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Introduction

Research in HDFS

The Department of Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) is committed to high-quality research with the aims of improving the health and well-being of diverse individuals, families and communities across the lifespan. In our research, we recognize, as a core value, the central role of diversity and interdependence among children, families, and communities in human developmental processes. Our department comprises interdisciplinary scholars, within the department’s signature areas of Early Childhood Development and Family Resiliency, who focus on understanding human development and family relationships, and using this knowledge to design prevention and interventions programs to improve the well-being of children, families, and communities.

By definition, interdisciplinary implies that problems cannot be solved by one discipline; the strength in our department’s approach is drawing together expertise from multiple disciplines to address the world’s most pressing problems. The commitment of our faculty to social justice and applied intervention development make us strong partners in applied, translational research addressing traditionally disenfranchised individuals, families and communities. Our interdisciplinary faculty are collaborating with colleagues across other departments within the College of Social Science, across colleges including the College of Education, the College of Human Medicine, and the College of Nursing, and across universities, nationally and internationally.

Our departmental commitment to the health and well-being of individuals, families and communities aligns with national and international thematic priorities set by leading agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and the World Health Organization. Related, the expectation is that faculty in the department develop extramurally-funded research programs around relevant thematic priorities. To date, the department’s faculty have been highly successful in obtaining extramural support from agencies such as the Administration for Children and Families, the National Institutes of Health, the U.S. Department of Defense, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the National Science Foundation, and the Institute of Education Sciences.

Departmental Resources

Our department includes two structures that serve the community and which provide a context in which to conduct applied research: the Child Development Laboratory (CDL), and the Couple and Family Therapy (CFT) clinic. The CDL offers full-day programs for children ages six weeks through five years, and half-day preschool programs for children three through five years of age.
The Child Development Laboratory schools also offer inclusive educational programming and applied classroom-based intervention for children with autism and other neurodevelopmental disabilities. Graduate students and faculty within HDFS and from units across campus have conducted research, including externally-funded research at the CDL. The CFT clinic offers clinical services to individuals, couples, and families from the surrounding community and advanced doctoral training as one of an elite group of accredited CFT programs that provide research-intensive environments. The CFT clinic serves as an active research site for graduate students and for faculty.

**Guidelines for Faculty Workload**

All tenure-stream faculty are expected to have an active program of research and to be active in teaching and service/outreach. Regarding research expectations and productivity, faculty are expected to work toward developing and sustaining national and international reputations based on original research, scholarship, and publications. It is expected that this body of work is supported by external funding and that faculty actively seek funding to advance their research agendas. Although there are variations in workload appointments across faculty, some with heavier research loads and some with heavier teaching loads, all faculty are expected to have an active program of research pursuant to their workloads in alignment with College of Social Science research expectations, and the University’s Research Intensive designation. The standard workload expectations for tenured faculty members is 50% research, 38% instruction (three courses per year), and 12% service/outreach. A reduction in teaching load is possible for tenured faculty through extramural grant support, and in some cases for labor-intensive administrative roles (e.g., Graduate Education director). Most faculty with extramural grants have a reduced teaching load through salary recovery from the grants. Consistent with the College of Social Science expectations, the standard workload expectation for pretenured faculty in the department is 50% research, 38% instruction (three courses per year), and 12% service/outreach.

It is to the benefit of the department for faculty members to have fruitful and satisfying careers. The details in this research plan are designed to provide clarity on expectations of productivity as well as information on examples of strategies to support faculty productivity. As noted elsewhere in this document (pages 7-10) and in the College of Social Science Research Plan (see College Support and Incentives for Research Activity in the CSS research plan), both the department and the college are invested in the success of the faculty. Faculty are encouraged to use annual evaluation meetings with the Chairperson as opportunities to be proactive in planning for their success and the continued success in their careers.

