



# *Getting to the Heart of it All*

Connecting Gender Research, WIE Programs, Faculty & Corporate Partners

2012 Conference | June 25-27, 2012 | Columbus, Ohio



## **2012 WEPAN National Conference**

**Getting to the Heart of it All:  
Connecting Gender Research, WIE Programs,  
Faculty & Corporate Partners**

**June 25-27, 2012**

**Columbus, Ohio**

## *ADVANCing Women and STEM Faculty Members through Strategic Career Planning*

Melissa Latimer, J. Kasi Jackson, Katie Stores  
West Virginia University

### **Abstract**

This strategic career planning workshop “trains the trainer” while demonstrating a retention promoting tool that attendees can implement on their own campus. We focus on tenure and other career milestones. The workshop consists of a hands-on demonstration followed by implementation guidelines based on the ADVANCE campus experience. Our *objectives* are to:

- Activate a best practice ADVANCE model on behalf of those underrepresented in STEM and their male counterparts.
- Provide a tool to the WEPAN community that can influence the retention of women in STEM.
- Train the Trainers.

### **Introduction**

#### **Rationale for this Specific Workshop Content**

The impetus for our strategy is based on first-hand knowledge of the challenges faculty face when required to articulate their *long-term* career goals via career style grant proposals, departmental strategic planning, or most importantly, their personal professional plans. Based on our experience as reviewers for two internal career sponsorship programs, faculty often present their research outcomes and significance clearly, but they struggle when asked to think critically about their own long-term career plans. Although we focus on the promotion and tenure process, this model can easily be modified for advancing to full professor, becoming a field leader, or preparing an application for a career style grant proposal (e.g., National Science Foundation CAREER program).

#### **Workshop Structure**

We served as facilitators in the review of the fictional Professor’s offer letter, departmental promotion and tenure guidelines, annual Chair review, internal and external teaching and research resources for faculty, and strategies for acquiring those resources. Attendees are guided through a step-by-step process regarding how to advise Professor Smart on attaining tenure.

The first section of the workshop is an overview of the various faculty evaluation documents (i.e., the letter of appointment, a memorandum of understanding, annual workload form, annual report, and annual reviews) currently utilized by our institution as well as how these documents are employed (i.e., permanent assignment of work expectations, one year and multi-year changes in teaching, research, and service assignments, annual evaluation and performance-based salary recommendation, promotion and/or tenure). Attendees are reminded that the workshop focuses on the connection between the departmental/College promotion and tenure

manual, the appointment letter, and annual reviews provided by the departmental faculty evaluation committee and chair. Sample text on research evaluation from various departmental promotion and tenure manuals are highlighted to illustrate common themes and differences across the institution.

During the second portion of the workshop, attendees are asked to review the fictional offer letter and complete the career development assessment table in terms of the *research criteria*. Specifically, attendees are asked to identify what the offer letter indicates is required for this new faculty member to be promoted to Associate Professor with the award of tenure. Attendees are then asked to review the third year annual review letter to determine where the faculty currently stands in terms of meeting these research requirements. They are then asked to identify the top priorities for this faculty member, an appropriate timeline for completing these tasks, tasks within and outside the scope of the faculty member, and the resources necessary to meet these research expectations.

### **Workshop Tools**

**Promotion and Tenure Guidelines:** At the University, we have University, College, and departmental promotion and tenure guidelines. Some Colleges utilize the University guidelines, some use one set of guidelines for their whole College, and some have department specific guidelines. These documents vary in length and detail. For example, within the College of Arts and Sciences, the departmental guidelines (which all utilize the same template) vary in size from nine pages (Chemistry) to forty-seven pages (English). We provided this information so that workshop participants become aware of the various models existing on our campus. Given the length of time scheduled for the workshop, we chose to provide sample text on research expectations from two departments, one with a more general description of research expectations and one with more specific research guidelines.

**Offer Letter (Appendix, Item A):** Through our contacts with the College Dean's office we were able to get a copy of a "real" redacted offer letter for a recently hired faculty member in the sciences.

