity and urges that all members of the University—faculty, students, staff and administration—work together to develop new approaches to maintain diversity as a critical component of student education, research and service at the University of Michigan.”

It is my honor to be part of an institution that has been a true leader in its continuous pursuit of diversity within higher education. We remain committed to the highest aspirations for a diverse future. I invite you to join this remarkable community, adding your unique perspective to our richly varied viewpoints and contributions.

Sincerely,

Mark Schlissel, MD, PhD
President
Hiring and retaining exceptional academic colleagues is one of the most important things we do as faculty members. We value the University of Michigan’s stimulating, welcoming and diverse environment, and we want to continue to attract world-class artists, scholars, and students. Thus we must actively recruit talented colleagues, not just during formal searches, but at every opportunity: socially and professionally, one-on-one and via affinity groups, at conferences, and while performing field work.

Efforts to recruit, retain, and promote diverse faculty have produced slow and uneven results. This has been the case both nationally and at the University of Michigan. Since the summer of 2002, initially under the auspices of the U-M’s NSF ADVANCE grant, the Strategies and Tactics for Recruiting to Improve Diversity and Excellence (STRIDE) Committee has given presentations to search committees and other interested faculty and administrators aimed at helping with the recruiting and retention of women and other minorities under-represented among the faculty (e.g., racial and ethnic minorities, sexual minorities, people with disabilities). This Handbook for Faculty Searches and Hiring is designed to integrate and summarize the recruitment and hiring practices that have been identified nationally and by the STRIDE committee as effective, practical, and fair. This faculty recruitment handbook has been updated regularly and this extensive revision was completed in the summer of 2014. The present version incorporates valuable material from the Office of the Provost Academic Affairs Faculty Hiring Manual developed in 2013 by a committee whose members included Lester P. Monts, Derek B. Collins, Alan V. Deardorff, Carmen R. Green, S. Jack Hu, Maya Kobersy, Carla O’Connor, Catherine Shaw, Anthony Walesby, and Gretchen Weir. This document is a combined product of the ADVANCE Program and the Office of the Provost committee, and supersedes all previous faculty recruitment handbooks. It reflects our collective best judgments about best practices. The Handbook for Faculty Searches and Hiring will be reviewed annually and updated as needed to respond to relevant new research findings.

The STRIDE committee is composed of a diverse group of senior faculty who are able to advise individuals and departments through presentations, detailed and targeted advice, or focused discussions as needed on hiring practices aimed at increasing both the diversity and excellence of the
faculty. Although STRIDE was initially focused on faculty in science and engineering, in 2006 the Provost expanded its portfolio to include all schools and colleges in the University. Several times a year STRIDE offers a workshop for search committee members and other faculty entitled “Workshop on Faculty Recruitment for Diversity and Excellence.” The most recent PowerPoint slides for the presentation are accessible at the following URL:

advance.umich.edu/stride.html

After several years of experience with the STRIDE committee and several other related activities, ADVANCE was able to report real progress in the recruitment of women in each of the three colleges that employ the largest number of scientists and engineers at the University (College of Engineering, LSA Natural Sciences, and Medical School Basic Sciences). Before STRIDE began, the average rate of hiring new women faculty in STEM fields was 13% (as a proportion of all new faculty hired). In the years since STRIDE began (AY2003–2014), the rate has averaged 32% (a statistically significant increase). While many factors no doubt contributed to departments’ or program’s willingness and ability to hire more women, STRIDE is the intervention that most directly provided ideas, tools, and best practices to aid in recruitment.

Moreover, some particular departments have reported especially rapid progress. For example, before the ADVANCE Program, the U-M Chemistry Department’s average representation of women in their applicant pool (1998–99 to 2002–03) was 10%. After the ADVANCE Program and the Department’s adoption of “open searches,” the average representation of women in the applicant pool rose to 18%. The percentage of underrepresented minority faculty also increased from 2% in AY2001 to 7% in AY2014. In the Department of Astronomy, the number of women on the tenure track increased from 0 in AY2001 to 4—or 25%—in AY2014. Rates of underrepresented minority faculty did not change over this same time period but were relatively high (13% in AY2014). Both departments—which participated actively in ADVANCE programs and employed recommended hiring practices—have become nationally recognized for the outstanding quality and diversity of their faculty hiring during this period.

The larger context for faculty hiring activities includes both national and federal mandates, state legal constraints, and university commitments. As then President Coleman stated in her remarks to the community after the 2006 passage of Michigan’s Proposal 2, “The University of Michigan embraces, promotes, wants, and believes in diversity,” Laurita Thomas, Associate Vice President for Human Resources, expressed the following views in a letter to the U-M community, available at hr.umich.edu/announcements/prop2.html

“The passage of Proposal 2 does not change our commitment, nor does it alter our employment practices or the protections and requirements of various federal and state laws including the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Michigan’s Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act, which prohibit a wide array of discrimination extending far beyond issues of race and gender.”

“We must continue to work diligently to recruit and retain the best faculty and staff by creating a community that seeks, welcomes and defends diversity. We will do so in compliance with state and federal laws, and federal law requires that we continue to take affirmative steps (known as affirmative action) in our employment process in order to adhere to the equal employment opportunity and affirmative action provisions of Executive Order 11246 regarding race, gender, color, religion and national origin required of all federal contractors. Proposal 2 specifically states that it does not prohibit actions that are required to establish or maintain eligibility for any federal program, if ineligibility would result in a loss of federal funds to the state.” Specifically, the document explains that this means that:

- The University’s nondiscrimination policy remains in full force and effect (see SPG 201.35 spg.umich.edu/pdf/201.35.pdf).
- A host of federal and state civil rights laws, including those discussed above, continue to be in effect and applicable to the University.
- The University must continue to adhere to all the requirements of Executive Order 11246.
- As it relates to the employment process, Executive Order 11246 requires all federal contractors, such as U-M, to take affirmative steps to ensure its employment process is fair and equitable and offers equal opportunity in hiring and employment. The types of affirmative steps required include a focus on recruiting and outreach, such as casting the widest net possible when conducting an employment search.
- Executive Order 11246 also requires that federal contractors not discriminate against job applicants or employees.
- The University’s standard statement in employment ads, “A Non-Discriminatory/ Affirmative Action Employer” or similar language such as “Affirmative
Action/Equal Opportunity Employer is required by Executive Order 11246 and must continue to be used. Further information regarding the University’s nondiscrimination statement, its employment diversity, or its affirmative action obligations can be obtained from the Office of Institutional Equity.

hr.umich.edu/oie

This handbook is designed to provide guidance on how to recognize and recruit outstanding colleagues. Its techniques will increase the probability of identifying and attracting the best candidates, while helping us, as representatives of the University, demonstrate and articulate U-M’s values. We believe that diversity, academic excellence, and enhanced student learning are so closely linked that we should hire and retain excellent faculty from a diverse array of backgrounds and experiences whenever possible.

Whether you are involved in a formal search or recruiting in other ways, it is important that you provide opportunity to all applicants, including scholars and artists from underrepresented groups.

The process that meets our need for excellence also addresses our desire for inclusiveness. This manual outlines the multiple steps of the process:

- Initiating the Search Process
- Committee Activity Before the Search Begins
- Recruiting Activities During the Search
- Handling Campus Visits
- Final Stages of the Search Process: Negotiating the Offer
- Getting Off to a Good Start
- Evaluating the Search

This manual also contains three appendices consisting of a sample search committee charge, resources for active recruiting, and a reading list containing pertinent articles grouped by category.

This manual is not meant to supersede the existing procedures in any particular school or college but rather to encourage consistent and good practices across campus. The workshops provided by STRIDE are an important and useful complement to the information provided here. Several schools and colleges mandate STRIDE workshops for chairs and/or search committee members, a practice we recommend.
The composition of the search committee, the charge to the search committee, and the definition/description of the faculty position are factors likely to have consequences for the outcome of the search. It is important that these issues be addressed deliberately and early. The ADVANCE Program leadership is happy to meet with department chairs or other decision-makers to help think through issues associated with the composition of, and charge to, the search committee.

Composition of the Committee

- Search committees should include members with different perspectives and expertise, and with a demonstrated commitment to diversity.
- Search committees should include women and underrepresented minorities whenever possible. Note, however, that women and minorities are often asked to do significantly more service than majority males, so it is important to keep track of their service load, free them from less significant service tasks, and/or compensate them in other ways.
- It is often helpful to appoint some search committee members from outside the department.

Defining the Position

- Define the position in the widest possible terms consistent with the department’s needs. Aim for consensus on specific specialties or requirements, while planning to cast the hiring net as broadly as possible. Make sure that the position description does not needlessly limit the pool of applicants. Some position descriptions may unintentionally exclude female or minority candidates by focusing too narrowly on subfields in which few specialize.
- Consider as important selection criteria for all candidates (regardless of their own demographic characteristics), the ability of the candidate to add intellectual diversity to the department, to work successfully with diverse students and colleagues, and to mentor diverse students and junior colleagues.
- If women or minority candidates are hired in areas that are not at the center of the department’s focus and interest, they may be placed in an unfavorable situation. It is important to carefully think about how the department will support not only the individual, but
also the development of that person’s area within the department. Consider “cluster hiring,” which involves hiring more than one faculty member at a time to work in the same specialization.

• Establish selection criteria and procedures for screening, interviewing candidates, and keeping records before advertising the position.

• Make sure that hiring criteria are directly related to the requirements of the position, clearly understood, and accepted by all members of the committee. Ensure that criteria will not be assessed in terms of a single limited indicator and that committee members recognize the inevitable measurement uncertainty that is associated with any given indicator.

• Get committee (and if appropriate, departmental) consensus on the relative importance of different selection criteria. Plan to create multiple short lists based on different key criteria. (See “Creating the Short List,” in section IV, below.)

Posting the Position

The job posting is the committee’s—and the University’s—first opportunity to clearly communicate about the position to the wide range of candidates it hopes to attract. First impressions are important. Make sure the announcement is clear, accurate, and welcoming.

Many schools and departments advertise openings in the Chronicle of Higher Education, Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, and major journals in their field. Most fields have resources—listservs, email groups, etc.—that can help you identify or reach diverse qualified candidates.

Language for Announcing Positions

Proactive language can be included in job descriptions to indicate a department’s commitment to diversity. This may make the position more attractive to female and minority candidates. Examples include:

• “The college is especially interested in qualified candidates who can contribute, through their research, teaching, and/or service, to the diversity and excellence of the academic community.”

• “The University is responsive to the needs of dual career couples.”

• “Women, minorities, individuals with disabilities, and veterans are encouraged to apply.”

• “The University of Michigan [or school/college/department] seeks to recruit and retain a diverse workforce as a reflection of our commitment to serve the diverse people of Michigan, to maintain the excellence of the University, and to offer our students richly varied disciplines, perspectives, and ways of knowing and learning.”

• “The school/department is interested in candidates who have demonstrated commitment to excellence by providing leadership in teaching research or service toward building an equitable and diverse scholarly environment.”

• “We will consider applicants knowledgeable in the general area of xxx. There are several broad areas of interest, including [several named]. In general, we give higher priority to the overall originality and promise of the candidate’s work rather than to the sub-area of specialization. XXX University is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer and is committed to increasing the diversity of its faculty. We welcome nominations of and applications from anyone who would bring additional dimensions to the university’s research, teaching and clinical mission, including women, members of minority groups, protected veterans and individuals with disabilities.

The race and/or gender of candidates may not be factors considered in hiring decisions, but search committees may specify service, research, and other factors that could contribute to intellectual diversity, and the ability of the department or school/college to meet the needs of diverse students. Manuals of our peer institutions may be helpful, such as UCLA’s Faculty Search Toolkit at faculty.diversity.ucla.edu/resources-for/search-committees/search-toolkit.

The Importance of Dual Career Considerations

While it is critical that women and minority candidates be treated first and foremost as the scholars they are, it is equally important that search committees and departments understand the importance of dual career considerations in recruiting women and underrepresented minority faculty. To help qualified spouses and partners find appropriate positions, you might consider including the following statement in the ads for positions: “The University is responsive to the needs of dual career couples.”

At the same time, it is critical that all search committees recognize that it is inappropriate and illegal for individuals’ marital or family status to affect evaluation of their application. Knowledge—or guesses—about these matters may not play any role in the committee’s deliberation about candidates’ qualifications or the construction of the short list. All committee members should recognize this and help maintain a proper focus in committee deliberations, but the
Details are listed below and can be found at the following URL: [hr.umich.edu/empserv/department/empsel/legalchart.html](http://hr.umich.edu/empserv/department/empsel/legalchart.html)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>LEGAL QUESTIONS</th>
<th>DISCRIMINATORY QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Family Status          | Do you have any responsibilities that conflict with the job attendance or travel requirements?  
Must be asked of all applicants.                                                                                                         | Are you married?  
What is your spouse's name?  
What is your maiden name?  
Do you have any children?  
Are you pregnant?  
What are your childcare arrangements?                                                                                   |
| Race                   | None                                                                                                                                                                                                             | What is your race?                                                                                     |
| Religion               | None  
You may inquire about availability for weekend work.                                                                                                                                                     | What is your religion?  
Which church do you attend?  
What are your religious holidays?                                                                                           |
| Residence              | What is your address?                                                                                                                                                                                              | Do you own or rent your home?  
Who resides with you?                                                                                                             |
| Sex                    | None                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Are you male or female?                                                                                  |
| Age                    | If hired, can you offer proof that you are at least 18 years of age?                                                                                                                                           | How old are you?  
What is your birthdate?                                                                                                           |
| Arrests or Convictions of a Crime | Have you ever been convicted of a crime?  
You must state that a conviction will be considered only as it relates to fitness to perform the job being sought.                                                                                       | Have you ever been arrested?                                                                             |
| Citizenship or Nationality | Can you show proof of your eligibility to work in the U.S.?  
Are you fluent in any languages other than English? You may ask the second question only as it relates to the job being sought.                                                      | Are you a U.S. citizen?  
Where were you born?                                                                                                               |
| Disability             | Are you able to perform the essential functions of this job with or without reasonable accommodation?  
Show the applicant the position description so he or she can give an informed answer.                                                                 | Are you disabled?  
What is the nature or severity of your disability?                                                                                       |
committee chair has a special responsibility to ensure that the discussion excludes any inappropriate considerations. The U-M Human Resources and Affirmative Action website includes a chart comparing legal questions with discriminatory questions about:

- Family status
- Race
- Religion
- Residence
- Sex
- Age
- Arrests or convictions
- Citizenship or nationality
- Disability

Regardless of candidates’ personal characteristics (and without knowing anything about an individual’s partner or family status), one feature of the University environment that is likely to be important and attractive to all candidates is its promotion of a humane work setting. As you provide that information to all candidates, keep these considerations in mind:

- While it is common for academics to be partnered with other academics, academic women are more likely to be partnered with other academics than academic men are. This means that disadvantages that affect two-career academic couples have a disproportionate impact on women.
- At the same time, recognize that there is variability among women in their personal and household circumstances. Do not assume one household type (e.g., a husband and children) applies to all women.
- Make sure everyone on the search committee has a good working knowledge of the U-M’s dual career support programs. Consult the Provost’s Office for further information. Information is also available online at provost.umich.edu/programs/pfip.html. This site provides online resources for dual career partners seeking employment. Other documents are available by contacting the Provost’s Office.
- Precise procedures vary in each school and college, so search committee chairs should consult their department chairs about the correct procedures they should follow.
- Provide all candidates with copies of dual career resources, which are also available online:
  provost.umich.edu/programs/dual_career/DualCareerBrochure9201.pdf
- Address perceptions that Ann Arbor, as a small city, offers limited opportunities for a candidate’s spouse or partner. Make sure candidates know about the diverse employment possibilities their partners might find not only at the university, but also throughout Ann Arbor and in the larger Southeast Michigan area. The Dual Career office can provide helpful information about Ann Arbor and surrounding communities. (See contact information above.)
- Identify someone in the department or outside it who can offer to have a confidential conversation (one not to be conveyed to anyone else in the department) with candidates about these issues. This person should be well-informed about all programs supporting faculty members’ families, and willing to describe or discuss them with candidates, without transmitting information about the candidate’s personal circumstances to the department or the search committee. For example, the College of Engineering has a committee of senior faculty women who volunteer to serve as contacts for women candidates, and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ADAA) requires that each female candidate meet with a member of this committee.
- If a candidate does mention having a spouse or partner who will need help finding a relevant position, follow the procedures appropriate in your school or college to arrange interviews or other opportunities for the spouse or partner as early in the hiring process as possible. Your department chair is the best source on this, but it is always possible to get information and assistance from the Dual Career Coordinator in the Provost’s office.
- As noted in other places within this handbook, make sure all applicants for faculty positions are provided with information about the University’s family friendly policies.

The ADVANCE Program can be reached by email at: advanceprogram@umich.edu or by web form request at: advance.umich.edu/contact.html
III. COMMITTEE ACTIVITY BEFORE THE SEARCH BEGINS

The search committee, and/or a larger group in the department, should engage in a relatively extended review of the wider context of the discipline, as well as the department’s own past history of searching and hiring, before beginning a new search. In the case of a department that has had limited success in recruiting women and minorities, the department is more likely to be able to achieve a different outcome if it has some understanding of factors that may have played a role in limiting its past success.