**Measuring Research Productivity**

Faculty productivity is assessed each year using a formal points-based review by the Department Advisory Committee (four elected tenure stream faculty members serving a two-year term), advisory to the Department Chairperson who makes the final determination (See Appendix A for the Annual Report). To assist in the review process, faculty in Human Development and Family Studies submit an Annual Report to the Chairperson that provides a detailed summary of their work for the year across research, teaching, and service/outreach. The Annual Report includes a quantitative summary of productivity as well as an optional narrative faculty may elect to complete to provide additional information about their productivity in a given year. These reports
are used by the Chairperson and the Department Advisory Committee to evaluate faculty productivity, as well as to guide the Chairperson’s determination of merit and market raise increases for the year. Consistent with the College of Social Science’s expectations that faculty are developing and sustaining national and international reputations based on their original research, prioritized in the annual evaluation are research activities, including peer-reviewed publications in high-quality journals (i.e., journals with an impact factor of at least 1.0—the Department’s standard for quality, reputable journals) (see Appendix B for examples of journals with IFs of at least 1.0; note that the list is not exhaustive), and external funding for research, especially funding from those sources that generate high indirect cost return, with an emphasis on funding from federal sources (such as the National Institutes of Health, the U.S. Department of Defense, and the National Science Foundation). Other valued scholarly publications, such as book chapters and edited or authored books published in respected academic presses, are important scholarly contributions, but are not the main priority considered in determining research productivity; nor should chapters and edited/authored books be the only type of publication that faculty are concentrating on.

External funding is an essential component of faculty productivity and measure of their scholarship reputation. This is not only a department requirement but is a key College and University objective. This is especially critical in the consideration of eligibility for promotion to Professor; in the College of Social Science guidelines, the essential qualifications for promotion to Professor are “continued scholarly activity with impact, evidence of heightened professional stature and leadership in the field, and a record of receiving support for research from external sources.” Additionally, the College of Social Science research plan makes a clear link to the University’s priority for faculty-generated extramural support, on pages 1-2 of the plan:

Generating external support for research is an important university objective. The University administration links its allocation of financial resources to the colleges (e.g., new faculty hiring lines, “start-up” funds for new faculty, and support for new projects) to performance metrics that include production of external research awards. The College of Social Science is responding to this challenge by encouraging a culture that emphasizes the development of greater external support and the recognition of success in this area. All academic departments and schools are expected to contribute to this objective within their own disciplinary cultures.

Metrics to Evaluate Faculty Productivity

The research plan for the College has been clear that the faculty are to establish and maintain consistent patterns of productivity via publications in peer-reviewed, high quality journals and ongoing grant activity. The following metrics are used to define productivity and will be considered collectively as general indicators of quality.

Scholarly publications. Metrics for scholarly publication include: Number of peer-reviewed publications, quality rating of journal, order of authorship, book chapters, books and edited books published by established academic presses, and citation rates. There are several indicators of journal quality. These include the impact factor of the journal, affiliation of the journal with a national/international scholarly association such (e.g. American Psychological Association, the National Council on Family Relations, the American Association for Marriage
and Family Therapy, the Society for Research in Child Development), placement of the journal in indexes such as PubMed, reputation of the journal in the field, and acceptance and rejection rates of the journal. Faculty in HDFS are expected to lead publications, to participate as co-authors, and to mentor students in the publishing of quality peer-reviewed journal articles. Given the inter-disciplinary nature of our work, multi-authored publications are common and are valued. Faculty should plan to have a combination of publications including first- or sole-authored, second and other-authored, and student lead-authored publications. Credit will be given for a balanced publication record within each review year. In the case of an Annual Report with all other-authored (3rd plus) and/or all student-led publications in the period of review, credit will be given but to a lesser degree than a review period that includes a first/sole and second authored publications. Faculty are expected to publish in journals with the highest impact factor possible, including those journals meeting a minimum cut off of 1.0; in the case of publication in a high impact journal of 4 and greater, higher points will be given in recognition of this achievement.

A journal’s impact factor is a measure that reflects the average number of citations of recent articles published in the journals; it is used as a proxy of the importance of a journal in the field. While the department is sympathetic to journals with lower impact factors and no impact factors, particularly if a manuscript is guaranteed to have a sizable impact on practice and policy, the expectation is that faculty are routinely publishing in journals with an impact factor of 1.0 or higher. Faculty publishing in unranked or low-ranking journals should be sure that they balance their publication portfolio with manuscripts in ranked journals. In the Social Sciences, journal impact factors typically range from 1.0 to 6.0 as follows. In a review of 193 journals ranked across psychology, family studies, human development, social work, and nursing with impact factors 1 or greater (See Appendix B) approximately 54% of these journals have impact factors between 1.0 and 1.99; approximately 28% have impact factors between 2.0 and 2.99; approximately 8% have impact factors between 3.0 and 3.99; and, approximately, 6% have impact factors 4.0 or greater. In the case of newer journals that are not yet in the rating system, faculty may report acceptance/rejection rates or other evidence of quality in their year-end reports to the Chairperson. The department recommendation is to use the 5-year impact factor (unless the journal is newer than 5 years). These should be found on the Web of Science Journal Citation Report https://jcr-incites-thomsonreuters-com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/JCRJournalHomeAction.action

Citations should be reported from Google Scholar.