**Annual Review Guidelines (Appendix, Item B):** Each year, the Office of the Provost (i.e., the Associate Provost for Academic Personnel) at the University provides sample annual review letters to Deans and Chairpersons. The sample letters follow a fictional tenure-track Assistant professor (Professor S. Smart) during her first, second, third, and critical year reviews (one in which tenure and promotion are recommended and one in which they are not). Each of the letters are written by Professor Smart's chairperson. We chose to use these sample letters as the foundation for our fictional "third year review" letter because (1) they are detailed letters that illustrate different kinds of circumstances Chairs and/or departmental committees may encounter in their yearly review of faculty (2) they represent "ideal" letters and thus are appropriate models for letter construction, and (3) because they are freely shared across the campus, many faculty are familiar with them. We used the redacted offer letter and the Professor Smart models to draft the fictional "third year review" letter. We then worked with the Associate Provost for

Academic Personnel (the promotion and tenure specialist at our institution) to create a final, approved document.

Career Development Assessment Table (Appendix, Item C): We created a chart to help faculty focus on what we believe are the most important of pieces of information—what is expected of this faculty member, where does she currently stand in terms of meeting those expectations, what does she need to do and when, and what resources does she need to be successful.

### **Description of What Happened in the Workshop**

After we complete the demonstration of the workshop process, we will share our experiences running two of these workshops on our campus. The workshop facilitators either wrote or dictated notes (i.e., data dumps) immediately following the last workshop. These data dumps are used to document our general perceptions, insights about the process. We have found this to be incredibly helpful in all aspects of our ADVANCE work. Here are our observations:

- (1) A larger number and variety of questions were posed in the first session. Several reasons could underlie this observation: as mentioned by another attendee, the first session of participants could have had more serious concerns and really needed the workshop to receive immediate answers, personality differences, or more questions could have been posed because there is a greater difference in guidelines from the colleges represented in the first session.
- (2) Faculty at the *Associate* level, regardless of their discipline, may have as many questions as the assistant professors. The main question was “how do you know when it is time to apply for promotion to Professor?”
- (3) Although the exercise focused on the research expectations for the fictional faculty member, the participants still asked questions about teaching and service.
- (4) One of the things that came up consistently when shown a copy of a “model evaluation letter” is that faculty are surprised by the content of that letter (i.e., that it contains both a formative and summative evaluation of their career). There seemed to be some general dissatisfaction with the feedback faculty receive so we spent some time addressing what can they do to try and rectify the situation (i.e., how can they ensure they receive a model evaluation letter).
- (5) Not all of the faculty members are writing narrative statements about their teaching, research, and service. One of them wasn’t even aware she could be putting a narrative statement into her file.
- (6) Utilizing realistic sample letters spurred more questions than we expected in a simple Q&A style session.
- (7) The workshop facilitator(s) can really assist in keeping the group on topic and ensuring that critical information is shared.

### **Implementation Results**

Our University campus is geographically dispersed thus we held separate workshops at two different (and on different days to accommodate various teaching schedules) campus locations to maximize opportunities for participation. A total of twelve faculty members participated in the

workshop, five on the first day and seven on the second day. Eleven of the workshop participants were female.

Table 1 is a summary of the evaluation data provided by the evaluators and the graduate research assistant. Ten workshop participants (representing approximately 83% of all participants) responded to the survey. The front page of the survey consisted of eight questions using a Likert scale of 1-5, with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 5 representing “strongly agree.” There was also one item asking for additional feedback on the workshop.

**Table 1. Summary of Event Survey Results:** Survey items are listed below in the order of the mean values generated by participants’ responses. The percent indicating strong agreement and agreement also are shown for each item.

Questionnaire Item	Mean	Strongly Agree	Agree
The workshop facilitators were able to answer my questions about promotion and tenure	5.00	90%*	0%
The workshop provided relevant examples to assist with understanding of annual evaluation.	4.70	70%	30%
The workshop has given me a better idea of how to make an action plan to advance my career.	4.70	70%	30%
The workshop helped me understand the promotion and tenure process.	4.67	60%*	30%
The workshop helped me develop skills for career planning.	4.44	40%*	50%
The workshop gave me effective strategies for pursuing career enhancement funding.	4.44	50%*	30%
The workshop increased my awareness of where to find resources related to the promotion and tenure process	4.20	40%	40%
The Career Development Assessment Table is a useful tool.	4.20	40%	50%

**\*One person did not respond.**

Respondents offered very positive assessments of all aspects of the workshop. Between 80-100 percent of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the eight statements about the workshop. It was encouraging to see that the item with the highest score was in regards to the workshop facilitators’ abilities to answer questions about the promotion and tenure process. It appears that, overall, the workshop was successful in providing knowledge to faculty about career advancement and the promotion and tenure process.