Creating a large pool of qualified candidates is the single most important step in conducting a successful search. Search committee members must take an active role in identifying and recruiting candidates and not leave a stone unturned in seeking out excellent candidates.

Reviewing the National Pool

- Take steps to identify the national “pools” of qualified candidates for the field as a whole and for subfields in which you are considering hiring. Subfield pools are sometimes quite different from overall pools. ADVANCE Program staff are willing and able to assist you in identifying field and subfield pools.
- Identify any institutions or individuals that are especially successful at producing women and/or underrepresented minority doctorates and/or postdoctorates in your field or the desired subfield. Recruit actively from those sources as well.

Reviewing Past Departmental Searches

- Find out how many women and underrepresented minorities have applied for past positions in your department, as a percentage of the total applicant pool.
- Find out how many women and underrepresented minorities have been brought to campus for interviews in your field in previous searches.
- If women or underrepresented minority candidates have been hired in recent searches, ask the search committees, the department chair, and the recently hired faculty themselves how they were successfully recruited.
• If women or underrepresented minority candidates have been offered positions but have turned them down, attempt to find out why they have turned them down. Do recognize that many candidates are less than candid in talking with colleagues in the same field. ADVANCE does conduct exit interviews with faculty who leave positions at U-M annually and updates its report of themes identified in that report. Since these interviews are confidential, results specific to any individual or field cannot be divulged. However, you may find the annual report of campus-wide results will help you identify relevant issues. Be sure, in any case, to listen for potential insights into departmental practices that might have been a factor in candidates’ decisions. Stories that appear to be highly individualized at first may reveal patterns when considered in the aggregate.

• Find out what has happened to women and underrepresented minorities who were not offered positions in previous searches. Where are they now? Does it appear that evaluation bias may have interfered with the assessment of their likely success?

• If no women or underrepresented minorities have been offered positions in recent searches, consider redefining departmental evaluation systems in ways that might better take strengths of all candidates into account. Consider, too, whether positions have been defined too narrowly. If candidates have been ranked on a single list, consider using multiple ranking criteria in the future.

Initial Discussions of the Search Committee’s Charge

• Review the charge to the committee, including legal requirements and documentation (see Appendix 1 for a sample).

• Identify the tasks to be completed by the committee and set up a meeting schedule.

• Establish committee expectations regarding confidentiality and attendance.

• Decide what role, if any, internet searches are to play in the selection process and determine how equity and privacy concerns can be addressed if they are used or considered.

• Determine materials to be submitted by candidates; with the aim of ensuring that candidates will have the best opportunity to make a case for what they could contribute.

• Identify ways in which the committee as a whole will ensure that affirmative action is properly addressed and that diverse candidates are encouraged to apply.

• Verify that its charge includes particular focus on equitable search practices, and the goal of identifying outstanding candidates, including outstanding women and underrepresented minority candidates for the position.

• Articulate the fact that diversity and excellence are fully compatible goals and can and should be pursued simultaneously.

• Identify selection criteria and develop the position description prior to beginning the search.

• As is consistent with federal affirmative action obligations, at the beginning of the search establish plans to actively recruit women and underrepresented minorities into the applicant pool.

• Be sure that all members of the search committee understand the potential role that evaluation bias could play to produce an unfair and inequitable search process.

• Review practices that will mitigate the kinds of evaluation biases that social science research has demonstrated result in unfair evaluations for women and minority candidates.

• Charge the search committee with customizing the candidate evaluation tool for that search (perhaps with discussion of overall emphases, relative importance of different criteria).

• Have the department or school faculty discuss and approve the candidate evaluation tool’s list of criteria before the search starts.

• Include a checklist of responsibilities for search committee chair and for department chair (including ensuring the above practices are followed and ensuring that inappropriate discussions are prevented or addressed.

• Include discussion of how the plans to represent the school’s or department’s commitment to and strategies for hiring and advancing diverse faculty are integrated into the hiring process. This may be of particular concern for departments that have few or no women or under-represented minority faculty. In these cases, it is crucial to develop long-term strategies for recruiting diverse faculty that go well beyond any single search. For example, the department might consider inviting women or minority faculty to give talks and then inviting them to apply for positions the following year.

• Remind committee members that the ADVANCE Program is available to consult as questions arise throughout the search process.
Issues to Cover in the First Search Committee Meeting

I. Introduction
   a. Thank the committee members for agreeing to serve.
   b. Do introductions.

II. Charge (the following provided merely as examples)
   a. Review essential characteristics of the position with the expectation that the committee will fine tune the position description. These might include:
      i. Distinguished or promising record of scholarship; success in core academic functions (research and teaching); need to avoid overreliance of single indicators of excellence
      ii. Tenurable at professor level (if applicable)
      iii. Strong administrative experience and skills (if applicable)
      iv. Commitment to diversity, a core value of the University
      v. Ability to mentor diverse students and junior colleagues
   b. Set a clear expectation that the committee will cast a broad net for prospective candidates (national / international search).
   c. Detail the required outcome, e.g., “We have been asked to provide our recommendation of a single candidate for the department to hire” OR “we have been asked to provide a ranked list of the top 2 or 3 candidates for the department to discuss” OR “We have been asked to recommend an unranked list of 3–4 candidates. Because the committee is advisory, the candidates recommended to the Dean must be unranked.”
   d. The Dean/Department Chair would like recommendations by [date].

III. Staff Support
    [Name] has been assigned to provide staff support for the search. She/he has experience staffing searches and will provide a full range of support to help guide the committee through the search process. [Name], who is also a veteran of a number of searches in our office, will be assisting [Name] as needed.

IV. Process
   a. Outline time frame and frequency of meetings as well as expectations concerning attendance and confidentiality.
   b. Discuss what materials will be requested and where they will be kept.
   c. Discuss process to be used to set criteria for job posting.
   d. Discuss process the committee will use to generate short list/interview/campus visit candidates and campus visit candidates for approval.
   e. Discuss the role that evaluation bias can play in searches, and the specific steps the committee will take to mitigate it.
   f. Decide what role, if any, internet searches are to play in the selection process and determine how equity and privacy concerns can be addressed if they are used.
   g. Discuss any approvals, such as approval to interview, that the committee must seek before proceeding.
   h. Remind committee members that internal candidates, if there are any, should be treated the same as external candidates.
   i. Discuss how the search will be concluded.
IV. RECRUITING ACTIVITIES DURING THE SEARCH

Broadening the Pool

- Be aware that the University of Michigan’s Provost’s Faculty Initiative Program (PFIP) provides supplemental resources “to help the schools and colleges and other academic units to hire and retain faculty who contribute to the intellectual diversity of the institution, to assist the dual career partners of tenure track and tenured faculty, and to respond to unique opportunities.” This program can often help you recruit and retain women and minority faculty, among others. Consult the Provost’s Office for further information: provost.umich.edu/programs/pfip.html.

- View your committee’s task as including a process of generating a pool rather than merely tapping it. This may be accomplished by having committee members attend presentations at national meetings and develop a more diverse list of potential future candidates based on those meetings. Candidates identified in this way may be in any field, not necessarily the one targeted for a particular search. In fact, the department may consider creating a committee to generate exceptional candidates for targeted recruitment outside of subfield-defined searches. In addition, the committee may consider issuing promising candidates invitations to visit U-M informally to present research before those individuals are ready for an active search. Cultivating future candidates is an important activity for the search committee to undertake, and may require that the search have a longer time horizon than is typical (one academic year).

- If your department is a significant source of qualified applicants nationally, consider setting aside the traditional constraint against “hiring our own.” It may be important, if your department or related ones at U-M is a significant producer of the pool, to avoid unduly constraining the search to those trained elsewhere.

- Keep in mind that some highly-ranked eminent universities have only recently begun actively to produce women and minority PhDs. Therefore, consider candidates from a wide range of institutions.

- Consider the possibility that individuals, including women and underrepresented minorities, who have excelled at their research and teaching in departments less highly ranked than U-M’s may be under-placed and might thrive in the University of Michigan research environment.

- Consider reopening or intensifying the search if the pool of applicants does not include any female or minority candidates who will be seriously considered by the search committee.
Using Active Recruiting Practices

- Use electronic job-posting services, particularly those targeted at diverse groups such as minority and women’s caucuses or professional networks in your discipline. (Several resources are listed below.)
- Make personal contacts, including women and minorities, at professional conferences and invite them to apply.
- Ask faculty and graduate students to help identify strong candidates, including women and minority candidates.
- Contact colleagues at other institutions to seek nominations of students nearing graduation or others interested in moving laterally, making sure to request inclusion of minorities and women.
- Place announcements in websites, listservs, journals, and publications, including those aimed specifically at underrepresented minorities and women.
- Identify suitable faculty at other institutions, particularly women and minority faculty who may currently be under-placed, and send job announcements directly to them.
- Contact relevant professional organizations for rosters listing women and minorities receiving PhDs (or other relevant degrees) in the academic field.

Be aware that most academic fields have resources—listservs, email groups, etc.—that can help you identify or reach qualified women and minority candidates. Either seek these out on your own, or request assistance from advanceprogram@umich.edu in identifying them. Appendix 2 presents a list of active recruiting resources.

How to Avoid Having Active Recruitment Efforts Backfire

Women and minority faculty candidates, like all candidates, wish to be evaluated for academic positions on the basis of their scholarly credentials. They will not appreciate subtle or overt indications that they are being valued on other characteristics, such as their gender or race. Women candidates and candidates of color already realize that their gender or race may be a factor in your interest in their candidacy. It is important that contacts with women and minority candidates for faculty positions focus on their scholarship, qualifications, and their potential academic role in the department.

Conducting a Fair Selection Process

Documenting the Search

Systematic tracking of the committee’s interaction with applicants is not only helpful to the committee during the search, but the resulting records may be useful in the future.

- Develop a standard form that summarizes each candidate’s progress during the search process (e.g., nominated, applied, reviewed, failed to meet minimum qualifications, shortlisted, interviewed, eliminated, etc.)
- Create a physical and/or electronic file for each candidate who meets the objective criteria established by the committee to hold their materials, recommendations, interview notes, and records of communications. (See below for maintaining appropriate contact with candidates.)
- Provide a secure location for files to ensure confidentiality throughout the search, such as a password-protected website to track candidates, their status, and associated materials.
- Maintain official minutes of search committee meetings. These can be brief, but they should document general criteria established by the committee and their decision-making process.
- Keep copies of letters and advertisements, especially those efforts made to recruit women and underrepresented minority candidates.
- Ensure that each applicant receives an Applicant Data Form to be returned to the Office for Institutional Equity. (See hr.umich.edu/hrris/forms/pdfs/selfida2.pdf.) This form offers the applicant the option of reporting his or her gender, ethnicity, and race. OIE uses these data to evaluate the success of the committee’s efforts to generate a diverse pool. Contact your school or college for information about how this form should be distributed.
- Ensure consistency of evaluations, interviews, and reference checks by developing standard forms and standard questions for these activities.
- Ensure that documentation provides rationales for search committee decisions and recommendations. This can be as extensive as notes to the candidate files, or as brief as a line in committee minutes (e.g., “The committee decided to limit interviews to those candidates having more than ten years of teaching experience”). Notes should indicate specific job-related reasons for selection or non-selection.
Communicating Promptly and Courteously with Candidates

Ongoing communication is vital to the success of the current search and to future searches. Our treatment of applicants, even those we do not wish to interview, should demonstrate the values of the University of Michigan and our respect for current and potential colleagues. Slow or sloppy communication can create a negative impression of the department, school, or University as a whole.

- Respectful communication and complete confidentiality are very important throughout the search
- Keep all candidates informed in a courteous and timely manner about the progress of the search
- Craft courteous form letters
- Notify candidates who were eliminated at the outset of the search because they do not meet minimum requirements; express appreciation for their interest in U-M
- Make timely requests to internal and external colleagues for nominations
- Send thank you messages upon receipt of nominations
- Send communications to nominees encouraging them to apply (include position description)
- Send timely acknowledgments of receipt of applications and/or other materials
- Send timely notification to candidates who are no longer being considered; provide feedback on their application, if appropriate, and thank them for their interest in U-M
- Engage in prompt follow-up with finalists after campus visits
- Make timely and courteous requests for references
- Keep the “short list” of candidates up to date on the status of the search, but they should not be told that another candidate has been offered the job until the finalist has accepted the department’s offer

Reviewing Applications with Objective Criteria

As you begin to evaluate applicants, be aware of conscious and unconscious biases that may exist, including those below, which have been identified by psychological research:

- We often judge people based exclusively on our own experience.
- We tend to favor people who look like us or have other experiences like our own.
- We need to consider the experience and needs of our diverse student population.
- Women and underrepresented minority candidates are penalized disproportionately if reviewers do not allocate adequate time (15–20 minutes) to reviewing their files.
- Be sure to consider whether you are using evidence to arrive at your evaluations/ratings.

There is a large body of work on how unconscious biases influence judgments when reviewing scientific work and job candidates. Examples include:

- The STRIDE Committee’s website is a helpful resource for PowerPoint slides, resources, and tools: advance.umich.edu/stride.html
- Virginia Valian’s videotaped lecture summarizing her research, which can be found at video.mit.edu/search/?q=valian&x=0&y=0
- ADVANCE Program staff will be happy to help you obtain this material (advanceprogram@umich.edu).

By incorporating the qualifications in the position description into a standard evaluation form, screening criteria can be applied consistently to all candidates.

- Determine, prioritize, and document search criteria based on position duties. Discuss the range of evidence that will be considered as relevant to each criterion.
- Notice that different criteria may produce different top candidates. Be sure to consider all criteria that are pertinent to the department’s goals (e.g., experience working with diverse students). In addition, discuss the relative weight of the different criteria, and the likelihood that no or few candidates will rate high on all of them.
- Identify essential or threshold qualifications without which a candidate will not be selected, no matter how impressive in other areas. Rank other skills or competencies in order of importance.
- Consider including criteria not directly related to the specific discipline, if they are nonetheless important to the ability to succeed in the job in the department or college, such as collegiality or an unusual combination of skills/perspectives.
- Ensure that the criteria for evaluation of candidates do not preclude people with non-traditional career patterns (e.g., an engineer who has worked at a national research laboratory, individuals who have taken family leave, a first-generation scholar who began his or her career at an institution that was not research-intensive, or individuals with disabilities whose careers have been interrupted).
• Consider highly successful people with transferable skill sets.

• Develop a mechanism for screening applications that includes recording why or why not the applicant was selected. You will need to justify your final recommendations based upon the position description.

• Using a standard form will keep committee members focused on the agreed-upon criteria and provide documentation for the process.

One of the hallmarks of an equitable search is that all candidates are treated in the same manner. This may include asking the same questions under the same conditions, and being evaluated using consistent criteria. It is difficult to maintain a level playing field if the search committee uses internet searches to gather additional information about the candidates.

• Some candidates might gain an unfair advantage because of their positive presence on the web; others might be disadvantaged by incorrect information.

• Internet searches might also reveal personal details, such as marital status or age, which should not be considered by the search committee members. Because it is difficult to disregard this kind of information once it enters the review process, it is best to avoid it.

The committee should decide what role, if any, internet searches are to play in the selection process, and should ensure that the same standard is applied to all candidates. In addition, if internet searches are used, candidates should be provided an opportunity to respond to any information considered by the committee.

Creating the Short List

The most important general point about the process of creating the short list is to build in several checkpoints at which you make a considered decision about whether you are satisfied with the pool of candidates you have generated.

• Get consensus on the multiple criteria that will be used to choose candidates for interviews. Notice that different criteria may produce different top candidates. Be sure to consider all criteria that are pertinent to the department’s goals (e.g., experience working with diverse students might be one). In addition, discuss the relative weighting of the different criteria, and the likelihood that no or few candidates will rate high on all of them.

• Beware of systems of evaluation that inadvertently screen out well-qualified applicants from minority-serving institutions.

• Be careful to place a suitable value on non-traditional career paths. Take into account time spent raising children or getting particular kinds of training, unusual undergraduate degrees, and different job experiences. There is considerable evidence that evaluations of men frequently go up when they have such experience, while evaluations of women with the same kinds of experience go down.

• Develop a “medium” list from which to generate your short list. Are there women or minority candidates on it? If not, consider intensifying the search before moving on to a short list.

• Consider creating separate short lists ranking people on different criteria, such as teaching, research potential, collaborative potential, and mentoring capacity. This helps mitigate the tendency for “halo” effects that result from reliance on overall impressions rather than evidence-based judgments of particular criteria. Develop your final shortlist by taking the top candidates across different criteria. Evaluate this step before finalizing the list; consider whether evaluation bias may still be affecting your choices.

• Be sure to consider the experience and needs of our diverse student population.

• Review the top female and/or minority candidates in your pool. Consider whether your short list should be revised because the committee’s judgments were influenced by evaluation bias (the tendency to underestimate women and underrepresented minority members’ qualifications and overestimate those of white males).