The department recognizes that the context of publications provides critical information on how to interpret the numbers of publications (e.g. one publication in a journal with an impact factor of 5 as compared to two publications in a journal with an impact factor of 1.3 is an example of many potential variations in publication records in a given year). Generally, faculty should have, at a minimum, 1-2 papers published per year with additional expectations for faculty with greater research assignments (e.g., 1-2 papers for research appointments in the 10% to 37% range; 3 or more papers for faculty with research appointments in the 38% to 50% range; and 4 or more for faculty in the 62.5% range. Again, publications may reflect a balance of first and other-authored manuscripts. Because there are fluctuations in rates of publications from year to year (e.g. due to events such as the timeliness with which journals process manuscripts, heavy data collection occurring within a review year, illness), the Chairperson will also consider the average number
of publication over the immediate past three year period as an indicator of ongoing research productivity and general consistency of productivity, to take into account the fluctuation of productivity within a time window. Faculty may choose to report in-press papers among publications in a given year. In this case, however, in-press papers should not be reported again in subsequent review periods as in print.

**Citations of Work.** While publishing manuscripts is an important metric, the influence that a manuscript has on a field is also an important consideration. The quality of a paper is also determined by how much it is cited by other scholars. Because of this quality metric, each faculty member will be asked to list the five most highly-cited papers in the most recent five-year period as indicated by Google Scholar (e.g. if a paper was published in the year 2011 and was cited 33 times in the last five years [i.e. 2011-2015 for a 2015 annual review], faculty would report the citation for that paper as 33. Information on citations also provides additional context for a faculty member’s publication record.

**Research funding.** Metrics for research funding include: Volume of grants (number of research grants submitted, resubmitted, scored, awarded, dollar amount of awards); source of external grants (federal, state, industry, foundation, association, other); external vs. internal funding; resources generated by grant (indirect cost return, involvement/support of graduate students with research assistantships (preferable), undergraduate students, involvement of untenured faculty in senior faculty programs of funded research); level of participation (PI or Co-PI, Co-1, other roles); number of collaborative/cross-college proposals; number of graduate students with external funding for research (fellowships, dissertation awards); and, sabbatical leaves funded by outside sources. Consulting roles on grants are viewed as academic/scholarship service rather than as an active grant role in support of the faculty member’s program of research, percent effort; as such, consulting roles on grants are not counted as being “grant active.” While evaluating the merit of a grant needs to occur on a grant by grant basis, in principle, grants will be evaluated with higher merit if the faculty is a PI or Co-PI, if it is a Federal grant, if it brings in the full IDC rate negotiated for that agency (e.g. 52% for NIH; 30% for USDA), if it funds graduate students, if it pays at least 10% of a faculty members salary, and if it is external. In addition to the promotion of faculty members’ programs of research and contributions to science, grant funding plays a critical role in increasing the stature of the department and the university, both of which are key in garnering university resources and in recruiting and retaining excellent faculty in the department, and in fully funding graduate students, a key consideration in the department’s ability to recruit and maintain the strongest students. When reporting grant activity, faculty should not report funding as active if the end date for the funding, as stated by the awarding agency, has passed. Faculty may note no cost extensions (in which the active funding has ended but funds are being spent and work continues) in their optional narratives, specifying the continuing work underway.

**Comments on Teaching and Service/Outreach**

The goal of this document is to outline expectations relative to research productivity within the department. However, faculty contributions to teaching and service/outreach will also be reflected in annual Activity Reports. Below the document provides a basic overview of teaching and outreach, with more specificity on expectations provided in the Department’s Promotion and Tenure document.
**Teaching.** Faculty are expected to engage in high quality teaching in undergraduate and graduate courses. The university assesses the quality of teaching via the Student Information Rating System (SIR). Faculty report SIRs scores on the Activity Report. SIRs are expected to fall in the above average to superior ranges (1.0-2.99) for areas assessed. The department recognizes some variation in SIRs based on class size (larger classes tend to garner lower SIRs than smaller classes) and by type of classroom (online classes tend to garner lower SIRs than in-person classes); however, it is not impossible to achieve SIRs in the exceptional range for larger classes and online classes. In addition to SIRs, faculty also have opportunities to report other aspects of quality which would be described and documented on the Activity Report and include activities such as: collecting pre and post course data to assess student learning; collecting mid-term feedback from students and making adjustments to improve the delivery of the course; participating in teaching workshops (e.g., through Faculty Organization and Development) and making adjustments to teaching methods, and the integration of innovative technology methods in courses, to name a few.