The participants were asked to *give any additional feedback on this event*. Three of the 30 respondents gave additional feedback recorded in the table below.

**Table 2. Additional Feedback**

The ones that I didn't circle were things I already knew and I didn't want to make it seem like a workshop didn't address those well
--

That's a great venue to discuss our career and interact with colleagues at the same stage in the career! Thanks!
--

This is so helpful. I will make sure to tap more of these resources.
--

## **Guidelines For Modifying and Applying this Workshop on other Campuses**

### **Key Players Who Need to be Present at the Workshop:**

- (1) A faculty member who has recently gone through the promotion and tenure process (preferably **not** someone who is there to brag about their own accomplishments). You need a faculty member who is committed to clarifying the process to other faculty members, honest, thoughtful, knows the process, and understands the potential differences in expectations across disciplines, colleges, etc.
- (2) Someone who is aware of the variety of internal and external “resources” to assist faculty in their research and/or teaching endeavors.
- (3) A faculty member who has served on departmental and college promotion and tenure committees and written letters as a Chair.
- (4) The promotion and tenure guru at your institution.
- (5) In addition, we also see the value of having representatives from each college if possible. This may not be manageable on a large scale. This approach can have a positive impact because the faculty members have access to administrators that may seem unapproachable. The challenge is ensuring that everyone feels comfortable asking questions without penalty.
- (6) A capable facilitator who is aware of the workshop goals.

### **Advice for Running the Workshop:**

- (1) Remember that the exercise is designed to facilitate a conversation about promotion and tenure.
- (2) Getting through the actual exercise is not the most important goal of the workshop.
- (3) Keep the groups fairly small, even if it requires running multiple workshops.
- (4) Have the administrators sit at the tables with the faculty members and begin casual conversations before the event begins. We had a “brown bag” session and provided cookies for dessert. Have the administrators literally bring their own brown bag lunch. Keep it informal.
- (5) Use realistic workshop materials.
- (6) Run through the exercise with members of your team and/or other faculty before you offer the workshop.
- (7) Be aware of the issues that make it difficult for junior faculty to ask critical questions about the promotion and tenure process.
- (8) Write similar scenarios and run workshops for Associate Professors.
- (9) Have all workshop resources reviewed and approved by your university promotion and tenure expert.

## **Acknowledgments**

Partial support for this work was provided by the National Science Foundation's ADVANCE IT Program under Award HRD-1007978. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

**Appendix: Workshop Materials**

**Item A: Offer letter**

Date

Dr. Smart

Address

City, State Zip Code

Dear Dr. Smart:

I am pleased to offer you a position as an Assistant Professor in the \_\_\_\_\_ Department in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University. The initial term of your appointment is from August 5, 2012 through May 15, 2013 at a nine-month salary rate of \$\_\_\_\_\_; the nine-month rate will be the basis for subsequent appointments and salary calculations. Your actual salary for this initial August 16, 2012 through May 15, 2013 period (during your first year only) will be \$\_\_\_\_\_. Your first paycheck during this time period will be issued on or about August 31, 2009. This position is full-time, tenure track, and benefits eligible. Medical coverage should begin September 1. This position is an Employee Category FT (Faculty Tenure-Track) and Salary Plan FT.

This offer of employment is conditioned upon approval by all the appropriate governmental authorities, and upon your ability to provide satisfactory documentation verifying your eligibility to work for the University in the above-mentioned position. The University is required to maintain Federal I-9 Forms that verify each employee's identity and eligibility to work in the USA. To comply with federal requirements, new employees must bring employment eligibility and identity documentation to Employee Data Services (EDS) before their first day of paid employment. Please see the website for the list of acceptable documents as well as employee processing locations and hours. If you are a U.S. citizen or resident alien, your social security card and driver's license will be requested. If you are a nonresident alien you must contact the Assistant Director of Immigration Services, immediately at (XXX)XXX-XXXX. You will need to complete I-9 paperwork five working days prior to August 16, 2012 in order to be employed effective August 16. Processing this paperwork after that date will result in a prorated salary.

Your recruitment is part of an increased emphasis on research activity in the college of arts and sciences. You are expected to develop a strong, externally funded research program in your specialty within the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ and to contribute as is appropriate to your research area to interdisciplinary research initiatives.