• Evaluation bias is minimized if you interview more than one woman and/or underrepresented minority candidate. As noted earlier, research indicates that interviewers evaluate women and underrepresented minorities more fairly when there is more than one woman in the interview pool. When there is only one woman or underrepresented minority, s/he is far less likely to succeed than women or minorities who are compared to a diverse pool of candidates, probably because of the heightened perceived salience of his or her race or gender.

• Remember that there are many ways to assess a candidate’s skills (e.g., samples of work, presentation of research, or a lecture in an undergraduate class) and each assessment tool produces different kinds of information.
• If the committee learns of a candidate who is not appropriate for the current open position, but who would broaden intellectual diversity at U-M, the committee should forward that information to the department Chair or Dean. The Provost provides supplemental resources to help the schools and colleges and other academic units to hire faculty who contribute to the intellectual diversity of the institution, to assist the dual career partners of tenure track and tenured faculty, and to respond to unique opportunities. Provost’s Faculty Initiative Program funding may be available to help units recruit tenure-track faculty apart from the search at hand.

• Submit a request for approval of interview candidates, if your department or school/college requires a review of the committee’s short list at this point.

Inviting Candidates to Interview

Letters and information packages should be prepared in advance so that the committee can promptly send a complete invitation package as soon as it decides whom to interview. It is easier to evaluate an informed candidate than one who has not been given the opportunity to prepare. Provide information about the following issues, as appropriate:

• Time, place, and format of the interview. If “hotel” interviews at conferences are a part of the process, consider whether the setting (a hotel room) may make members of some groups (e.g., women) less comfortable than others. Consider whether this practice is essential to your process if it likely disadvantages some groups. Equally, if you use Skype or phone interviews, consider whether you have found that some kinds of individuals consistently perform better in that context and if that differential performance is job-relevant.

• Detailed itinerary, including names of interviewers

• Contact information, including cell phone number of host

• Background on department, school/college, the University of Michigan, and Ann Arbor

• Travel arrangements and directions to campus

• Contacts that a candidate can use if s/he needs accommodations for a disability

• General information on family-friendly policies, benefits and dual career services from your school/college and/or the Provost’s Office.
V. HANDLING CAMPUS VISITS

With careful planning, a campus visit can create a positive impression on the candidate while also gathering specific information on which the University can make an informed decision about which candidates to nominate.

Planning for Effective Information-Gathering

• Identify all people and groups to be involved in the interview process and provide them with relevant information about the position: job description, essential functions of the position, necessary areas of inquiry, and standard interview questions.

• Schedule and reserve appropriate spaces for interviews and communicate those times and places to interviewers as far in advance as possible. Send reminders a few days before the event.

• Review the structure of the visit and the interview process with all interviewers, especially those who may be conducting individual interviews rather than meeting with the committee.

• Provide faculty with this section of the faculty hiring manual to ensure that they have a consistent and comprehensive understanding of the interview process.

• Provide information about the candidate and his or her scholarly work to all faculty and encourage them to read it. Faculty who are prepared ask better questions and make a better impression on the candidate.

• Ask faculty to provide feedback about specific facets of the candidate’s potential, rather than just requesting generic feedback. Studies show that when people focus on particular issues of performance, they are much less likely to rely on implicit or unconscious biases.

• Provide a rating sheet, ranking system, or other systematic feedback mechanisms, and detail how feedback should be given to the committee or chair.

• Encourage faculty to take notes during the interview that focus on required skills and relevant applicant responses.

• Notes can be helpful when reflecting on individual applicants or when discussing them with others who interviewed the same persons at different times.
• Remind faculty of their responsibility not only to elicit specific information from the candidate but also to be courteous to the candidate and positive about U-M.
• Be explicit about confidentiality expectations.
• Require interviewers to understand what questions should not be asked of candidates. This will help ensure that interviews are conducted appropriately.
• Remember that the candidate should do the majority of the talking during an interview.
• Consider asking each candidate to present a paper, to lead a colloquium, teach a class, or meet with graduate students while on campus for the interview. If they conduct any of these activities, arrange for feedback to the committee about their performance.

Making a Good Impression

• Remind participants that the campus visit is an important opportunity for the department to communicate three messages:
  o You are seriously interested in the candidate’s scholarly credentials and work, as well as other evidence of their excellence and creativity.
  o Michigan is a good place to work, because it is intellectually lively and committed to diversity in its leadership, faculty, staff and student body.
  o Michigan is a good place to work, because it has a variety of humane, family-friendly policies in place.

How these messages are communicated can make a critical difference in recruiting individuals to campus. They may be especially important in recruiting women or minority candidates to departments in which they will be vastly outnumbered by male or majority colleagues.

• Make it clear that you are interested in the candidate’s scholarship and skills, rather than his or her demographic characteristics. It is not helpful to make a point with candidates that the department is eager to hire women and minorities.

• Consider how the department will represent the University as a whole as a place in which women and minority faculty can thrive.

• Consider how the department will represent itself as a place in which women and minority faculty can thrive. This may be difficult for departments that currently have few or no women and minority faculty members. Some things that may make the department more attractive to women and under-represented minorities are:
  o Clear and public policies and procedures for evaluation and promotion
  o Mentoring resources for junior faculty in general and female and underrepresented minority faculty in particular
  o Development of some practices in evaluation and annual reporting that value mentoring of women and minority faculty and students

• Schedule interviews and events with consistency in achieving outcomes, recognizing that different means may be required. For example, white male candidates may automatically be meeting with white male faculty, given the composition of your department. When recruiting candidates with different race and/or gender characteristics, it will be equally important for them to meet diverse students and faculty. Race/ethnicity and gender are not the only personal characteristics that may be important to consider; if a candidate mentions that s/he is particularly concerned with the availability of a community identified with a particular nationality, religion, family status, sexual identity or other characteristic, take steps to help them meet with appropriate members of that community. One option is to create opportunities for the candidate to meet with faculty members outside the evaluation process, including members of STRIDE, who can provide relevant information to candidates.

• Give the candidate a chance to interact with the department’s faculty in multiple venues. Formal talks may not reveal every candidate’s strengths. Consider including Q + A sessions, “chalk talks,” and other less formal interactions.

• Be sure to offer information and access to faculty who might represent opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration.

• Avoid leaving candidates alone with faculty who may be hostile to hiring women and underrepresented minorities. If a candidate is confronted with racist, sexist or homophobic remarks, take positive and assertive steps to defuse the situation. Be sure there is a practice in place in the department for dealing with the expression of racist, sexist or homophobic attitudes, and that the candidate is made aware of it, if the situation arises.

• Be sure to gather equivalent information from all candidates, so you will be able to evaluate them all in terms of the same criteria. This does not require use of uniform questions with all candidates, but does require care in obtaining comparable information.
• Introduce women and minority members of the department to all candidates, not just women and minorities. Moreover, if women and minority faculty members are expected to play an especially active role in recruiting new faculty, be sure to recognize this additional service burden in their overall service load.

• Inform candidates before scheduling the interview what expenses will and will not be reimbursed, what receipts are needed, and how to fill out expense forms. Reimburse him or her as soon as possible.

• First impressions are important.
  o Provide transportation to and from the airport and the hotel.
  o If the candidate arrives the evening before the interview, be sure a search committee member or other faculty member is available to take the candidate to dinner and/or other activities.
  o These arrangements should be comparable for all candidates.

• Consider appointing a host for the visit who takes responsibility for all aspects of the visit. That person should assign a search committee member or staff member to escort the candidate to and from interviews.

• Do not schedule the candidate’s interview day so tightly that there is no time for breaks. Candidates should be given windows between appointments to take care of personal and professional business and to gather their thoughts.

• Be sure that departmental staff know that candidates will be visiting so that they can greet visitors appropriately.

• Plan schedules that are similar in format to ensure an equitable basis for evaluation. Internal and external candidates should be given equal opportunity to interact with campus colleagues.

• Mention to all candidates that the University offers reasonable accommodations to persons with disabilities. The following language may be used:
  o The University provides reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities, both in the interview process and for its faculty, students and staff. Should you need an accommodation, please let us know at your earliest convenience so that we may make arrangements in advance of your interview. Please contact at [phone number] or [email] with any request you may have.
  o If a candidate requests an accommodation and the department does not know how to meet the accommodation request or has concerns about the request, please contact the Office for Institutional Equity at 734/763-0235(v) or 734/647-1388 (tty), or Institutional.Equity@umich.edu for assistance.

• Consider providing a guided tour of campus and showcase the community; discuss the positive aspects of working and living in Ann Arbor and the surrounding communities.

• Share information such as:
  o The link to the University’s “About Working Here” website.
  o The link to “Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender Faculty and Staff Welcome Guide.”
  o The link to the University’s Veteran’s Connection website.
  o The link to Campus Disability Resources.
  o Information about the diverse employment possibilities that partners might find not only at the University (umich.edu/~jobs/), but at other institutions of higher learning in Michigan (michiganherc.org) and throughout Ann Arbor and the larger Southeast Michigan area.
  o Dual career services brochures from your college or the Provost’s Office as well as a link to the University’s website on dual career resources.
  o Policies and information on maternity/child rearing leave, child care, elder care and modified duties/flex schedules. Much of this information is available on the Work Life Resource Center’s website.
  o Information about fun University or Ann Arbor events, such as Top of the Park, The University Musical Society, the Uniquely Michigan website and information about recreational activities, such as the websites created by the International Center and the Athletics Department.
  o Information about benefits offered by the University, including medical and retirement benefits. Information is available at the Benefits website.
• Openly discuss standards of creative and scholarly productivity and research with all candidates.

• Decide whether the search would be enhanced by a meeting with the Associate Dean, Dean, or the Provost. If so, prepare them in advance by sharing the candidates’ CVs.

• Demonstrate a commitment to teaching by including students in the schedule and/or a commitment to interdisciplinary and interdivisional activity by scheduling interviews with colleagues in other departments and divisions, if appropriate.

• Allow time at the end of the visit for a private meeting between the candidate and the chair of the search committee or department. Use this opportunity to learn what questions remain, whether the candidate has questions about the position, and what may be obstacles to their accepting it.

• Confirm the candidate has been given copies of the University’s “family-friendly” policies (dual career, maternity leave, modified duties, etc.), regardless of gender, partner or parent status, or race or ethnicity.

• Remind interviewers that all the time spent with an applicant, including social functions and meals, is considered part of the interview process. Anyone who meets with the candidate in a social context should avoid conversation that touches on inappropriate topics or inquiries that are illegal in an interview context. Such discussion could be misinterpreted by the candidate at the time or subsequently.

• Make a good last impression. The last point of contact – e.g., the person conducting the last interview or taking the candidate to the airport – should be someone with a positive attitude towards the candidate, the department, and the University.

• Under no circumstances should a candidate be told that the position has already been offered to another individual, nor should it ever be suggested that one or more candidates is being interviewed for reasons unrelated to the designated qualifications for the position.

Making the Final Decision or Recommendation

• Consider only the candidate’s ability to perform the essential functions of the job and avoid making assumptions based on perceived race, ethnic background, religion, marital or familial status, age, disability, sexual orientation, or veteran status.

• Ask faculty to provide feedback about specific facets of the candidate’s potential, rather than just requesting generic feedback. Studies show that when people focus on particular issues of performance, they are much less likely to rely on implicit biases. A sample evaluation form follows; it can be modified to represent the key criteria for your search.

• Ensure that the final discussion of the candidates remains focused on the search criteria and evidence about the qualifications of the candidates for the position. Do not engage in or permit others to engage in discussion of personal characteristics that are not job-relevant, or global evaluations unsupported by specific evidence.

• Often providing an unranked list of acceptable candidates to the chair or dean, or the department, allows more diverse candidates to remain in consideration at the last stage. Sometimes more than one candidate can be considered for a final offer.
Candidate Evaluation Template

The following offers a method for department faculty to provide evaluations of job candidates. It is meant to be a template for departments that they can modify as necessary for their own uses. The proposed questions are designed for junior faculty candidates; however, alternate language is suggested in parentheses for senior faculty candidates.

Candidate’s Name:

Please indicate which of the following are true for you (check all that apply):

☐ Read candidate’s CV
☐ Read candidate’s scholarship
☐ Read candidate’s letters of recommendation
☐ Attended candidate’s job talk
☐ Met with candidate
☐ Attended lunch or dinner with candidate
☐ Other (please explain):

Please comment on the candidate’s scholarship as reflected in the job talk:

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________

Please comment on the candidate’s teaching ability as reflected in the job talk:

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________

Please rate the candidate on each of the following:

Potential for (evidence of) scholarly impact
Potential for (evidence of) research productivity
Potential for (evidence of) research funding
Potential for (evidence of) collaboration
Fit with department’s priorities
Ability to make positive contribution to department’s climate
Potential (demonstrated ability) to attract and supervise graduate students
Potential (demonstrated ability) to teach and supervise undergraduates
Potential (demonstrated ability) to be a conscientious university community member
Other comments?

excellent good neutral fair poor unable to judge
VI. Final Stages of the Search Process: Negotiating the Offer

While the committee may feel they are moving quickly as they debate and decide on final recommendations and conduct reference and credential checks, the finalists will be acutely aware of any delays in communication. The committee chair or his or her designee should be responsible for staying in touch with finalists, if only to report no decision has been made.

- The “short list” of candidates should be kept up-to-date on the status of the search but should not be told that another candidate has been offered the job until the finalist has accepted the department’s offer.

- If a candidate has been completely eliminated with no possibility of being reconsidered, let them know with a personal letter or phone call that includes appreciation of their talents and their interest in the University of Michigan.

- If there is any doubt about the appropriateness of eliminating and contacting selected candidates, consult with the Office for Institutional Equity or the Office of the General Counsel.

- The way an offer is negotiated can have a huge impact not only on the immediate hiring outcome, but also on a new hire’s future career. Candidates who feel that University representatives (committee chairs, department chairs, deans, etc.) conduct negotiations honestly and openly, and aim to create circumstances in which they will thrive, are more satisfied in their positions and more likely to stay at the U-M than are those who feel that a department or chair has deliberately withheld information, resources, or opportunities from them. Initial equity in both the negotiated conditions and in the department’s follow-through on the commitments it makes are important factors in retention as well as recruitment.
• Women and minority candidates may have received less mentoring at previous career stages than their counterparts, and may therefore be at a disadvantage in knowing what they can legitimately request in negotiations. In addition, there is some evidence that women are less inclined to negotiate for themselves than men are. To ensure equity, aim to empower the candidate to advocate on his or her own behalf, by providing all candidates with a complete list of things it would be possible for them to discuss in the course of negotiations. This list will vary by field, and should include those items that will maximize the likelihood of candidate success in that field. For some fields these might include:
  o Salary
  o Course release time
  o Lab equipment
  o Lab space
  o Renovation of lab space
  o Research assistant
  o Clerical / administrative support
  o Attractive teaching opportunity
  o Travel funds
  o Discretionary Funds
  o Summer salary
  o Moving expenses
  o Assistance with partner/spouse position
  o Other issues of concern to the candidate

• Consider appointing a negotiation facilitator—which may be the search committee chair—to help the candidate throughout the negotiation process. This person should be specifically charged with assisting the candidate in articulating her/his needs and desires to the chair or dean, and providing information about the University context, not with actually negotiating the offer.
VII. GETTING OFF TO A GOOD START

• Be sure to provide clear, detailed, written information about mentoring practices as well as all crucial review criteria and milestones such as annual reviews, third-year reviews, tenure reviews, and post-tenure promotion reviews.

• If a candidate has a partner who will need placement help, try to help arrange interviews or other opportunities for the spouse or partner as early in the hiring process as possible. See The Importance of Dual Career Considerations within Section II, and be familiar with University resources to support these efforts. Consult the Provost’s Office for further information.

• If the department hires a strong woman and/or minority candidate, consider the factors that may have enabled it to do so and keep a record of good practices and successful searches for future reference.

• If the applicant pool was not as large, as qualified, or as diverse as was anticipated, consider:
  o Could the job description have been constructed in a way that would have brought in a broader pool of candidates?
  o Could the department have recruited more actively?
  o Were there criteria for this position that were consistently not met by women or candidates of color? Where they relevant to the job description?

• If women and/or minority candidates were offered positions that they chose not to accept, what reasons did they offer? Consider as many factors as you can identify. Are there things that the department could do to make itself more attractive to such candidates in the future? Be sure that any analysis and insight is shared with departmental decision-makers and is part of the process of initiating future searches.

VIII. EVALUATING THE SEARCH

• If the department hires a strong woman and/or minority candidate, consider the factors that may have enabled it to do so and keep a record of good practices and successful searches for future reference.

• If the applicant pool was not as large, as qualified, or as diverse as was anticipated, consider:
  o Could the job description have been constructed in a way that would have brought in a broader pool of candidates?
  o Could the department have recruited more actively?
  o Were there criteria for this position that were consistently not met by women or candidates of color? Where they relevant to the job description?