**Service/Outreach.** Faculty are expected to serve on departmental and college and/or university committees as needed and to engage in other forms of academic service such as serving on committees of scholarly organizations. Outreach efforts are also reported and underscore the land grant mission of the university. Examples of outreach efforts include presentations to community organizations and to community research partners.

**Compiling Annual Report Data**

As noted, faculty will prepare and submit a required Annual Report. In addition to the report, faculty may include an optional, brief narrative as context for their performance for the year.

Points across research, teaching, service/outreach will be summed within each category (research, teaching, service/outreach), and totaled for the final point allotment. Below are general guidelines for interpreting ranges of points across research, teaching, service and outreach for faculty. It is important to note that the descriptions below are general examples with the understanding that faculty activities will vary.

**Superior Performance.** A typical faculty member with a superior performance in the review year will have exceptional achievements and are likely to have 5 or more publications (including some 1st authored publications) in high impact journals (with impact factors greater than 1.0); multiple or large federal grants; multiple presentations at national or international conferences; national service such as journal editor, chair of a grant review panel, or national leadership as an officer for a major professional organization); and show strong departmental citizenship. Teaching activities will be exceptional (including exceptional SIRs, exceptional qualitative feedback), will include the use of innovative teaching methods, and will include outstanding mentorship of students on research. In particular, strong mentorship of students is noted by the faculty actively involving students in the consistent production and delivery of high-impact peer-reviewed publications and presentations, and in grant-writing activities. Research should have strong outreach components (relevance of the research in influencing policy, practice, communities, etc.).
**Strong Performance.** Typical faculty with strong performance are likely to have 3 or more publications (including at least one 1st authored publication) in high impact journals (with impact factors greater than 1.0), multiple federal grant submissions and/or an active external grants, several presentations at national or international conferences, strong academic service (for junior faculty this would include activities such as actively reviewing manuscripts for key journals; for senior faculty, this would editorial roles, participation on a grant review panel, service on a national board, etc.), and show strong departmental citizenship. Teaching activities will be exceptional (including exceptional to above average SIRs, strong qualitative feedback), will include the use of innovative teaching methods, and will include strong mentorship of students on research (publications, presentations). Faculty should be actively involving students in research. Research should have outreach components (relevance of the research in influencing policy, practice, communities, etc.).

**Meets Expectations.** Typical faculty meeting expectations are likely to have 2 or more publications in high quality journals with impact factors greater than 1.0 in the review year (with at least one article been first or second author), at least one external grant submission or active external grant, some presentations at national or international conferences, active role as ad hoc reviewer for journals, and show strong departmental citizenship. Teaching activities will be solid (including good to average SIRs, solid qualitative feedback), will include the use of solid teaching methods, and will include some mentorship of students on research (e.g., involvement in presentations). Research should have outreach components (relevance of the research in influencing policy, practice, communities, etc.).

**Below Expectations.** Typical faculty not meeting expectations will have records within the review year that reflect limited (no or 1) publications in high impact journals with impact factors over 1 or with publications only appearing in journals without impact factors or with impact factors less than 1.0, limited grant activity (no submissions for external funding; participates only as a consultant on grants, rather than having salary covered by grants), no presentations at national or international conferences, lack of involvement of students in research. Teaching activities are minimal and SIRS scores may be low (3.0-5.0).

In addition, the aggregate data on publications (total number in the year), research dollars requested and received, and citations over the past 5 years for the five most highly cited papers in Google Scholar per faculty FTE will be transformed into a per faculty measure by dividing the total number of Tenure System Faculty (General Fund FTE). These data will be useful to evaluate our departmental performance relative to our peer institutions.