This appointment is offered in accordance with the provision of the Board of Governor's Policy 2 and the Faculty Handbook. As with all positions in higher education, it is subject to the availability of State funds and approval of the appropriate expenditure schedule.

Your employment at the University is governed by the rules and policies contained in these documents, and by other policies adopted by the University, the College, and by the faculty and administration of the Department of \_\_\_\_\_, as they are and as they may from time to time be changed. Significant policies and procedures include, but are not limited to, University statements that address evaluation, promotion and tenure, conflict of interests, outside professional interests, intellectual property, and integrity and compliance. It is your responsibility to be aware of these policies and procedures as well as others that may apply to you. Further information concerning your privileges and duties as a faculty member may be obtained by contacting your Chair.

All faculty are reviewed annually. The initial review of tenure-track faculty is required in January of the first full academic year. Your continued appointment is dependent upon your fulfillment of the responsibilities of this position, as they were stated in the position announcement, and as they are changed over time.

Annual evaluations in this position will follow the accepted procedures in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ and the College. During the fourth year of your appointment, the annual review will be more rigorous, to determine the extent to which you are making clear progress toward tenure. By this time, your teaching should be at a level

such that if sustained you would be judged as making a significant contribution in teaching. Because significant contributions in research are expected, there will be particular focus on the expectation for you to have developed an active and independent research program that is supported through competitive extramural research funding, that yields publications (normally in high-quality, peer-reviewed print or electronic journals), and that provides research training and experience for students, including opportunities to conduct thesis and dissertation research. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching and/or failure to achieve an independent research program by the time of your fourth-year review could lead to the issuance of a terminal contract at that time or in a subsequent year.

In this probationary tenure-track appointment, tenure must have been awarded by the end of your sixth year on the faculty; that is, by the end of the 2017-18 academic year, your "critical year." If you have not earned tenure by that time, you will be offered a terminal contract for your seventh year of employment. During your fourth year of employment, you will have the opportunity to request that your critical year be moved one year earlier, to the 2016-17 academic year. Should you make such a request, and should it be granted, a tenure decision would be required in the new critical year instead of the original critical year. If this option is exercised and you have not earned tenure by the end of 2016-17, you will be offered a one-year terminal contract for 2017-18.

Enclosed are copies of the University Policy and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation and the College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. Information about requirements for promotion and tenure may also be found in Policy 2 and the Faculty Handbook. These documents will give you a better sense of specific requirements for promotion and tenure that you will be expected to meet. During the time of appointment as assistant professor and thereafter, you will be expected to engage in the three major functions of the University: research, teaching and service. You will note that the University criteria indicate that in order to be recommended for tenure a faculty member is normally expected during the probationary period to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching and research, and reasonable contributions in service, at the University. The normal proportional values of this tenure track assignment allocated to teaching, research, and service are as follows: 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. The assignment may be adjusted in accord with circumstances documented in your annual workload plans; however, regardless of these proportions, you will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in both teaching and research, and at least reasonable contributions in service.

In the area of teaching, you will be expected to demonstrate effectiveness as a teacher in classroom and laboratory contexts at the undergraduate and graduate levels, including graduate student supervision. Your teaching assignment during the fall 2012 semester will be: \_\_\_\_\_ . In the spring 2013 semester, you will teach \_\_\_\_\_. Your teaching assignment thereafter will be determined in consultation with your department Chair in accord with Department and College needs. To provide concentrated time to enable you to write proposals and articles, you will not be assigned teaching during one semester of the 2013-2014 academic year.

Sustained meritorious teaching evaluations of "good" or "excellent" combined with documented achievement in supervising and mentoring graduate and undergraduate students in your laboratory will constitute significant contributions in teaching. Classroom teaching will be evaluated by the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ faculty and by Student Evaluations of Instruction. You will be expected to include the results of Student Evaluations of Instruction for each of your classes in your department personnel file. You are encouraged to also include other documentation of teaching accomplishments and effectiveness in your file for annual review, including assessment of classroom teaching processes and evidence of students' achieving intended learning outcomes.