• If women and/or minority candidates were offered positions that they chose not to accept, what reasons did they offer? Consider as many factors as you can identify. Are there things that the department could do to make itself more attractive to such candidates in the future? Be sure that any analysis and insight is shared with departmental decision-makers and is part of the process of initiating future searches.
MEMORANDUM

TO: [Dean or Department Chair]
FROM: [Dean or Department Chair]
RE: Search for
DATE: 

I am inviting you to become a member of the advisory committee to search for [describe the position] in the department/school/college of .

The advisory committee is charged with finding and recruiting the very best candidate to fill this position. It is an important task, since we have high expectations about what this new faculty colleague could bring to the position and our community. [Insert here the preliminary position description and the job requirements, e.g. “We are seeking an assistant professor in the field of X with particular expertise in the areas of Y and Z.”]

[If appropriate use this paragraph to describe any additional goals of the search, e.g., acquire expertise in an emerging field, increase opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration, shore up an area recently weakened by attrition.]

_________________________
has agreed to chair the search committee, with

_________________________
and

_________________________
providing committee support.

The University is committed to creating an environment that is welcoming, inclusive and supportive for all members of our community. As a search committee member, you will play a critical role in ensuring that the search reflects these values. Please familiarize yourself with the attached search manual, which clearly explains how to meet the University’s equal opportunity and affirmative action obligations by conducting a fair, open and equitable search. [Mention any additional materials that have been compiled for the committee, for example, timeline or reference material.]

I am asking that the advisory committee complete its search by ____________________, at which time I will ask for [specify the expected outcome, for example an unranked list of three to four candidates that the committee recommends for the position]. I will then meet with the committee to hear your views on the strengths and weaknesses of the final candidates.

I appreciate your willingness to provide this important service to [our department/school].

cc: Search Chair
APPENDIX 2: ACTIVE RECRUITING RESOURCES

Be aware that most fields also have resources—listservs, email groups, etc.—that can help you identify or reach qualified women and minority candidates in particular. Either seek these out on your own, or request assistance from advance@umich.edu in identifying them. Some fairly broad listings are included here.

“Guidelines for Recruiting a Diverse Workforce.” Penn State University. Available online: psu.edu/dept/aaoffice/pdf/guidelines.pdf


“Recruitment and Selection of Faculty and Academic Professional and Administrative Employees Appendix A: Recruiting a Diverse Qualified Pool of Applicants” University of Minnesota.

policy.umn.edu/groups/hr/documents/appendix/recruitfacpa_appa.pdf

“Best Practices in Recruiting and Retaining Under-Represented U. S. Minority Faculty at the University of Minnesota: A Handbook for institutional leaders and faculty search committees:

“Massachusetts Institute of Technology Faculty Search Committee Handbook.” (2002).
web.mit.edu/faculty/reports/FacultySearch.pdf

“Search Committee Toolkit.” University of California at Los Angeles.
faculty.diversity.ucla.edu/search/searchtoolkit/docs/SearchToolkit071008.pdf

“Faculty Search Committee Guidelines.” Case Western Reserve University.
case.edu/president/aaction/Faculty%20Search%20Guide.pdf

“Recruitment and Retention: Guidelines for Chairs.” (updated 2007). Hunter College, CUNY.

“Leap Recruiting Faculty Brochure.” University of Colorado, Boulder.
colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/leap/downloads/leap_recruiting.pdf

The WISE Directories publishes free annual listings of women and minority Ph.D. recipients in STEM fields, downloadable as pdf documents.
cic.net/Home/Students/DoctoralDirectory/Introduction.aspx

The Minority and Women Doctoral Directory “is a registry which maintains up-to-date information on employment candidates who have recently received, or are soon to receive, a Doctoral or Master’s degree in their respective field from one of approximately two hundred major research universities in the United States. The current edition of the directory lists approximately 4,500 Black, Hispanic, American Indian, Asian American, and women graduate students in nearly 80 fields in the sciences, engineering, the social sciences and the humanities.” Directories are available for purchase:

mwdd.com

National Science Foundation Survey of Earned Doctorates is published yearly. While it does not list individual doctorate recipients, it is a good resource for determining how big the pool of new women and minority scholars will be in various fields.

nsf.gov/statistics/srvydoctorates

Ford Foundation Fellows is an on-line directory of minority Ph.D.s in all fields, administered by the National Research Council (NRC). The directory contains information on Ford Foundation Postdoctoral fellowship recipients awarded since 1980 and Ford Foundation Predoctoral and Dissertation fellowship recipients awarded since 1986. This database does not include Ford Fellows whose fellowships were administered by an institution or agency other than the NRC.
nrc58.nas.edu/FordFellowDirect/Main/Directory.aspx

Mellon Minority Undergraduate Fellowship Program provides an on-line list of minority Ph.D.s and their dissertation, book and article titles in all fields.
muf.org (select Fellows Update from the menu bar on the main page)
The Faculty for The Future Project is administered by WEPAN (The Women in Engineering Program and Advocates Network), and offers a free forum for students to post resumes and search for positions and for employers to post positions and search for candidates. The website focuses on linking women and underrepresented minority candidates from engineering, science, and business with faculty and research positions at universities.

**enr.psu.edu/fff**

IMDiversity.com is dedicated to providing career and self-development information to all minorities, specifically African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans and women. It maintains a large database of available jobs, candidate resumes and information on workplace diversity.

**imdiversity.com**

Nemnet is a national minority recruitment firm committed to helping schools and organizations in the identification and recruitment of minority candidates. Since 1994 it has worked with over 200 schools, colleges and universities and organizations. It posts academic jobs on its website and gathers vitas from students and professionals of color.

**nemnet.com**

HBCU Connect.com Career Center is a job posting and recruitment site specifically for students and alumni of historically black colleges and universities.

**jobs.hbcuconnect.com**

Society of Women Engineers maintains an online career fair.

**swe.org**

Association for Women in Science maintains a job listings page.

**awis.org**

American Indian Science & Engineering Society maintains a job listings page (and a resume database available to Career Fair exhibitors).

**aises.org**

American Indian Graduate Center hosts a professional organization, fellowship and post-doctoral listings, and a magazine in which job postings can be advertised.

**aigcs.org**

National Society of Black Engineers seeks increase the number of minority students studying engineering at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. It encourages members to seek advanced degrees in engineering or related fields and to obtain professional engineering registrations.

**nsbe.org**

Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers is a leading social-technical organization whose primary function is to enhance and achieve the potential of Hispanics in engineering, math and science.

**shpe.org**

American Physical Society Education and Outreach department maintains a roster of women and minorities in physics. It contains the names and qualifications of over 3100 women and 900 minority physicists. The Roster serves as the mailing list for The Gazette, the newsletter of the APS Committee on the Status of Women in Physics (CSWP), and is widely used by prospective employers to identify women and minority physicists for job openings.

**aps.org/programs/roster/index.cfm**

Recruitment Sources page at Rutgers lists several resources that can be helpful in recruiting women and minority candidates.

**uhr.rutgers.edu/ee/recruitmentsources.htm**

Faculty Diversity Office page at Case Western Reserve University provides links to many specific professional organizations and diversity resources for faculty searches.

**case.edu/president/aaction/diverse.html**

The CIC Doctoral Directory is a listing of doctoral degree recipients who are members of groups underrepresented in higher education and who are alumni of the universities of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation. The Directory is designed to increase the visibility of doctoral alumni who bring diverse perspectives and experiences to higher education. The Directory will be promoted among hiring committees at CIC member universities, and the searchable, online database will be freely available to the public.

**cic.net/Home/Students/DoctoralDirectory/Introduction.aspx**
Appendix 3: Reading Lists

1. What is the nature of the problem?—General analysis


Research on “stereotype threat” (Aronson, Quinn, & Spencer, 1998; Steele, 1997; Steele & Aronson, 1995) suggests that the social stigma of intellectual inferiority borne by certain cultural minorities can undermine the standardized test performance and school outcomes of members of these groups. This research tested two assumptions about the necessary conditions for stereotype threat to impair intellectual test performance. First, we tested the hypothesis that to interfere with performance, stereotype threat requires neither a history of stigmatization nor internalized feelings of intellectual inferiority, but can arise and become disruptive as a result of situational pressures alone. Two experiments tested this notion with participants for whom no stereotype of low ability exists in the domain we tested and who, in fact, were selected for high ability in that domain (math-proficient white males).

In Study 1 we induced stereotype threat by invoking a comparison with a minority group stereotyped to excel at math (Asians). As predicted, these stereotype-threatened white males performed worse on a difficult math test than a nonstereotype-threatened control group. Study 2 replicated this effect and further tested the assumption that those that have been attributed to genetically rooted sex differences.


Women don’t ask shows women how to reframe their interactions and more accurately evaluate their opportunities. The book includes examining how to ask for a desired outcome in ways that feel comfortable and possible, taking into account the impact of asking on relationships. It also discusses how to recognize the ways in which our institutions, child-rearing practices, and unspoken assumptions perpetuate inequalities—that are not only fundamentally unfair but also inefficient and economically unsound.


We pursue the idea that racial stereotypes are not only descriptive, reflecting beliefs about how racial groups actually differ, but are prescriptive as well, reflecting beliefs about how racial groups should differ. Drawing on an analysis of the historic and current status of East Asians in North America, we study descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes of East Asians along the dimensions of competence, warmth, and dominance and examine workplace consequences of violating these stereotypes. Study 1 shows that East Asians are descriptively stereotyped as more competent, less warm, and less dominant than Whites. Study 2 shows that only the descriptive stereotype of East Asians as less dominant than Whites is also a prescriptive stereotype. Study 3 reveals that people dislike a dominant East Asian coworker compared to a nondominant East Asian or a dominant or a nondominant White coworker. Study 4 shows that East Asians who are dominant or warm are racially harassed at work more than nondominant East Asians and than dominant and nondominant employees of other racial identities. Implications for research and theory are discussed.


This chapter examines one factor that contributes to the current frustrations of black Americans: the operation of a subtle form of racism among individuals that is less overt but just as insidious as old-fashioned racism.


This paper develops theory about the conditions under which cultural diversity enhances or detracts from work group functioning. From qualitative research in three culturally diverse organizations, we identified three different perspectives on workforce diversity: the integration-and-learning perspective, the access-and-legitimacy perspective, and the discrimination-and-fairness perspective. The perspective on diversity a work group held influenced how people expressed and managed tensions related to diversity, whether those who had been traditionally underrepresented in the organization felt respected and valued by their colleagues, and how people interpreted the meaning of their racial identity at work. These, in turn, had implications for how well the work group and its members functioned. All three perspectives on diversity had been successful in motivating managers to diversify their staffs, but only the
integration-and-learning perspective provided the rationale and guidance needed to achieve sustained benefits from diversity. By identifying the conditions that intervene between the demographic composition of a work group and its functioning, our research helps to explain mixed results on the relationship between cultural diversity and work group outcomes.


Discusses what psychologists, after years of study, now know about intergroup bias and conflict. It is stated that most people reveal unconscious, subtle biases, which are relatively automatic, cool, indirect, ambiguous, and ambivalent. Subtle biases underlie ordinary discrimination: comfort with one’s own in-group, plus exclusion and avoidance of out-groups. Such biases result from internal conflict between cultural ideals and cultural biases. On the other hand, a small minority of people, extremists, do harbor blatant biases that are more conscious, hot, direct, and unambiguous. Blatant biases underlie aggression, including hate crimes. Such biases result from perceived intergroup conflict over economics and values, in a world perceived to be hierarchical and dangerous. Reduction of both subtle and blatant bias results from education, economic opportunity, and constructive intergroup contact. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2005 APA, all rights reserved)


This article presents results of research proceeding from the theoretical assumption that status is associated with high ratings of competence, while competition is related to low ratings of warmth. Included in the article are ratings of various ethnic and gender groups as a function of ratings of competence and warmth. These illustrate the average content of the stereotypes held about these groups in terms of the dimensions of competence and warmth, which are often key elements of evaluation.


Renowned psychologist and winner of the Nobel Prize in Economics, Kahneman explains the two systems that drive the way we think: System 1 is fast, intuitive, and emotional; System 2 is slower, more deliberative, and more logical. The impact of overconfidence on corporate strategies, the difficulties of predicting what will make us happy in the future, the profound effect of cognitive biases on everything from playing the stock market to planning our next vacation—each of these can be understood only by knowing how the two systems shape our judgments and decisions.


This article proposes that many federal programs can be best understood as “affirmative action for whites” both because in some cases substantial numbers of other groups were excluded from benefiting from them, or because the primary beneficiaries were whites. It states the rationale for contemporary affirmative action as “corrective action” for these exclusionary policies and programs.


This article briefly reviews the arguments presented in Scott Page’s article “Making the Difference: Applying a Logic of Diversity” before plumbing the assumptions that underlie his case. It challenges several of these assumptions suggesting that the nature and effects of diversity in organizations are more complex and less predictable than he suggests. It then outlines an alternative conceptualization of the nature and effects of diversity in organizations, and concludes by proposing a set of practical suggestions that may indeed allow organizations to realize the benefits of diversity that Page calls for.


The self-fulfilling prophecy is, in the beginning, a false definition of the situation evoking a new behaviour which makes the original false conception come true. This specious validity of the self-fulfilling prophecy perpetuates a reign of error. For the prophet will cite the actual course of events as proof that he was right from the very beginning.


This book includes 12 contributions from Latino and Latina professors and academics with experience in universities throughout the United States. The introduction provides an overview.


This article explains why corporate spending of billions of dollars on diversity training, education, and outreach makes
good business sense and why organizations with diverse employees often perform best. This is done by describing a logic of diversity that relies on simple frameworks. Within these frameworks, it is demonstrated how collections of individuals with diverse tools can outperform collections of high “ability” individuals at problem solving and predictive tasks. In problem solving, these benefits come not through portfolio effects but from superadditivity: Combinations of tools can be more powerful than the tools themselves. In predictive tasks, diversity in predictive models reduces collective error. Page shows that diversity matters just as much as highly accurate models when making collective predictions. This logic of diversity provides a foundation on which to construct practices that leverage differences to improve performance.


In 4 experiments, the authors investigated whether race is perceived to be part of the business leader prototype and, if so, whether it could explain differences in evaluations of White and non-White leaders. The first 2 studies revealed that “being White” is perceived to be an attribute of the business leader prototype, where participants assumed that business leaders more than nonleaders were White, and this inference occurred regardless of base rates about the organization’s racial composition (Study 1), the racial composition of organizational roles, the business industry, and the types of racial minority groups in the organization (Study 2). The final 2 studies revealed that a leader categorization explanation could best account for differences in White and non-White leader evaluations, where White targets were evaluated as more effective leaders (Study 3) and as having more leadership potential (Study 4), but only when the leader had recently been given credit for organizational success, consistent with the prediction that leader prototypes are more likely to be used when they confirm and reinforce individualized information about a leader’s performance. The results demonstrate a connection between leader race and leadership categorization.


Male-female differences in performance ratings were examined in 486 work groups across a wide variety of jobs and organizations. As suggested by the sex stereotyping literature, women received lower ratings when the proportion of women in the group was small, even after male-female cognitive ability, psychomotor ability, education, and experience differences were controlled. Replication of the analyses with racial differences (White-Black) in 814 work groups demonstrated that group composition had little effect on performance ratings. The effects of group composition on stereotyping behaviors do not appear to generalize to all minority contexts.


This paper describes administrator search processes at a predominantly white university in order to explore whether searches may be a cause for the limited success in diversifying administrative groups.


Recent studies have documented that performance in a domain is hindered when individuals feel that a sociocultural group to which they belong is negatively stereotyped in that domain. We report that implicit activation of a social identity can facilitate as well as impede performance on a quantitative task. When a particular social identity was made salient at an implicit level, performance was altered in the direction predicted by the stereotype associated with the identity. Common cultural stereotypes hold that Asians have superior quantitative skills compared with other ethnic groups and that women have inferior quantitative skills compared with men. We found that Asian-American women performed better on a mathematics test when their ethnic identity was activated, compared with a control group who had neither identity activated. Cross-cultural investigation indicated that it was the stereotype, and not the identity per se, that influenced performance.


When women perform math, unlike men, they risk being judged by the negative stereotype that women have weaker math ability. We call this predicament stereotype threat and hypothesize that the apprehension it causes may disrupt women’s math performance. In Study 1 we demonstrated that the pattern observed in the literature that women underperform on difficult (but not easy) math tests was
observed among a highly selected sample of men and women. In Study 2 we demonstrated that this difference in performance could be eliminated when we lowered stereotype threat by describing the test as not producing gender differences. However, when the test was described as producing gender differences and stereotype threat was high, women performed substantially worse than equally qualified men did. A third experiment replicated this finding with a less highly selected population and explored the mediation of the effect. The implication that stereotype threat may underlie gender differences in advanced math performance, even those that have been attributed to genetically rooted sex differences, is discussed.