**Increasing the Quality and Quantity of Research Activity**

The articulation of signature areas of research excellence is an important way to identify the unique niche that our department fills in the College and University and the ways it adds value to the institution through research. Identification of significant areas of faculty expertise and capacity increases the visibility of faculty, encourages cross-college collaborations, enables administrators to highlight research contributions to constituents, and attracts grant dollars. Current signature areas of research excellence include Early Child Development (aspects of communication in early development which include: language and literacy, communication
behaviors in children with disabilities and their families, communication of and messages about emotions, communication about food and feeding regulation related to obesity risks), and Family Resiliency (immigration, military returning from war, homeless families, family violence, mental health in families, families of children in foster care, socioeconomic disadvantage). Our core value in the appreciation and promotion of diversity is reflected in work across the department on diverse children, youth and adolescents and families in challenging contexts.

There are a number of potential strategies to increasing the quality and quantity of research productivity. Two key strategies include internal funds for which a faculty member could apply via a proposal to the Chairperson to use in hiring a grant consultant or external reviewer in the preparation of an external grant application and funds for statistical consultation on the preparation of an external grant application. Other examples of strategies include reductions in teaching loads when a faculty member’s external grant funds a graduate student for that semester on a .50 research assistantship. For an externally-funded grant, a portion of the indirect costs are also directed back to the faculty member for professional use; this rate varies very slightly from year to year depending on departmental budgetary considerations. We are the only department in the College of Social Science, at present, that offers a portion of indirect costs to support faculty achieving excellence in their research programs. Faculty and area groups may discuss with the Chairperson other strategies to promote high quality research.

**Expectations for Faculty at Different Ranks**

All tenure-stream faculty are expected to work toward developing and sustaining national and international reputations based on original research, scholarship, and publications, and this body of work is expected to result in externally-supported projects whose source and scope is appropriate to their discipline and area of expertise. Critically important is the evidence of a consistent, ongoing program of original research as evidenced by publishing in high quality peer-reviewed journals or academic presses and obtaining external funding for research as described earlier in the document.

**Pre-Tenure Faculty**

Faculty hired at the level of assistant professor are expected to be ready to begin a reputable and sustainable program of research. Preference is given to those who have completed post-doctoral training, have experience in an externally-funded research setting, a promising record of first-authored publications in high impact peer reviewed journals, and a continuing connection to strong, funded, research mentors. Faculty hired at the advanced assistant or associate level (but not entering with tenure) would be expected to have a strong record of publication and success in seeking and obtaining external funding for their research (though not necessarily as PI). The College of Social Science Research plan states the following regarding new faculty hires:

*Candidates for faculty positions should demonstrate a capacity to publish lead-authored (e.g., first listed or corresponding author) original articles in high-quality, refereed journals; peer-reviewed chapters for edited books; and/or books by highly regarded academic presses; and to attract appropriate external support to facilitate their research and scholarship. If the candidate is a new Ph.D., there should be clear evidence of the potential for such qualities during their graduate training.*
Assistant professors are expected to publish regularly in high impact peer-reviewed journals with first-authorship on several publications. As noted, while the department is sympathetic to journals with lower impact factors and no impact factors, particularly if a manuscript is guaranteed to have a sizable impact on practice and policy, the expectation is that faculty are routinely publishing in journals with an impact factor of 1.0 or higher. HDFS does not specify a number of publications required for incoming- and developing- assistant professors, because publications depend also on the quality of the outlet as well as other considerations including marked productivity in other areas (e.g., extramural funding). That said, it is common for candidates interviewing for assistant professor positions to have multiple publications, even if they are entering the position directly from graduate school.

Assistant professors, in line with the College of Social Science research plan, are expected to take the initiative and seek external support for their work:

_During an assistant professor’s initial probation period and after their probation review they are expected to seek external support for their research either as a project director, principal investigator, or as key personnel supported by grants or contracts._

Ideally, assistant professors would also collaborate with senior researchers on extramurally-sponsored projects. Examples of funding expected at the level of assistant professor (and even post-doctoral researcher) would include a role of PI on a small federal grant (e.g., a R-03 or R-21 from the National Institutes of Health; a new investigator award from the Centers for Disease Control) or a Co-PI or Co-I on a federal grant. Acquiring an internal source of funding, such as seed grants from Michigan State University, is important to initiate research and collect pilot data. However, there is the expectation that this internal funding would lead to larger applications for external support. Credit is given for active submission of high quality grant applications. While it is important that assistant professors have had experience in applying for external funding and working on grants, they are not currently required to have acquired extramural funding as PI to obtain tenure. Further detail is contained in the department’s “Guidelines for promotion and tenure” (2007).