In the area of research, you will be expected to maintain an active independent research program that is supported by extramural research funding; that yields publications in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals; and that provides research training and experience for the Department's students, including opportunities for students to conduct thesis and dissertation research. In order to achieve a record of significant contribution, and to be promoted and granted tenure, you are expected to have secured two significant grants, as principal investigator or major co-investigator, from agencies such as NSF, NIH, the Department of Energy, or Department of Defense. I want to emphasize that the decision for promotion and tenure will be based primarily on your demonstration of significant and meritorious contributions in research and teaching activities, and at least reasonable contributions in service.

Your service assignments, although not yet specified, may include contributions to the Department, College, University, profession, and public-at-large. For purposes of promotion and tenure, you are expected to perform at least reasonable service responsibilities at a satisfactory level. Meritorious (i.e., beyond satisfactory) service contribution usually includes steady, on-going service to the department beyond sporadic committee work, along with some service to the University, the profession, and society.

To assist you in your transition to this tenure track position and to help establish your research program, you will have access to \$\_\_\_\_\_ in start-up funds to be used primarily during the first two years of your appointment, with exceptions as defined by prior agreement with your Chair in consultation with the Dean. These funds have been budgeted for: seven days of salary in the summer of 2012 (as noted above); two months of salary in the summer of 2013; two months of salary in the summer of 2014; one month of salary in summer 2015; \$\_\_\_\_\_ for equipment, general expenses, and travel; and \$\_\_\_\_\_ for postdoctoral research associate support and for GRA support for two summers. The exact amounts may shift across categories, subject to approval of your Chair.

As acknowledgment of these general conditions and the more specific aspects of your employment, please sign and return the original of this letter within two weeks of receipt. A copy of the letter is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions about the offer, conditions of employment, or specific assignments that cannot be answered by Dr. \_\_\_\_\_, do not hesitate to contact me. We look forward to your joining the University and the College.

Sincerely,

John Doe  
Dean

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Birthdate: \_\_\_\_\_

\*Please provide an official transcript posting the highest degree you have earned. Send to the Associate Dean, Office of the Dean - College of Arts and Sciences, PO Box XXXX, XXXX, XX XXXXX-XXXX.

c: Department Chair  
Assistant Dean for Finances

**Item B: Sample Letter: Third Annual Review**

January 12, 2015

Dr. S. A. Smart  
Department of Social Ecology  
College of Human Ecology  
XXX University

Dear Dr. Smart:

The Department of Human Ecology Personnel Committee has reviewed your performance during the 2013-14 academic year, which was your third review as a tenure track faculty. As the Committee's letter of January 6 indicates, they believe your performance to be excellent in research and teaching and good in service. By a 4 to 1 vote, the Committee recommended your continuation on the faculty. I concur with the majority of the committee, based on your performance in the areas discussed below.

Instruction

According to your appointment letter "you will be expected to demonstrate effectiveness as a teacher in the classroom and laboratory contexts at the undergraduate and graduate levels, including graduate student supervision".

During Fall Semester, 2013 you taught one undergraduate section of "The Principles of Social Ecology". This was the third semester you taught this particular undergraduate course.

During Spring Semester, 2014 you taught one graduate section of "Social Interaction and Space." This was the second semester you taught this course.

Current course syllabi were included in your personnel file for the undergraduate and graduate courses you taught. As was the case during previous reviews, the course syllabi for each course was well developed and appropriately organized. The technique of grouping readings, video tapes to be viewed, and classroom topics in the "Principles of Social Ecology" syllabus appeared to be especially effective.

Student rating of your instruction in each of your courses suggest you are viewed as an outstanding instructor. On a five point scale rating your teaching effectiveness (Question 22), your mean rating was 4.4; the mean rating of other instructors in the University was 4.0.

I have also had the opportunity to review your narrative about your teaching, course review sheets, sample exams, class exercises/assignments, grading rubrics, project descriptions, and student evaluation summaries for each of your assigned courses. The evidence indicates that you invest considerable time and effort into your teaching. Your consistently high SEI scores and the positive open-ended comments demonstrate that students appreciate these efforts.

Your teaching contributions also include supervising three undergraduate students in your laboratory and serving as a chair or committee member on three graduate student thesis/dissertation committees.

I commend you for your accomplishments in the area of teaching. Now that you have successfully taught each of these courses several times, I advise you to be judicious in the effort you dedicate in the instructional mission at this point in your career. I continue to be supportive of a more circumscribed approach to teaching these courses.