Stereotype threat is being at risk of confirming, as self-characteristic, a negative stereotype about one's group. Studies 1 and 2 varied the stereotype vulnerability of Black participants taking a difficult verbal test by varying whether or not their performance was ostensibly diagnostic of ability, and thus, whether or not they were at risk of fulfilling the racial stereotype about their intellectual ability. Reflecting the pressure of this vulnerability, Blacks underperformed in relation to Whites in the ability-diagnostic condition but not in the nondiagnostic condition (with Scholastic Aptitude Tests controlled). Study 3 validated that ability-diagnosticity cognitively activated the racial stereotype in these participants and motivated them not to conform to it, or to be judged by it. Study 4 showed that mere salience of the stereotype could impair Blacks' performance even when the test was not ability diagnostic. The role of stereotype vulnerability in the standardized test performance of ability-stigmatized groups is discussed.


Two experiments showed that framing an athletic task as diagnostic of negative racial stereotypes about Black or White athletes can impede their performance in sports. In Experiment 1, Black participants performed significantly worse than did control participants when performance on a golf task was framed as diagnostic of “sports intelligence.” In comparison, White participants performed worse than did control participants when the golf task was framed as diagnostic of “natural athletic ability.” Experiment 2 observed the effect of stereotype threat on the athletic performance of White participants for whom performance in sports represented a significant measure of their self-worth. The implications of the findings for the theory of stereotype threat (C. M. Steele, 1997) and for participation in sports are discussed.


On the basis of the connectionist model of leadership, we examined perceptions of leadership as a function of the contextual factors of race (Asian American, Caucasian American) and occupation (engineering, sales) in 3 experiments (1 student sample and 2 industry samples). Race and occupation exhibited differential effects for within- and between-race comparisons. With regard to within-race comparisons, leadership perceptions of Asian Americans were higher when race-occupation was a good fit (engineer position) than when race-occupation was a poor fit (sales position) for the two industry samples. With regard to between-race comparisons, leadership perceptions of Asian Americans were low relative to those of Caucasian Americans. Additionally, when race-occupation was a good fit for Asian Americans, such individuals were evaluated higher on perceptions of technical competence than were Caucasian Americans, whereas they were evaluated lower when race-occupation was a poor fit. Furthermore, our results demonstrated that race affects leadership perceptions through the activation of prototypic leadership attributes (i.e., implicit leadership theories). Implications for the findings are discussed in terms of the connectionist model of leadership and leadership opportunities for Asian Americans.

**Steele, C. (2010).** *Whistling Vivaldi: And other clues to how stereotypes affect us (issues of our time).* New York: WW Norton & Company.

Through dramatic personal stories, Claude Steele shares the experiments and studies that show, again and again, that exposing subjects to stereotypes—merely reminding a group of female math majors about to take a math test, for example, that women are considered naturally inferior to men at math—impairs their performance in the area affected by the stereotype. Steele’s conclusions shed new light on a host of American social phenomena, from the racial and gender gaps in standardized test scores to the belief in the superior athletic prowess of black men. Steele explicates the dilemmas that arise in every American’s life around issues of identity, from the white student whose grades drop steadily in his African American Studies class to the female engineering students deciding whether or not to attend predominantly male professional conferences.
Whistling Vivaldi offers insight into how we form our senses of identity and ultimately lays out a plan for mitigating the negative effects of “stereotype threat” and reshaping American identities.


This paper reviews empirical data to show that negative stereotypes about academic abilities of women and African Americans can hamper their achievement on standardized tests. A ‘stereotype threat’ is a situational threat in which members of these groups can fear being judged or treated stereotypically; for those who identify with the domain to which the stereotype is relevant, this predicament can be self-threatening and impair academic performance. Practices and policies that can reduce stereotype threats are discussed.


This article describes how a concept car designed by women was rated highly by men.


This book attempts to uncover the invisible barriers that prevent women from achieving the same professional success as men. Valian’s arguments are based on statistical laboratory and field studies and center around gender schemas – our implicit hypotheses about sex differences. Though gender schemas are not entirely inaccurate, Valian argues that schemas alter our ability to evaluate men and women without bias. In general, the schema of a woman is incompatible with the schema of a successful professional. The consequence is that professional women are often underrated, while their male counterparts are overrated. Because of these imbalances, however slight, women accumulate advantage at a slower rate than men.

**Tutorials for Change: Gender Schemas and Science Careers (Valian, V. Hunter College of the City University of New York).**

[http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/gendertutorial/tutorials.htm](http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/gendertutorial/tutorials.htm)

This Web link provides four tutorials, designed as slides with voice-over narration. The narration will start automatically with each slide. You may stop the narration by clicking on “stop narration”.


Research on tokenism processes is reviewed and coalesces around gender constructs. Reducing negative tokenism outcomes, most notably unfavorable social atmosphere and disrupted colleagueship, can be done effectively only by taking gender status and stereotyping into consideration. These findings have applied implications for women’s full inclusion in male-dominated occupations.

### 1a. What does the problem look like in science?


Why aren’t there more women in science? Female college students are currently 37 percent less likely than males to obtain a bachelor’s degree in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM), and comprise only 25 percent of the STEM workforce. This paper begins to shed light on this issue by exploiting a unique dataset of college students who have been randomly assigned to professors over a wide variety of mandatory standardized courses.

We focus on the role of professor gender. Our results suggest that while professor gender has little impact on male students, it has a powerful effect on female students’ performance in math and science classes, their likelihood of taking future math and science courses, and their likelihood of graduating with a STEM degree. The estimates are largest for female students with very strong math skills, who are arguably the students who are most suited to careers in science. Indeed, the gender gap in course grades and STEM majors is eradicated when high performing female students’ introductory math and science classes are taught by female professors. In contrast, the gender of humanities professors has only minimal impact on student outcomes. We believe that these results are indicative of important environmental influences at work.

**Casadevall, A., & Handelsman, J. (2014).** The Presence of Female Conveners Correlates with a Higher Proportion of Female Speakers at Scientific Symposia. *mBio, 5*(1).
We investigated the hypothesis that the gender of conveners at scientific meetings influenced the gender distribution of invited speakers. Analysis of 460 symposia involving 1,845 speakers in two large meetings sponsored by the American Society for Microbiology revealed that having at least one woman member of the convening team correlated with a significantly higher proportion of invited female speakers and reduced the likelihood of an all-male symposium roster. Our results suggest that inclusion of more women as conveners may increase the proportion of women among invited speakers at scientific meetings.


This chapter and book explore the ways in which the lack of critical mass for women in science disadvantages them when it comes to the kinds of networking that promotes collaboration and general flow of information needed to foster the best possible research.


This article presents the findings from an analysis of the European Molecular Biology Organization Long Term Fellowship granting scheme in order to determine if gender bias exists in the program. When the success rate is calculated for the spring and autumn session for the years 1996–2001, the female applicants were, on average, 20% less successful than the males.

Georgi, Howard. (2000). “Is There an Unconscious Discrimination Against Women in Science?” APS News Online. College Park, Maryland: American Physical Society. This is an examination of the ways in which norms about what good scientists should be like are not neutral but masculine and work to disadvantage women.


We investigated the association between a U.S. National Institutes of Health (NIH) R01 applicant’s self-identified race or ethnicity and the probability of receiving an award by using data from the NIH IMPAC II grant database, the Thomson Reuters Web of Science, and other sources. Although proposals with strong priority scores were equally likely to be funded regardless of race, we find that Asians are 4 percentage points and black or African-American applicants are 13 percentage points less likely to receive NIH investigator-initiated research funding compared with whites. After controlling for the applicant’s educational background, country of origin, training, previous research awards, publication record, and employer characteristics, we find that black applicants remain 10 percentage points less likely than whites to be awarded NIH research funding. Our results suggest some leverage points for policy intervention.


Analyzing university faculty and graduate student data for the top ten U.S. economics departments between 1987 and 2007, we find that there are persistent differences in gender composition for both faculty and graduate students across institutions and that the share of female faculty and the share of women in the entering PhD class are positively correlated. We find, using instrumental variables analysis, robust evidence that this correlation is driven by the causal effect of the female faculty share on the gender composition of the entering PhD class. This result provides an explanation for persistent underrepresentation of women in economics, as well as for persistent segregation of women across academic fields.

Hopkins, N., Bailyn, L., Gibson, L., & Hammonds, E. (2002). The Status of Women Faculty at MIT: Overview of Reports from the Schools of Architecture and Planning; Engineering; Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences; and the Sloan School of Management. The MIT Faculty Newsletter, XIV(4).

The overview of MIT’s more recent study of all of its schools.


This article examines the role of various kinds of institutional discrimination in producing the underrepresentation of black faculty.


Science is stratified, with an unequal distribution of research facilities and rewards among scientists. Awards and prizes, which are critical for shaping scientific career trajectories, play a role in this stratification when they differentially enhance the status of scientists who already have large reputations: the ‘Matthew Effect’. Contrary to the Mertonian norm of universalism – the expectation
that the personal attributes of scientists do not affect evaluations of their scientific claims and contributions—in practice, a great deal of evidence suggests that the scientific efforts and achievements of women do not receive the same recognition as do those of men: the ’Matilda Effect’. Awards in science, technology, engineering and medical (STEM) fields are not immune to these biases. We outline the research on gender bias in evaluations of research and analyze data from 13 STEM disciplinary societies. While women’s receipt of professional awards and prizes has increased in the past two decades, men continue to win a higher proportion of awards for scholarly research than expected based on their representation in the nomination pool. The results support the powerful twin influences of implicit bias and committee chairs as contributing factors. The analysis sheds light on the relationship of external social factors to women’s science careers and helps to explain why women are severely underrepresented as winners of science awards. The ghettoization of women’s accomplishments into a category of ‘women-only’ awards also is discussed.


This excerpt provides an overview of differences in the science careers of men and women.


This is the original MIT report that has spurred so many other studies


This account of the Matthew effect is another small exercise in the psychosociological analysis of the workings of science as a social institution. The initial problem is transformed by a shift in theoretical perspective. As originally identified, the Matthew effect was construed in terms of enhancement of the position of already eminent scientists who are given disproportionate credit in cases of collaboration or of independent multiple discoveries. Its significance was thus confined to its implications for the reward system of science. By shifting the angle of vision, we note other possible kinds of consequences, this time for the communication system of science. The Matthew effect may serve to heighten the visibility of contributions to science by scientists of acknowledged standing and to reduce the visibility of contributions by authors who are less well known. We examine the psychosocial conditions and mechanisms underlying this effect and find a correlation between the redundancy function of multiple discoveries and the focalizing function of eminent men of science—a function which is reinforced by the great value these men place upon finding basic problems and by their self-assurance. This self-assurance, which is partly inherent, partly the result of experiences and associations in creative scientific environments, and partly a result of later social validation of their position, encourages them to search out risky but important problems and to highlight the results of their inquiry. A macrosocial version of the Matthew principle is apparently involved in those processes of social selection that currently lead to the concentration of scientific resources and talent (50).


This article documents the low rate of Asian and Asian American scientists at higher and leadership levels even in fields where they are relatively numerous at lower ranks.


Despite efforts to recruit and retain more women, a stark gender disparity persists within academic science. Abundant research has demonstrated gender bias in many demographic groups, but has yet to experimentally investigate whether science faculty exhibit a bias against female students that could contribute to the gender disparity in academic science. In a randomized double-blind study (n = 127), science faculty from research-intensive universities rated the application materials of a student— who was randomly assigned either a male or female name—for a laboratory manager position. Faculty participants rated the male applicant as significantly more competent and hireable than the (identical) female applicant. These participants also selected a higher starting salary and offered more career mentoring to the male applicant. The gender of the faculty participants did not affect responses, such that female and male faculty were equally likely to exhibit bias against the female student. Mediation analyses indicated that the female student was less likely to be hired because she was viewed as less competent. We also assessed faculty participants’ preexisting subtle bias against women using a standard instrument and found that preexisting subtle bias against women played a moderating role, such that subtle bias against women was associated with less support for the female student, but was unrelated to reactions to the male student. These results suggest that interventions addressing faculty gender bias might advance the goal of increasing the participation of women in science.

This report looks at the representation of women and minorities in the ‘top 50’ departments of science and engineering disciplines in research universities, as ranked by the National Science Foundation according to research funds expended. The report is based on survey data obtained from these departments and covers the years 1993 to 2002. The analysis examines degree attainment (BS and PhD) and representation on the faculty in the corresponding disciplines. The data demonstrate that while the representation of women attaining a PhD in science and engineering has significantly increased in this period, the corresponding faculties remain overwhelmingly dominated by white men.

### 2. How does evaluation bias actually operate?


Empirical study demonstrating impact of implicit discrimination by race, and not attributable to class.


Reflective discussion of how and where implicit discrimination operates. Includes useful review of the literature, and fairly extended discussion of research needed.


Stereotypes may influence judgment via assimilation, such that individual group members are evaluated consistently with stereotypes, or via contrast, such that targets are displaced from the overall group expectation. Two models of judgment—the shifting standards model and status characteristics theory—provide some insight into predicting and interpreting these apparently contradictory effects. In two studies involving a simulated applicant-evaluation setting, we predicted and found that participants set lower minimum-competency standards, but higher ability standards, for female than for male and for Black than for White applicants. Thus, although it may be easier for low-status group members to meet (low) standards, these same people must work harder to prove that their performance is ability-based.


A change in the audition procedures of symphony orchestras—adoption of “blind” auditions with a “screen” to conceal the candidate’s identity from the jury—provides a test for gender bias in hiring and advancement. Using data from actual auditions for 8 orchestras over the period when screens were introduced, the authors found that auditions with screens substantially increased the probability that women were advanced (within the orchestra) and that women were hired. These results parallel those found in many studies of the impact of blind review of journal article submissions.


This chapter proposes “a theory of limited differences” where even if the life events to which people are exposed have small short-term effects, over the life course
events have large cumulative effects. The authors suggest that the small disparities at every stage of a woman scientist’s career combine to create a subtle yet virtually unassailable barrier to success.


One hundred male and female MBA students evaluated a woman applicant for a managerial position when the proportion of women in the applicant pool was varied. Results indicated that personnel decisions of both males and females were significantly more unfavorable when women represented 25% or less of the total pool. Additional findings suggest that this effect was mediated by the degree to which sex stereotypes predominated in forming impressions of applicants. The results were interpreted as supportive of the thesis that situational factors can function to reduce the adverse effects of sex stereotypes in employment settings.


This study investigated reactions of subjects to a woman’s success in a male gender-typed job. The results showed that when women were acknowledged to have been successful, they were less liked and more personally derogated than equivalently successful men. The data also showed that being disliked can affect career outcome, both for performance evaluation and reward allocation.


Women are less likely than men to be associated with leadership, and the awareness of this stereotype may undermine women’s performance in leadership tasks. One way to circumvent this stereotype threat is to expose women to highly successful female role models. Although such exposures are known to decrease women’s leadership aspirations and self-evaluations, it is currently unknown what the effects of role models are on actual behavior during a challenging leadership task. We investigated whether highly successful female role models empower women’s behavior in a leadership task. In a virtual reality environment, 149 male and female students gave a public speech, while being subtly exposed to either a picture of Hillary Clinton, Angela Merkel, Bill Clinton, or no picture. We recorded the length of speeches as an objective measure of empowered behavior in a stressful leadership task. Perceived speech quality was also coded by independent raters. Women spoke less than men when a Bill Clinton picture or no picture was presented. This gender difference disappeared when a picture of Hillary Clinton or Angela Merkel was presented, with women showing a significant increase when exposed to a female role model compared to a male role model or no role models. Longer speaking times also translated into higher perceived speech quality for female participants. Empowered behavior also mediated the effects of female role models on women’s self-evaluated performance. In sum, subtle exposures to highly successful female leaders inspired women’s behavior and self-evaluations in stressful leadership tasks.


Shows that more effective work behaviors are retrospectively attributed to a fictitious male police officer than a fictitious female one—even though they are rated equivalently at first. Evidence in the study shows that this results from overvaluing male officers’ performance rather than from derogating females’.


This is an examination of issues involved in recruitment of racial minorities to faculty positions, especially issues associated with the prestige of training institutions.


This article demonstrates widely shared schemas, particularly “implicit” or unconscious ones, about race, age and gender.


When study participants were asked to identify the leader of the group, they reliably picked the person sitting at the head
of the table whether the group was all-male, all-female, or mixed-sex with a male occupying the head; however, when the pictured group was mixed-sex and a woman was at the head of the table, both male and female observers chose a male sitting on the side of the table as the leader half of the time.


Identification of the causes underlying the underrepresentation of women and minorities in academia is a source of ongoing concern and controversy. This is a critical issue in ensuring the openness and diversity of academia; yet differences in personal experiences and interpretations have mired it in controversy. We construct a simple model of the academic career that can be used to identify general trends, and separate the demographic effects of historical differences from ongoing biological or cultural gender differences. We apply the model to data on academics collected by the National Science Foundation (USA) over the past three decades, across all of science and engineering, and within six disciplines (agricultural and biological sciences, engineering, mathematics and computer sciences, physical sciences, psychology, and social sciences). We show that the hiring and retention of women in academia have been affected by both demographic inertia and gender differences, but that the relative influence of gender differences appears to be dwindling for most disciplines and career transitions. Our model enables us to identify the two key non-structural bottlenecks restricting female participation in academia: choice of undergraduate major and application to faculty positions. These transitions are those in greatest need of detailed study and policy development.