**Post Tenure Faculty**

The tenured faculty in the department include those who came up through the rank of assistant professor as well as faculty hired in with tenure. Faculty hired at the full professor level would be expected to have a strong national reputation, an established program of research, and experience with externally funded grants as PI or Co-PI. During the post tenure period, faculty are expected to build on their pretenure research accomplishments, and use these as a launching pad to further their professional development and in sustaining their national and international scholarship reputations. The College of Social Science has the expectation that all tenure-stream faculty members—regardless of rank—will seek external support for research. The CSS research document states clearly:

_Associate Professors and Professors are expected to develop and sustain their national and international reputations based on original research, scholarship, and publications._
and to lead (e.g., principal investigator, project director) externally-supported projects whose source and scope is appropriate to their discipline and area of expertise.

Tenured faculty are expected to maintain a consistent, sustainable record of research that produces significant peer reviewed publications in high impact journals and external funding support. Presumably, those already at the rank of full professor would continue to meet these standards. The College of Social Science, within the larger context of Michigan State University’s Research Intensive designation, sets a high bar for full professors:

*The essential qualifications for promotion to Professor are continued scholarly activity with impact, evidence of heightened professional stature and leadership in the field, and a record of receiving support for research from external sources.*

As noted, fluctuations in research productivity are expected. However, sustained periods of inactivity are problematic as this pattern does not meet the expectations of tenured faculty members in the College of Social Science. Patterns of inactivity sustained over a two to three year period include: a lack of productivity in publishing, obtaining grants, mentoring graduate students, and other related research activity. More specifically, this research inactivity could include sustained periods (e.g., two to three years) with minimal publication activity (no publications or fewer than 2 publications in journals with an impact factor of at least 1.0 over a consecutive three-year period) and/or a tendency to publish only in unranked journals with no impact factors or impact factors below 1.0, publishing only books or book chapters, lack of involvement of graduate students in publications and other research activities, a decline in presenting at professional meetings, and minimal grant activity (i.e., no funded grants funded or attempts to secure extramural funding). While the department recognizes fluctuations in activity, on occasion, from year to year, a sustained lack of activity (e.g., evidenced over two to three years) is problematic. Faculty who have any concerns about their productivity should be proactive and meet with the Chairperson to discuss strategies for improvement and reasonable resources to support improvement.

The Chairperson and DAC will annually review each case and consider any unique extenuating circumstances as reasons for the loss of productivity. The Chairperson will meet with the faculty member and implement a Faculty Development Plan (as specified in the College of Social Science Policy on Faculty Development; See Appendix D) to rectify the situation. Typically, this process includes a two-year retooling phase in which these faculty would create, in consultation with the HDFS department chair a detailed plan with measureable objectives and outcomes. Examples that could be included in this document could be skill acquisition and development, attendance at grant writing workshops, taking courses in an area, connecting with research mentors, identifying publications to complete and submit to identified journals, and the like. The Chairperson would need to approve of this plan, and the expectation is that the faculty member is both responsive and proactive about improving in areas of under-performance, including meeting agreed-upon deadlines and productivity standards in the improvement plan. The College of Social Science research plan is clear about what happens if faculty fail to achieve productivity in a two-year window:

*If an appropriate level of research activity cannot be re-started within a two-year period, however, it is appropriate for that individual to have an increased course load or other*
duties assigned that are not related to research. A larger course load or other negotiated activities for faculty who are not research-active help to support the research mission of the College by allowing research-active faculty—particularly junior faculty—to temporarily have a reduced course load. Thus, individuals who have a larger course load or other assigned duties as a result of little or no research activity should have their merit salary awards determined on the basis of a re-assignment of workload.

Role of Students in Research

Mentoring graduate students is an essential component of the workload of tenure-stream faculty in HDFS. Graduate students are essential for the success of a faculty member’s program of research and most research projects have one or more graduate students involved. Faculty typically utilize an apprentice model in which graduate students are an integral part of the research process, learning the skills of study design, study implementation and analysis, and disseminating findings through peer-reviewed manuscripts and presentations. The goal of the department is to have all of its research-oriented graduate students on assistantship, about half supported by the department as teaching assistants (TAs) and about half supported by grants or faculty start-up as research assistants (RAs). Many undergraduate students desire and need experience in research and faculty actively engage them in their programs of research. Faculty mentor motivated undergraduates in basic research skills and frequently involve them in presentations and publications.