In sum, I find your teaching performance for 2011 to be of high merit and rating a performance measure of “**excellent**”. In addition, I find that you are making very good progress toward the significant contribution in teaching required for promotion to associate rank with tenure.

### Research

As stated in your appointment letter “In the area of research, you will be expected to maintain an active independent research program that is supported by extramural research funding; that yields publications in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals; and that provides research training and experience for the Department’s students, including opportunities for students to conduct thesis and dissertation research”.

The 2010-11 academic year was one in which you made some progress in your research program. An article accepted during the 2009-10 academic year was published and credited in 2011. In addition, you reported the presentation of three research papers at international/national meetings. All three papers reflect research beyond the scope of your dissertation. While you have been quite diligent in your research efforts, I note that these efforts did not lead to any new peer-reviewed journal article submissions in 2011. To date, you have a total of three refereed articles published, all based on your dissertation.

You submitted (as the principal investigator) an application for NSF funding growing out of your summer Senate Research Grant funding. The NSF application was funded for \$105,200 and will be of great assistance to you in establishing your research program. The grant will support a portion of your salary and a graduate research assistant to facilitate your research efforts. Your receipt of this funding reflects positively on you and the department. You should be congratulated for this accomplishment. To date, you have secured one significant grant from a prominent external funding agency.

In sum, I find your research productivity for 2011 (one article, one funded external grant, three presentations) to be of high merit and rating a performance measure of “**excellent**”.

However, the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee indicates that *your overall research publications* are not what they would expect, given the emphasis that Departmental criteria place on scholarly publication. Earlier reviews have also indicated the need to increase your record of scholarly publications. As the Personnel Committee's letter indicates, it was this mixed response to your research productivity that resulted in one negative vote on your retention. Since research is one of the two areas in which you are expected to make significant contributions, it is important that you consistently demonstrate more than satisfactory performance in this area. The prior two reviews rated your research efforts as satisfactory. The failure to maintain improvement in this area could result in a recommendation from me against retention at the time of your next annual review.

Your top priority for 2012 should be peer reviewed article submissions and acquisitions and acquiring additional external funding. I encourage you to meet with me as soon as possible to review your 2012 publication plans and if necessary to identify resources to assist in developing a strategy for completing publications.

### Service

As found in your appointment letter, “you are expected to perform at least reasonable service responsibilities at a satisfactory level. Meritorious (i.e., beyond satisfactory) service contribution usually includes steady, on-going service to the department beyond sporadic committee work, along with some service to the University, the profession, and society”.

I was pleased to learn that you have expanded your service activities during your last review. You continue to serve on a departmental curriculum committee and have been appointed to the College Faculty Welfare Committee. Your materials included a curriculum proposal you submitted to the department, which was well-developed and well-written.

You have also served as an unpaid consultant to the State Department of Health in the area of spatial interactions. A letter from the Assistant Director of the Department expresses appreciation for the contributions you have made.

The increased service activities you have engaged in and the positive response to that service suggests you are meeting the goal of making reasonable contributions in service. I rate your service as “**good**”.

### Conclusions

As stated in your appointment letter “Your continued appointment is dependent upon your fulfillment of the responsibilities of this position, as they were stated in the position

announcement, and as they are changed over time”. Based on my review of your file, I want to remind you that you should also be mindful of the expectations laid out in our unit’s promotion and tenure guidelines. It is also important to note that it is your responsibility to be aware of all University and College policies, procedures, and statements concerning evaluation, promotion and tenure, conflict of interests, outside professional interests, intellectual property, and integrity and compliance.

Your performance in the area of research and teaching during the 2010-11 academic year was **excellent** and your service performance was **good**. The major concern I have after reviewing your performance during that year deals with the quantity of the peer reviewed articles you have produced. I encourage you to take the steps necessary to improve in this category, to a level that can be characterized as good or, preferably, excellent.

Please schedule a conference with me as soon as possible, so that we can discuss any questions you have about this evaluation, and also ways in which your performance in research can be further strengthened.

Sincerely,

C. D. McKee, Chair

- c Smart Personnel File
- I. Sotopé, Dean, College of Human Ecology (for information)

**Item C: Career Development Assessment Table**

Career Development: Assessment Table						
Criteria	Status: Where Do I Stand?	Action: Goal From Here?	Timeline	My Sphere of Influence	External Sphere of Influence	Resources Required