This research examines the multiple effects of racial diversity on group decision making. Participants deliberated on the trial of a Black defendant as members of racially homogeneous or heterogeneous mock juries. Half of the groups were exposed to pretrial jury selection questions about racism and half were not. Deliberation analyses supported the prediction that diverse groups would exchange a wider range of information than all-White groups. This finding was not wholly attributable to the performance of Black participants, as Whites cited more case facts, made fewer errors, and were more amenable to discussion of racism when in diverse versus all-White groups. Even before discussion, Whites in diverse groups were more lenient toward the Black defendant, demonstrating that the effects of diversity do not occur solely through information exchange. The influence of jury selection questions extended previous findings that blatant racial issues at trial increase leniency toward a Black defendant.


The authors of this study submitted the same c.v. for consideration by academic psychologists, sometimes with a man’s name at the top, sometimes with a woman’s. In one comparison, applicants for an entry-level faculty position were evaluated. Both men and women were more likely to hire the “male” candidate than the “female” candidate, and rated his qualifications as higher, despite identical credentials. In contrast, men and women were equally likely to recommend tenure for the “male” and “female” candidates (and rated their qualifications equally), though there were signs that they were more tentative in their conclusions about the (identical) “female” candidates for tenure.


This article spells out how the absence of “critical mass” can lead to negative performance outcomes for women and minorities. It addresses the impact on both the actor and the perceiver (evaluator).


This study compares over 300 letters of recommendation for successful candidates for medical school faculty positions. Letters written for female applicants differed systematically from those written for male applicants in terms of length, in the percentages lacking basic features, in the percentages with “doubt raising” language, and in the frequency of mention of status terms. In addition, the most common possessive phrases for female and male applicants (“her teaching” and “his research”) reinforce gender schemas that emphasize women’s roles as teachers and students and men’s as researchers and professionals.
3. Strategies for reducing the impact of bias on judgments


This study is one of many showing (1) that people vary in the degree to which they hold certain stereotypes and schemas; (2) that having those schemas influences their evaluations of other people; and (3) that it is possible to reduce the impact of commonly held stereotypes or schemas by relatively simple means. In this study college students with particularly negative stereotypes about women as college professors were more likely to rate accounts of specific incidents of college classroom teaching behavior negatively, if they were described as performed by a female. In the second phase of the study students’ reliance on their stereotypes was successfully reduced by providing them with time and instructions to recall the specific teaching behaviors of the instructors in detail. Thus, focusing attention on specific evidence of an individual’s performance eliminated the previously demonstrated effect of gender schemas on performance ratings.


This section describes the department chairs’ role in developing new faculty into teachers and scholars.


This article discusses common barriers to successful implementation of diversity-related cultural change efforts, including both those that are intentional and unintentional. It also outlines strategies for addressing or dealing with these various forms of resistance.


Investigated differences over a 10-year period in Whites’ self-reported racial prejudice and their bias in selection decisions involving Black and White candidates for employment in a sample of 194 undergraduates. The authors examined the hypothesis, derived from the aversive-racism framework, that although overt expressions of prejudice may decline significantly across time, subtle manifestations of bias may persist. Consistent with this hypothesis, self-reported prejudice was lower in 1998–1999 than it was in 1988–1989, and at both time periods, White participants did not discriminate against Black relative to White candidates when the candidates’ qualifications were clearly strong or weak, but they did discriminate when the appropriate decision was more ambiguous. Theoretical and practical implications are considered. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2005 APA, all rights reserved)


Based on data from a large national survey of nearly 1,700 people who received university degrees in the natural sciences or engineering and a subsequent in-depth follow-up survey, this book provides a comprehensive portrait of the career trajectories of men and women who have earned science degrees, and addresses the growing number of professionals leaving scientific careers. Preston presents a gendered analysis of the six factors contributing to occupational exit and the consequences of leaving science.


This essay enumerates hiring strategies that may disadvantage minority candidates or that might level the playing field.


Informed by the growing research literature on racial and ethnic diversity in the faculty, this guidebook offers specific recommendations to faculty search committees with the primary goal of helping structure and execute successful searches for faculty of color.

4. Dual career and work-family issues


This analysis of the Current Population Survey’s Outgoing Rotation Group data, a Bureau of Labor Statistics nationally representative survey, shows that the child penalty on labor force participation for prime-age women, aged 25 to 44, averaged -14.4 percentage points over the period from 1984 to 2004. This means that labor force participation by women in this age group with children at home averaged...
14.4 percentage points less than for women without children at home. The penalty was 20.7 percentage points in 1984 and has fallen consistently over the last two decades, down to 8.2 percentage points in 2004.


Survey research finds that mothers suffer a substantial wage penalty, although the causal mechanism producing it remains elusive. The authors employed a laboratory experiment to evaluate the hypothesis that status-based discrimination plays an important role and an audit study of actual employers to assess its real-world implications. In both studies, participants evaluated application materials for a pair of same-gender equally qualified job candidates who differed on parental status. The laboratory experiment found that mothers were penalized on a host of measures, including perceived competence and recommended starting salary. Men were not penalized for, and sometimes benefited from, being a parent. The audit study showed that actual employers discriminate against mothers, but not against fathers.


Op ed piece to counter the news and opinion articles that women, especially graduates of top-tier universities and professional schools, are “opting out” in record numbers and choosing home and family over careers.


Reflection by an academic historian both on the history of the academic workplace, and the ways in which it is currently an environment that is both inhumane and particularly difficult for women faculty.


Women in science tend to have partners who are also scientists. The same is not true for men. Thus many more women confront the “two-body problem” when searching for jobs. McNeil and Sher give a data overview for women in physics and suggest remedies to help institutions place dual-career couples.

Radcliffe Public Policy Center (2000). Life’s work: Generational attitudes toward work and life integration. Reports on the results of a national survey of Americans’ attitudes about work and family, economic security, workplace technology, and career development. The majority of young men report that a job schedule that allows for family time is more important than money, power or prestige.


This article addresses academic couples who face finding two positions that will permit both partners to live in the same geographic region, to address their professional goals, and to meet the day-to-day needs of running a household which, in many cases, includes caring for children or elderly parents.

5. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Issues


GLAAD’s Media Reference Guide offers reporters the language tools they can use to tell stories regarding the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered culture and people in a way that brings out journalistic excellence, while portraying the story participants with dignity, accuracy and fairness.


This study examined the influence of instructor sexual orientation on perceptions of teacher credibility. The purpose was to determine if college students perceive gay teachers as less credible than straight teachers. In addition, the researchers sought to explore the role of teacher credibility in terms of perceived student learning. In order to examine these variables, a male confederate presented a lecture on cultural influences to 154 undergraduate students enrolled in eight separate introductory communication
classes. In each class, the confederate was careful to keep his delivery and immediacy cues (e.g., vocal expressiveness, movement, and eye contact) natural and consistent. The confederate’s sexual orientation, however, was systematically manipulated. Findings indicate that students perceive a gay teacher as significantly less credible than a straight teacher. This study also found that students of a gay teacher perceive that they learn considerably less than students of a straight teacher. To help explain the complex reasons behind students’ biased evaluations, the authors have included an in-depth qualitative analysis of participants’ responses.

Tilcsik, A. (2011). “Pride and Prejudice: Employment Discrimination against Openly Gay Men in the United States.” *American Journal of Sociology* 117(2): 586–626. This article presents the first large-scale audit study of discrimination against openly gay men in the United States. Pairs of fictitious résumés were sent in response to 1,769 job postings in seven states. One résumé in each pair was randomly assigned experience in a gay campus organization, and the other résumé was assigned a control organization. Two main findings have emerged. First, in some but not all states, there was significant discrimination against the fictitious applicants who appeared to be gay. This geographic variation in the level of discrimination appears to reflect regional differences in attitudes and antidiscrimination laws. Second, employers who emphasized the importance of stereotypically male heterosexual traits were particularly likely to discriminate against openly gay men. Beyond these particular findings, this study advances the audit literature more generally by covering multiple regions and by highlighting how audit techniques may be used to identify stereotypes that affect employment decisions in real labor markets.

Weichselbaumer, D. (2003). Sexual orientation discrimination in hiring. *Labour Economics*, 10, 629-642. Little research has been done to examine discrimination against gays and lesbians in the labor market. Wage regressions have documented lower incomes for gays but repeatedly showed higher incomes for lesbians. The results concerning lesbian women are striking but can be reconciled with the existence of labor market discrimination, however. Problems like sample selection and unobserved heterogeneity—in particular, lesbians’ violation of stereotypical female gender roles—might be responsible for their higher earnings. To investigate whether discrimination against lesbians actually does exist, a labor market experiment is conducted. Job applications of candidates, who are equivalent in their human capital but differ in their sexual orientation, are sent out in response to job advertisements. Furthermore, to test whether increased masculinity affects labor market outcomes, the applicants differ in their perceived gender identity. While results show a strong negative effect for lesbian orientation, gender identity does not have a significant overall impact on hiring chances.


Straight Talk About Gays in the Workplace is filled with stories and interviews of real people working at real companies. These tales illustrate the frustrations of being gay in an indifferent or hostile company and the energizing effects of working for an inclusive one. The book shows how to create a harassment-free, inclusive workplace that recognizes the rights and answers the concerns of all employees; design and deliver sexual-orientation education for all employees; develop an AIDS/HIV educational program that can save lives; and implement domestic partner benefits programs (with detailed information on costs, tax issues, how to overcome objections, and why these benefits are so important to gay employees).


In this article Yoshino discusses the underlying discriminatory practice of forcing minorities to assimilate into the mainstream culture by covering mutable cultural traits. A wide range of minorities is explored to illustrate how prone to injustice the American melting pot can be when faced with diversity.
Candidate Evaluation Tool

The following offers a method for department faculty to provide evaluations of job candidates. It is meant to be a template for departments that they can modify as necessary for their own uses. The proposed questions are designed for junior faculty candidates; however, alternate language is suggested in parenthesis for senior faculty candidates.

Candidate’s Name:

Please indicate which of the following are true for you (check all that apply):

☐ Read candidate’s CV
☐ Read candidate’s scholarship
☐ Read candidate’s letters of recommendation
☐ Attended candidate’s job talk
☐ Met with candidate
☐ Attended lunch or dinner with candidate
☐ Other (please explain):

Please comment on the candidate’s scholarship as reflected in the job talk:

Please comment on the candidate’s teaching ability as reflected in the job talk:

Please rate the candidate on each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential for (evidence of) scholarly impact</th>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>fair</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>unable to judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential for (evidence of) research productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for (evidence of) research funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for (evidence of) collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with department’s priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make positive contribution to department’s climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential (demonstrated ability) to attract and supervise diverse graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential (demonstrated ability) to teach and supervise diverse undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential (demonstrated ability) to be a conscientious university community member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential (demonstrated ability) to mentor diverse students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other comments?

Available online (as a Word document) at advance.umich.edu/resources/candidate-evaluation-tool.docx
What is life like at Michigan for women and minority faculty?

Women comprised 32% of all tenure track, instructional faculty at UM during AY2014, but the rates in particular fields varied widely, e.g., from 19% of College of Engineering faculty, 23% of College of Literature, Science, and the Arts (LSA) natural science faculty, and 26% of the Medical School faculty to 41% of the LSA humanities and 46% of LSA social science faculty. Moreover, 75% of the tenure track, instructional faculty at UM in AY2014 were white; only 10% were from underrepresented minority groups, with 28% in the School of Social Work, 23% in the School of Education, and 22% in LSA social science departments, but only 5% in the College of Engineering, 6% in LSA natural science departments, and 5% in the Medical School.

Overall, women and minority faculty at the University of Michigan—like white men—report high levels of satisfaction with their teaching, research, and colleagues.

Nevertheless, the 2012 UM Faculty Survey revealed that women faculty report experiencing high rates of gender discrimination and unwanted sexual attention at UM (37% and 9%, respectively, in the last 6 years). The same survey revealed that 20% of faculty of color reported that they had experienced racial/ethnic discrimination at UM in the past 6 years.

There are important differences in the home lives of women and men faculty. Male faculty at UM are much more likely than women faculty to have a partner who is not in the workforce; women are more likely to be burdened by more household responsibilities than men.

Women faculty and faculty of color rated their departments more negatively than counterpart male and white faculty in terms of many features of the climate.

What exactly is “the climate”?

The workplace climate is the interpersonal environmental context for our work lives. It includes cues that we are taken seriously (that is, included and consulted), valued, and appreciated, in contrast to cues that we are invisible or unheard, devalued, and not appreciated.

What makes a climate bad?

Often it is enough for a workplace simply to have a numerically dominant group (by gender, race, or other characteristics) for that workplace to develop a “culture”—a set of daily practices and habits—that feel alien and exclusionary to people not in that group. Sheer demographics contribute to creating a climate that feels unwelcoming to people not like the dominant group.

Workplace climates feel unwelcoming when people’s actions (in the university context, administrators, faculty, students, and/or staff) seem disrespectful or hostile, regardless of their intent.

How can climate be improved?

Being aware of the problem and openly discussing it is an enormous first step. It is often difficult to talk about the climate openly, without fear of causing offense or pain. There are several resources for improvement including:

- CRLT Players performances of the “Faculty Meeting: Navigating Departmental Politics,” “Faculty Advising Faculty,” and “The Fence” sketches
- STRIDE presentations and discussions
- CEW’s Best Practices

Do women and minority faculty actually leave more than men do?

From the national data over time, we think they do, but it’s very hard to tell for sure about the University of Michigan. With such small numbers of women and minorities, and large numbers of men and majority members on the faculty, it’s very difficult to
assess differences in attrition rates. Moreover, the University does not record information about attrition in a uniform manner. We need to gather better data than we have. But given the small numbers of women and minorities, it is important to keep those we hire. The evidence about the climate suggests that may not be so easy.

**Do women faculty demand counter offers more than men because they are out on the market?**
No. In fact, evidence from many institutions suggests that women faculty are generally less likely to ask for counter offers than men and more likely simply to leave once they have made up their minds to go.

**Why do women and minority faculty leave?**
Generally, women and minority faculty eventually accept offers from other institutions for reasons that have to do with the climate at the first institution and their hopes for the climate at the second. Suspicions that they may be undervalued by the chair, colleagues, students, and/or staff are confirmed when people at other institutions treat them with respect and interest and offer them conditions of support for their research.

**Why do women and minorities leave instead of asking for a better situation at UM?**
If one of the important factors influencing women and minorities to leave is the climate, what exactly would they ask for?

It’s also true that partners’ careers and children’s preferences play more of a role in women faculty’s decision-making; for that reason, women faculty generally do not enter the job market for the purpose of improving their situation at their home institution. When they do enter the job market, they normally only pursue situations that address their household situations as well. In the end, when women are offered a job elsewhere, they are more likely to leave, while men are more likely to negotiate and stay.

**If it’s critical to keep women and minorities from responding to potential offers (since they’re likely to take them), what can be done to lessen the chances of them responding?**
We can ensure that the campus climate generally, and the departmental climate particularly, is so good that they will not believe they can reproduce it elsewhere.

At the campus level, this means ensuring that there are strong policies in place that support the career needs of faculty who carry substantial responsibilities for care giving and running households. These policies include flexibility in full- and part-time work and the tenure review period; institutional vigilance about evaluation bias in salary, tenure, and promotion assessments; and support for care giving responsibilities (including modified duties, delays in the tenure review).

At the departmental level, this means ensuring that department chairs are selected and supported in the maintenance of an environment that is respectful and inclusive in the classroom and laboratory, faculty meetings, corridors, and departmental decision-making. Clear and transparent policies are key supports for a respectful and inclusive climate.

**How can more women and minorities be retained?**
At the campus and college levels:
- Review and change policies.

At the departmental level:
- Improve the climate.
- Recruit more women and minorities.

At the individual level:
- Appoint women and minorities to leadership positions they deserve.
- Recognize women and minorities for their accomplishments.
- Provide better mentoring to women and minorities.

**What should happen if I hear that a woman or minority colleague is looking at jobs elsewhere?**
As with any faculty member, ask what would make him or her happier at UM. Talk to your chair or dean about what can be done to address his or her needs.

**What should I do if I learn that a woman or minority colleague has a great offer?**
Look at the whole package and evaluate the colleague’s contributions at UM carefully. Figure out whether s/he has been undervalued at UM and how you can value him or her more adequately. Be flexible and willing to make exceptions for both women and men where rules are concerned.

For more information or additional copies of this resource, please contact the ADVANCE Program at (734) 647-9359 or advanceprogram@umich.edu, or visit the ADVANCE Program’s Web site at http://advance.umich.edu.
Elizabeth Crosby Faculty Grants Program

Elizabeth Crosby Faculty Grants are available to individual faculty members to support a range of activities aimed at improving the environment for career satisfaction and success of a diverse faculty in science and engineering fields. Support may be requested for: programs and projects aimed at improving the career success of diverse faculty, especially for women and other members of under-represented groups, including efforts to support the special child or other dependent care associated with work-related travel, long stays at field sites, long and late hours at labs, or other essential research activities away from home.

Application Guidelines
The following criteria play crucial roles in the award process:

- Quality and significance of the scholarly activity to be supported by award
- Degree to which the project will enhance the environment for career satisfaction and success of a diverse faculty in science and engineering fields

ELIGIBILITY

Applications will be limited to faculty with appointments on the tenure track in science and engineering fields. Faculty on research or clinical tracks may apply if they are working toward a shift onto the tenure-track.

Applications for faculty in their first year are not likely to be supported; a strong case must be made regarding why the request cannot be covered by start-up funds.

REVIEW PROCESS

Reviews will be completed by an interdisciplinary panel of faculty.

APPLICATION PROCESS

1. Complete and submit an on-line application at the following link: https://umich.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_8HeegNUGBeZLG7P

The on-line application includes the following:

- Abstract of no more than 100 words describing the needed resources and their relationship to increasing the participation and advancement of a diverse faculty in science and engineering.
- The goals for the project to be supported by the award funds (250–500 words)
- How the award funds will be used to further your goals (250–500 words)
- The roles of any collaborators on the project (no more than 250 words)
- Why/How will Crosby Funds make a difference: why funds from this source, in particular, address this need (no more than 250 words)
2. Send an electronic copy of your budget/budget justification* and an abbreviated CV of no more than 4 pages (for applicant as well as all collaborators on the project) to ADVCrosby@umich.edu. Be sure to include your name in the filename; thus, filenames should be formatted as follows: [last name]-[first name]-Crosby (e.g., StewartAbby-Crosby).

*Outline budget expenses for award funds up to $20,000 (few awards will be for this amount), including their justification. Specify contingent budgets (that is, how funding may supplement other resources and/or depend on other funding). Other resources may include CME (if applicable), start-up funding, LSA Child Travel Expense Support. Any salary expenses must include appropriate calculation of benefits.

**DEADLINE

The on-line application, budget, and CV should be submitted no later than November 18, 2015.

**Awards will be announced and funds available no later than mid-January 2016.

Please direct any questions concerning this program to Shawn Beard (ADVCrosby@umich.edu) at 647-3688.

Elizabeth Caroline Crosby

World-renowned neuroanatomist, Elizabeth Caroline Crosby (1888–1983), began her long and distinguished career at the University of Michigan in 1920. Initially working as an anatomy instructor, she rose through the ranks to become the first woman professor of the medical school.

A dedicated researcher and teacher, Dr. Crosby published extensively in comparative anatomy, and received several prestigious awards. She was the first woman to be awarded the Henry Russell Lectureship at the University of Michigan (1946); she earned the Henry Gray Award in Neuroanatomy in 1972, and the National Medal of Science in 1979. After her retirement in 1958, at age sixty-nine, Dr. Crosby served as a clinical consultant at both the University of Michigan and University of Alabama, where one of her former students held a faculty position. She remained active in scientific work until the end of her life in 1983, at the age of ninety-four.
Addendum to the Elizabeth Crosby Faculty Grants Program Guidelines: Payment of Child Care Expenses and Non-University-affiliated Individual’s Travel

Why pay child care expenses/non-university-affiliated individual’s travel?

Faculty members have regularly incorporated a request for child care/non-university-affiliated individual’s travel into their Crosby proposals.

Why is it difficult to actually pay child care expenses/non-university-affiliated individual’s travel?

The University’s Office of Financial Operations will not allow, from any source, reimbursements to employees for child care expenses/non-university-affiliated individual’s travel or direct payments to child care providers. Because the cost of child care is tax deductible, funds provided to someone for the purpose of paying for child care need to be provided by a taxable method.

How can we pay child care expenses/non-university-affiliated individual’s travel?

The only method by which we can provide funds for these expenses is to provide this money to the award recipient as additional salary. Because this additional salary is taxable and expenses are incurred by the recipient as well as the paying department, the only way to get the actual amount of funds awarded to the faculty member is to “gross up” the payment. Providing an increased award amount as salary allows the faculty member to net the original award amount and covers incurred taxes, etc.

The Payroll Office provides a process to use when grossing up a payment. First, the original amount (the net amount we want to award the faculty member) should be inputted into the following website: http://www.finance.umich.edu/finops/payroll/calculators/grossup-less-than-halftime. The new salary amount should be increased by the fringe benefit percentage (applied only to the original salary amount) used for the individual faculty member (information about an individual’s fringe benefit percentage can be obtained from the Benefits Office) — this covers expenses incurred by the paying department.

For example, Dr. X should receive $750 for child care/non-university-affiliated individual’s travel and her fringe benefit rate is 22%. The calculation would be:

1) $750 inputted into http://www.finance.umich.edu/finops/payroll/calculators/grossup-less-than-halftime = $1188.59

2) $750 x .22 = $165 (.22 is for illustrative purposes only)

3) $1188.59 + $165 = $1353.59

Additional salary in the amount of $1,347 should be paid to Dr. X.
Well-conceived policies and procedures often help create a supportive climate for faculty. Over the past year or more—primarily through interviews, focus groups, and direct e-mail requests—we have been asking women faculty members to describe specific programs or general behaviors that contribute to a climate that supports their academic career success and satisfaction.

The following summary describes (often using their own words) what the women have told us. The examples represent three important general principles of effective leadership. One is transparency: Making all kinds of information available and easy to find. Two is uniformity: Leveling the field and dealing equitably with all faculty members. Three is assistance: Giving attention to the needs of faculty, offering mentoring and other types of help.

The overall message is a strong one: While no specific practice like those described in this report is likely to change the atmosphere in a department or unit, administrators who apply the touchstones of transparency, uniformity and assistance when developing or reviewing policies and procedures can create environments within which all faculty members flourish. In addition, because each academic unit is unique, administrators may either find that some of the following practices are not appropriate or decide that they need to tailor the practices to their particular situations.

We have organized this report according to the problems women faculty members most often speak about—(1) unsatisfactory hiring and initial negotiating patterns, (2) inadequate explanation of and access to relevant university and department information, (3) a lack of mentoring, (4) unclear or poorly managed review and tenure processes, and (5) an unwillingness to accommodate whole-life needs, especially family and childcare responsibilities. We have further identified each practice according to how many of the three themes of transparency, uniformity, and assistance it specifically addresses. For the most part, the faculty members are describing practices they have experienced here at the University of Michigan, although a few of the practices are ones that current or former UM faculty members have encountered at other research universities. This list of best practices is not a long one. As we proceed, we are likely to discover new suggestions to add.
I. **Issues related to Hiring and Negotiation.** Often newly hired faculty members are unsure about the things they can expect and ask for as part of their initial employment packages. Or they are promised (or believe they are promised) things that they later do not receive. Best practices in this area lead to open, good-faith negotiations that clearly outline what options new people can and cannot expect to receive.

- Some department chairs negotiate for resources with a list of requested items from potential new hires. According to a faculty member from one such department:
  
  “Before the second visit/interview, the Chair requested that I draw up and forward to him a list of equipment that I would need to conduct my research. Before our interview, he reviewed the list to determine what equipment was already available ("used" or as community property). Then, during our interview, he told me what community equipment would be available to me, what "used but working" equipment would be deeded to me, and the sum of money that he had determined would be sufficient to allow me to purchase the remaining items (based on the cost estimates that I had provided). This distribution was negotiable; one costly item that they expected I would share with the other members of the department was in fact something my lab would use heavily and would therefore need to purchase new. Once I explained the situation, the Chair agreed and the cash portion of my start-up package was adjusted accordingly.” (Transparency, Uniformity, Assistance)

- Certain negotiated agreements can be especially valuable for new women faculty members. Some departments allow a new hire to take off the first semester, delay teaching, delay start of the tenure clock, or reach other agreements to help with the transition to professional life. In addition, some departments provide start-up funds until the grant money can “kick in,” or they offer administrative, accounting, and technical assistants to help faculty members in the sciences to run their labs. (Assistance)

II. **Issues related to Providing Information.** Once here, new faculty members need all types of information, from where to get door keys, to how to access the Faculty Handbook and other written and web-based documents, to where in the library to find lists of faculty members’ salaries. Some departments have processes that make such information gathering easier.

- They have established communication systems and web sites that not only include relevant policies and procedures but also provide answers
to questions both new and veteran faculty members might have about the department. As one chair explained,

“I went to all of the new faculty members and asked, ‘What are the things you really wanted to know when you came here, or what you think you would have wanted to know?’ And I made a list of these things, and then they [new faculty members] were matched with faculty members in the department, and we gave the list to the faculty members and to the new people who had just arrived—in the hopes that they could then use it as the basis for starting a conversation. I’ll be interested to see how that works, but it’s spread over a lot of people.  
Q: “So you gave the tenured faculty the questions?”
A: “Yes, and also the people who were just starting out. And we’re going to modify the list. We also ended up putting it on our little, internal web site. So, if they forget their questions, they can go there.” (Transparency, Uniformity, Assistance)

• They have special programs for new faculty members that consist of off-campus retreats at the beginning of the year and/or series of workshops throughout the year—intended to give new faculty lots of valuable formal and informal information. As one example,

“We have a program where new faculty get together for lunch meetings, which I thought was great because it gives you information about different offices—the minority office or information about the honors program and different things. And you get to be with the Dean, and you get to meet the other new faculty. So I thought it was a positive experience.” (Transparency, Assistance)

• They optimize the information-gathering process by having the chair or some other senior department member meet individually with each new faculty member. During these one-on-one meetings—usually held after the faculty member has been on campus for a short while—the senior colleague can answer specific questions that have arisen for the junior faculty member and offer additional relevant information. (Transparency, Uniformity, Assistance)

III. Issues related to Mentoring. Mentoring helps insure that no one is allowed to “fall through the cracks.” Instead, one or more persons take it upon themselves—whether on their own initiative or as part of a formal mentoring program—to provide instrumental and emotional support and advice.

• Some formal mentoring programs consist of committees of between two and four senior faculty advisors for each new faculty member. The faculty member can meet with her/his committee as often as s/he wishes, and with one or more of the committee members at any given time. For example,
“We have mentorship committees with whom we meet once or twice a year. This is invaluable. They read things for us, give advice on where to publish, what research projects to really pursue, general professional development issues like how to network…. Mine helped me to feel integrated in the department and clear on what I need to do to achieve tenure.”

“The committee does not seem to have any charge given to it. But in my case, I communicate with members of my committee on a regular basis, from weekly to monthly…. We can call meetings of the committee as often as we like and can meet with members individually as often as we like. I think the committee is supposed to exist for the period up until tenure.” (Assistance)

- Some units establish other types of official mentoring programs for new faculty. The programs may consist of group meetings (“over lunch provided by the college—very important”) with school/college administrators. In one such program, “A senior faculty member facilitated monthly meetings focused on a topic of interest to junior faculty. He would either provide specific information himself or bring in an expert. For example, one meeting was devoted to issues in publishing…led [by] a journal editor. Another was devoted to writing grant proposals, and another to the tenure review process. It was understood that the meetings were opportunities for the junior faculty to express concerns and frustrations and that these would not go beyond the room. Later on, we also had each junior faculty person share an in-progress manuscript for constructive responses from the other members. That was helpful in informing all of us about each other’s work. It also helped us understand the diversity of theoretical orientations and professional agendas.” (Transparency, Uniformity, Assistance)

- Another mentoring format calls for more senior colleagues to reach out to their assistant and associate faculty members, offering to mentor them. The mentors raise such questions as “Where are you going?” and “What are you doing next?” Other department chairs call in associate professors to talk about their plans for promotion to full professor. (Uniformity, Assistance)

- According to various others we spoke to, valuable mentoring often consists of senior faculty members keeping their eyes on junior colleagues, i.e. stopping by their offices with questions like, “What are you spending your time on?” or “Are you writing proposals?” Ideally, department chairs “actually go out of their way to spend time with individuals, to go and talk to individual faculty members on a fairly
regular one-on-one basis. Somebody who does it well makes it look like it’s a purely chance meeting.” (Assistance)

- Several people told us that mentoring is likely to be more effective when it is documented and when the people acting as mentors are rewarded for and/or held accountable for the task:
  “Their intentions are very good but the reality is that, once somebody is assigned to be a mentor, there’s got to be somebody else who makes sure that all the mentors are doing their jobs. And I think that very often the administration of the department will just say, ‘Well, I’ve assigned a mentor so now I can wash my hands of it.’ And maybe on their annual review, the chairman will, in their 15-minute meeting, give some kind of [mentoring] advice. I think the mentors need to be pushed and reminded… I’m not sure I would call it ‘accountability,’ but at least they need to be prodded and asked, ‘Did you do it?’”

  “As soon as you get there you [should be] assigned someone as a mentor. The person actually knows that they’re assigned! And then in annual reviews—activity reports to fill out each year—the senior faculty member actually has to discuss their mentoring activities on the activity report… [And] something that may actually be a little more effective would be to have the junior people say what mentoring they’ve received [from their mentor].” (Assistance)

- Some UM colleges have created offices especially intended to support women faculty members; or they have incorporated such functions into already existing offices. These are places where women faculty and staff can go for questions related to salary, career opportunities, promotion, and other issues, and where they can obtain help with problem solving. (Transparency, Uniformity, Assistance)

- Several women have suggested that the university establish an office on campus where faculty members can go to safely, sympathetically, and efficaciously report grievances and get official help with problems within their departments and colleges. [Many women faculty members do not believe such a place now exists.] (Uniformity, Assistance)

IV. **Issues related to Review and Tenure Policies.** Transparency is nowhere more important than around issues related to annual and third year reviews and the tenure process. Best practices in these areas address the problems of the lack of specificity in review documents and the lack of clearly explained and equitable tenure procedures.

- Some UM schools have detailed, specific third-year review processes:
“One thing that was very helpful—as much as it was frustrating at some level—is that we developed a very involved mid-term review process…. It’s a hard and fast review as opposed to a formative review. And so they make us do it as [if it were for tenure review]. We have external reviewers and the like. And this is a new process they’ve started, because the old one was more formative than summative.” (Uniformity, Assistance)

• Departments may establish award committees, with junior and senior committee members appointed by the chair. A faculty member described one such program as follows: Each January, all faculty members complete an annual report form, describing their research programs and such activities as teaching assignments; committee service; numbers of advisees; collaborations; conferences attended; guest lectures presented; numbers of manuscripts and abstracts published; and current funding status, including grants pending. Two committee members, acting as primary and secondary reviewers, prepare a written summary of each report, including all teaching evaluations. At committee, the primary reviewer describes the person's progress, drawing attention to any achievements and/or problem areas. The committee members discuss and possibly amend each written report and then submit it to the Chair, who uses the committee's assessment as the basis for the annual conference with each faculty member. Frequently members of the committee discover situations that place a particular member at risk, and together the group makes specific recommendations to the Chair and to the individual to reduce that risk.

   “An important feature of the review process is that all junior faculty members serve on the P&A committee before their own packages are due to be evaluated. In this way, they learn the range of productivity and service characteristic of both junior and senior faculty. In addition, they see first-hand that the process is fair, open and compassionate.” (Transparency, Uniformity, Assistance)

• The more concrete the annual- and third-year reviews, the better:

   “One thing [I had at UM] was an annual meeting with the chair, so in theory you’re supposed to get progress reports. But what they do here [at current institution] is actually write you something each year. And they actually try to make the statements fairly concrete. They will say, ‘You need to improve your teaching’ or ‘You need to publish more papers.’ Those kinds of concrete statements, rather than the sort of ‘feel good’ things like ‘We value you.’” (Assistance)

• The practice in some departments is to place new faculty members onto the tenure portfolio committee, to allow them to watch the process. As one faculty member described such a program,
“The tenure portfolio gets put together by the college and then it gets judged by the college. The committees that help the candidates put their portfolios together have tenured members, but they also invite a number of junior members to attend these meetings. And every first year faculty is part of this committee. I wasn’t a voting member, but I saw an entire portfolio. I saw how they talked about it. I saw how they chose external reviewers and what the letter looked like that went out to them—and all kinds of details that I never would have even thought of asking…. So you go through every single step, and you get to read the entire portfolio. And they discuss the personal statement: what’s good about it, what’s not… I know some departments do the kind of mentoring where you see a portfolio of someone who went through and got promoted last year or something. This was even better than that because you actually went through the steps together.”

(Transparency, Uniformity, Assistance)

- Administrators may routinely link a junior faculty member with a senior colleague who acts as advocate during the tenure process. (Assistance)

V. Issues related to Departmental/College/University Policies. At various institutional levels, administrators have created and adapted policies and practices in order to ease the stress of academic life and increase research productivity. Women faculty members value these practices, both large and small, as ways to balance the many aspects of their lives: research, teaching, service, and family responsibilities. For example, University administrators—recognizing that women faculty members are a scarce commodity in some areas of the institution and thus are often called upon for extra committee service, advising and teaching—award competitive $5,000 Career Development funds for faculty members who are doing greater-than-average amounts of non-teaching service that draws them away from their scholarly agenda. Other such helpful programs include these:

- LS&A offers a nurturing leave for faculty members in their fourth year. This leave is an entitlement for everyone, consistent across the college and not dependent upon individual negotiation. It gives all tenure-track faculty members one semester off from university responsibilities, in order to concentrate on their research. (Uniformity, Assistance)

- Some departments tailor the official UM modified duties policy to make it more beneficial. They may very substantially decrease a faculty member’s committee work for the semester of modified duties: One woman described her experience as follows: “The way the policy reads in the books is good to begin with, but I think its implementation in my particular unit was excellent. For example, the policy states
that you still have to keep up with committee work and things of that sort. My committee work assignment for that term that I reduced my duties was minimal. And that was something that the department chair has to be credited with, I guess. I did do more committee work in the preceding and following terms to make up for it, but I think that was well worth not having to do much of it during the term that I was trying to reduce my duties.” (Assistance)

They may also make sure to provide adequate coverage for faculty members on modified duties: “We believe that it’s important that women are able to take the time necessary (as well as new fathers) and not be under pressure from their colleagues who are asked to provide coverage. Our incentive program provides generous financial remuneration for coverage.” (Assistance)

- Department administrators schedule no meetings before 9 a.m. or after 5 p.m., in order that parents can better manage their lives to coincide with their children’s. (Assistance)

- Department administrators set a reasonable time limit for service on time-consuming committees, while—at the same time—insure that women get a chance to serve on important committees. (Assistance)

- Department administrators give junior faculty members some priority in teaching assignments. As one faculty member explained, “The teaching assignments [in my UM department] were seniority based. So, if you once taught a course, you tended to keep it. Here [at current institution] teaching assignments give priority to the most junior people, to find out what they want to teach. And in fact some schools actually explicitly have a form that the junior faculty fill out for what they want to teach… Of course, that [may] make for ‘icky’ teaching loads for senior faculty, but I think it’s a lot healthier for junior faculty development.” (Assistance)
ADVANCE Collaborations with the CRLT Players

For certain events (STEP, LSA Tenure Process Review Dinners, Navigating Departmental Politics, and others), ADVANCE partners with the CRLT Players to showcase short sketches designed to help facilitate the discussion of specific subjects. Past sketches have included:

- **Faculty Advising Faculty**
  Explores the ways in which senior faculty members mentor their junior colleagues and considers the differing relationships and professional outcomes that can result from these processes.

- **Faculty Meeting: Navigating Departmental Politics**
  A richly layered sketch that can be productively used to focus on two issues important to any university: faculty hiring and departmental climate.

- **No Offense**
  Centers on the relationship between advisor and advisee in a lab setting.

- **The Fence**
  Invites the audience to observe members of a department's executive committee as they meet to discuss whether one of their junior colleagues should be awarded tenure.

- **Trigger Vignettes**
  Brief (2-5 minutes), customized scenes developed with client input and designed to spark dialogue on difficult issues.

- **University Department: The Musical**
  Imagines what a department might look like if all its members shared the truth about how they experience their varying roles... through song and dance!

You can visit the CRLT website (www.crlt.umich.edu) for more information.
Positive and Problematic Practices in Faculty Recruitment

This information comes out of three interview studies. Two were with individuals who turned down faculty offers, 11 from a UM science department in 2008 (8 women and 3 men) and 12 from the College of Engineering in 2009 (5 women and 7 men). Additionally, interviews were conducted with new faculty hires from the College of Engineering in 2009. In both studies of declined faculty, respondents emphasized that they had good experiences while visiting the University, and that their decision to turn Michigan down was difficult. Nevertheless, the data provided some information about practices that created a positive impression for job candidates as well as practices that contributed to their decisions.

Positive Practices

- Advertisements for the positions on website, trade journals and e-mail lists, etc. combined with word-of-mouth personal outreach from existing faculty.
- Warm attention from the department chair, including hosting of social interactions.
- Frequent and prompt attention (by phone and e-mail) from the department chair in the course of negotiations.
- Providing continual information about the timeline of hiring process to candidates, including explanations of delays.
- Opportunities to meet with both graduate students (lack of such meetings raised concerns both about their quality and their integration in department life).
- For women candidates: meeting with women faculty and postdocs (not meeting with them led to unresolved questions about the climate for women in the department), as well as meeting with ADVANCE representatives.
- Meeting with potential colleagues (in and outside the department) who work in the candidate’s research area.
- Receiving information about dual career opportunities early in the recruitment process.
- Receiving information about family friendly policies and resources (e.g., child care).
- Having partner treated with respect, interest, and enthusiasm.
- Accommodating family members’ needs during the visit.
- A sense that the department chair is negotiating with the candidate’s long-term best interest as a primary consideration.
- Rapid resolution of negotiation, yielding a formal offer quickly.
- Introduction to Ann Arbor, including city attractions, potential living areas, schools, etc.
Problematic Practices

- Contradictory information from the chair and other senior faculty members.
- Evidence of disorganization or lack of unity in the department’s approach.
- Suggestions by department faculty that candidates are not being recruited for their scientific excellence (but based on some personal characteristic, like gender or race).
- Being asked questions about family issues before any offer is made (marital status, planning for a family in the future, etc.); these generated resentment that such questions are both irrelevant and illegal, and yield inaccurate information.
- Potential department faculty colleagues interacting with the candidate’s partner in a way that suggests that the partner is not valued or desirable on his or her own terms.

For more information or additional copies of this resource, please contact the ADVANCE Program at (734) 647-9359 or advanceprogram@umich.edu, or visit the ADVANCE Program’s Web site at http://advance.umich.edu/.
Facts about ADVANCE Network

The Network to Advance Women Scientists and Engineers, is composed of tenure track faculty in science and engineering across the entire campus, meets several times each year to socialize, to talk about issues the members have in common, and to develop plans for the future.

There are a number of ADVANCE activities: leadership development activities, mentoring initiatives, career advising, book discussions, luncheons and dinners. The Network provides women faculty in science and engineering with opportunities to define collective goals and to get to know one another.

Facts about Career Advising/Mentoring For Faculty

General Information

Faculty careers develop over time through a series of decisions and choices made about how to spend time and what to do. Making those decisions requires information and judgment about consequences, since the decisions we make now are likely to matter for the long term. Career advice from people with information and experience can provide a crucial context for decision-making and career development. This ADVANCE handbook provides more information on mentoring relationships and the benefits it brings to both the mentor and the mentee: Giving and Getting Career Advice: A Guide for Junior and Senior Faculty.

For more information or additional copies of this resource, please contact the ADVANCE Program at (734) 647-9259 or advanceprogram@umich.edu, or visit the ADVANCE Program’s Web site at http://advance.umich.edu/
LIFT Core Competency Seminar Series Topics

2015-2016

Work-Life Integration: Making it Work (Kelly Ward, Washington State University)
- Integrating work and life as part of overall work expectations
- Developing schemas for managing work and life
- Discovering impact of cultural influences on work-life balance

Managing Time Across Multiple Universes: The Life of an Academic (Diana Kardia)
- Applying principles of time management within challenges of an academic environment
- Creating tailored approach to getting things done
- Balancing multiple roles with time management skills

2014-2015

Meetings That Matter (Diana Kardia)
- Establishing criteria for productive use of faculty time and attention
- Identifying strategies for navigating tension, complexity, voting blocks, and other typical faculty dynamics
- Discussing meeting techniques aimed at creating more cohesive and intellectually stimulating departments
- Considering the pros and cons of different methods of initiating or responding to charged encounters with colleagues

Navigating Department Politics (CRLT Players)
- Reflecting on common political tensions that emerge in academic units
- Identifying the stakes of navigating department politics effectively for individuals in different ranks/roles
- Developing an awareness of responses that can make a difficult conversation even more challenging
- Reconceptualizing what is difficult about "difficult" conversations
- Practicing effective strategies for participating in challenging conversations with colleagues
A Conversation about Academic Book Publishing (Rebecca Sestili)
- Navigating the process from proposal to publication
- Setting a realistic timeline,
- Writing an engaging proposal
- Understanding your editor and post-publication tasks

Leadership, Voice, & Authority (Rena Seltzer)
- Communicating authority
- Managing interrupters
- Disarming dissenters
- Reducing vulnerability to gender bias

Dealing with Stress (Catherine Lilly)
- Identifying the sources of stress
- Identifying the amount of stress and its impact
- Tools and approaches for dealing with stress
- Limiting the impact of stress on self, career and personal life

Creative Conflict (Catherine Lilly)
- Understanding conflict styles
- Recognizing when conflict is productive
- Positive uses of competition
- Confronting problematic behavior

How to Say No
- Recognizing when "no" is an appropriate response
- Motivation strategies for when it "has to be done"
- Communicating "no" effectively yet positively

Advancing an Agenda (Catherine Lilly)
- Mobilizing coalitions
- Working effectively with resistance
- Negotiating conflicting priorities
- Identifying communication strategies
2011-2012

The Pros and Cons of Academic Administration (Diana Kardia) (full professors)

- Specific gains and costs of formal leadership roles in academia
- How to recognize the right timing and the right opportunities
- Specific skills and strategies necessary to be a successful academic administrator
- How to be a scholar first, even while being an effective administrator

Managing Your Time and Productivity (Karla Vineyard)

- Balancing competing demands on your time
- Email management
- Reducing external distractions
- Maintaining your energy
- Building resilience
- Identifying self-defeating habits and internal blocks

Herding Cats, Watering Horses, and Other Challenges of Leading Faculty (Diana Kardia)

- Examine culture and organizational dynamics of departments, colleges, and universities
- Prepare faculty to recognize the factors at play with faculty leadership
- Provide more freedom in how to respond both as a leader and as a participant in the life of the academy.

Building Leadership Capacity (Karla Vineyard)

- Assess your leadership strengths
- Target development needs
- Create a personalized action plan for building your leadership capabilities
With the support of the Provost’s Office, the ADVANCE Program has developed **LIFT: Leadership and Integration in Faculty Transitions**. This initiative (now in its fifth year) includes two programs for tenure-track faculty campus-wide: the first is focused on the transition to associate professor and the second on the transition to full professor. The goals of both programs are to recognize faculty for their accomplishments, provide an opportunity for reflection, and to help faculty develop proficiency in leadership roles, increasing diversity, and improving climate, among other areas. Faculty who have been promoted within the last two years receive invitations to attend.

**LIFT: Transition to Associate Professor (Fall Term)**

This program examines the faculty career lifecycle and its transitions, the multiple dimensions of scholarship and scholarly learning after tenure, and strategies for making informed choices about service and leadership roles. The leadership skills required of (but too seldom developed in) faculty in general and the Associate Professor role more specifically are covered, along with suggestions for building collaborative communities and networks, and an introduction to the mentoring and peer evaluation experiences of tenured faculty.

**LIFT: Transition to Full Professor (Winter Term)**

This program examines the role of full professors within the larger context of the University. Aspects considered include ensuring that the curriculum, faculty hiring, mentoring, promotion and advancement, departmental work environments, and institutional resources and leadership all support the continued excellence of the institution. It acknowledges the changing economic, technological and global challenges and provides an avenue to help think through both the institutional challenges ahead, and the role of full professors in meeting them.

**Core Competency Seminars (Fall and Winter Term)**

In addition to the separate programs for newly promoted associate and full professors, the LIFT program also includes a series of 3-4 brief core competency seminars. These seminars provide additional opportunities for skill and resource development and are designed to support faculty in achieving their scholarly, institutional, and disciplinary goals. Seminar topics change each year and are open to all faculty on a first-come, first-served basis and are not dependent on attendance at the seminars.
Overview. Launch committees are designed to provide support and guidance to new junior faculty as they begin their careers at Michigan. Committees meet with the new faculty member regularly from the time of hire until the end of the first academic year at Michigan. Our pilot year (2012-2013) was modeled after a very successful effort at Case Western Reserve University and in 2013-2014 we built on our own success and expanded to include all new assistant professors in the College of Engineering and in STEM fields in LSA.

Committee Focus. Each committee focuses on those areas that are essential for new faculty success:
- Lab space and equipment, including computational resources
- Funding
- Lab personnel, including students
- Integration into the university, including introduction to potential collaborators
- Research and publication plans
- Teaching
- Service
- Mentoring plan for the pre-tenure period

Committee Makeup. Each committee has the following members:
- A senior faculty member in the new faculty member’s department with related research interests
- Department chair
- A senior faculty member from outside the department, in a field related to the new faculty member’s interests
- ADVANCE faculty member (convener)
- Newly hired faculty member

Committee members are identified and invited by ADVANCE, with input from the department chair. Each committee convenes two to three months before the arrival of the launchee at UM and meets formally about once per month thereafter either in person or by conference call. Meetings continue until the end of the first academic year. In addition to the monthly committee meetings, members may also meet informally with the new faculty member, as needed or desired.
University of Michigan's President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program

About the Program
In 2011, the University of Michigan joined in a collaborative partnership with the University of California to offer postdoctoral fellowship opportunities at the University of Michigan. In this program, the University of Michigan now offers postdoctoral research fellowships in science, technology, engineering, mathematics (STEM), economics, and political science, coupled with faculty mentoring, professional development, and academic networking opportunities.

The University of Michigan views these postdoctoral fellowships as providing an exceptional opportunity to recruit potential new faculty to the University by offering the possibility of either a postdoc alone or a combined postdoc and tenure track faculty appointment.

The University seeks applicants whose research, teaching, and service will contribute to diversity and equal opportunity in higher education. The program is particularly interested in scholars with the potential to bring to their research and undergraduate teaching the critical perspective that comes from their non-traditional educational background or understanding of the experiences of groups historically underrepresented in higher education.

Eligibility
The program is aimed at those interested in pursuing a postdoctoral research fellowship in science, technology, engineering, mathematics (STEM), economics, or political science. Disciplines that have not received a fellow will be given priority. Applicants who are not U.S. citizens or permanent residents when the application is due will not be considered. Applicants should expect to complete their doctorate on or before July 1 of the year following their application.

Candidates in all fields are evaluated by faculty reviewers in their own fields and in related fields. Faculty reviewers will evaluate candidates according to their academic accomplishments, the strength of their research proposal, and their potential for faculty careers that will contribute to diversity and equal opportunity through their teaching, research, and service. Faculty reviewers will submit their recommendations to the Office of the Provost, where the final selections will be determined.

Terms of Appointment
The University of Michigan President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program awards fellowships in the fields listed above for research conducted under faculty sponsorship. The annual award provides a salary of $50-60,000, depending on the field and level of experience, and $10,000 for research and professional development. The award also includes enrollment in health plan for fellow and dependent(s), group life insurance, three weeks of sick leave, and one month (non-accrual) of vacation.
President's Postdoctoral Fellows are expected to (1) establish residence and participate in academic life at the campus of their postdoctoral appointment, (2) focus full-time on research and avoid other commitments such as teaching or additional employment, (3) meet regularly with their faculty mentor, and (4) attend the PPFP professional development programs.

**Expectations for Mentors**
President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship mentors are usually tenured faculty who are expected to (1) take an active role in helping the fellow to plan and achieve his or her research goals, (2) assist the fellow in establishing a visible presence in department, (3) facilitate opportunities for the fellow to participate in national and international research meetings, (4) encourage the fellow to focus full-time on research and avoid other commitments such as teaching or outside employment, (5) assist the fellow in seeking opportunities to present papers or to interview for faculty positions, and (6) attend the program professional development activities such as the annual gathering.

**Expectations for Host Departments**
Host departments are encouraged to welcome the fellow into the department and make every effort to ensure that the fellow is included in communications about departmental colloquia, seminars and social events. Host departments are expected to provide the fellow with information about salary and benefits and administer the fellow’s research and professional travel funds. Host departments are expected to provide the fellow with appropriate office space and routine administrative support. In addition, President’s Postdoctoral Fellows should be provided with opportunities for career development, including consideration for a faculty position at the University of Michigan.

**Information about the first four years of the program**
- Postdoctoral fellowships were offered to 16 candidates.
- Recipients are listed on [http://presidentspostdoc.umich.edu/fellows.html](http://presidentspostdoc.umich.edu/fellows.html) and were placed in three schools/colleges.

**Information about the next year of the program (2015 – 2016)**
- On-line applications due to joint University of California-University of Michigan application system by November 1, 2015.
- Letters of support from up to two University of Michigan tenured/tenure-track faculty mentors and up to two references due by December 1, 2015.
- Letters of support from University of Michigan department chair/director/dean due by December 1, 2015.
- See [http://presidentspostdoc.umich.edu/](http://presidentspostdoc.umich.edu/) for more information.

**Proactive Steps Interested Departments Can Take**
- Cultivate exciting postdoc applicants.
- Ensure potential faculty mentors get to know potential applicants.
- Consider bringing potential applicants to campus for an informal visit before the application deadline.
- Plan how the department might assess applicants’ suitability for a “preemptive” tenure track offer at the same time as the President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship is offered.