Mentoring Program for Research

It is important to provide appropriate mentoring and support for faculty research activities at all faculty career stages. Informal collegial support systems within the unit to share information on funding priorities and opportunities, provide feedback on research projects, and review and edit manuscripts and proposals for funding are essential and are an ongoing aspect of life in academia. The department has a formal mentoring program for untenured faculty (see Appendix C) that includes provision of both internal and external mentors; untenured faculty members work with the Chair, upon joining the department, to establish connections to mentors and to set a mentoring plan. It is important to ensure that each faculty member not already connected, develops a personal relationship to externally-funded research teams in a variety of ways including informal mentoring, formal mentoring with financial incentives from the department, travel support to visit other laboratories, and support for funded scholars to visit MSU for intensive, informal interaction with faculty. HDFS has been successful in attracting visiting scholars and is seeking additional mechanisms for supporting these activities. The annual performance review and planning process is an important opportunity for the chair to work with individual faculty to develop targeted opportunities for each to become more research active. Particular attention is paid to the progress of untenured faculty.
Appendix A

ANNUAL REPORT

January 1, 2016-December 31, 2016

Human Development and Family Studies

Michigan State University

NAME

Please insert your items using Times New Roman in 12 point, unbolded text. Refer to the HDFS Research Plan for details that explain characteristics of productivity that inform variability in point allocations within sections. You may opt to include a one-page narrative to provide additional information on your activity. You will be evaluated based on what is included in this document. The faculty member is responsible for including all relevant items.

RESEARCH

WENT IN PRESS IN 2015 (Including went in press and published in 2015)

Note: Use an * to identify student authors.

Refereed article in an academic journal (15-30 points per product)

(Please provide FULL APA formatted citation, including all authors, title, journal, volume and page numbers; include impact factors found on the Web of Science Journal Citation Report https://jcr-incites-thomsonreuters-com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/JCRJournalHomeAction.action); Failure to include the impact factor will result in the committee scoring the article as having no impact factor

Use * to indicate student authors

Published monograph, book or edited book (20-60 points per product)

(Please provide full APA formatted citation)

Chapter in an academic book (10-20 points per product)
(Please provide full APA formatted citation, including all authors, chapter title, book title, editors, and page numbers; state whether or not the chapter has been through a formal peer review process)

Other Published Items: refereed proceedings, non-refereed proceedings, white papers, research and grant reports, non-refereed article in an academic journal, encyclopedia article, book or software reviews, editorials (noting local, regional or national media outlets) (5-15)

(Please provide full citation and clearly distinguish refereed from non-refereed items)

The five articles that have been most highly-cited in the past five-year period (Provide full APA formatted citation and the citation number from google scholar over the past 5 years only).

FUNDED RESEARCH (BOTH NEW AND CONTINUING)

Note. No-cost extensions should not be included in active continuing funding.

Newly and Ongoing Funded External Grant or award (funding source, amount, award year for the grant, indirect cost rate (20-60 points)

(Clearly identify if you are the PI, Co-PI, CO-I (briefly describe your role, conceptualizing, overall oversight, project management, design, analysis, dissemination, etc.); state the project name, granting unit, amount, and dates; note if this is a student grant such as an external dissertation funding mechanism, include whether grant carries IDC, note whether you are PI on a multisite grant)

NEWLY FUNDED

ONGOING

Internal Grant or award: amount, duration, reviewed; note if this is a student grant application (10-20 points)

(Clearly identify if you are the PI, Co-PI, or Co-I; state the project name, granting unit, amount, and dates)
Number of graduate students, post-doctoral fellows funded by assistantship on grants each semester (list names and semesters of funding/dates, indicate .25 or .50 FTE) (5-10 points)

External Grants Submitted but Not Funded or Pending in 2015 (funding source, amount, indirect cost rate; indicate whether pending, scored or not scored; note scores if the application was scored) (10-22 points)

External student funding proposal not funded (e.g., dissertation fellowship) (7 points)

Internal Grants Submitted but Not Funded or Pending in 2015 (funding source, amount) (2 points)

PRESENTATIONS

Presentation of an individual paper, paper within a symposium, or poster within a symposium at a professional meeting (4-10 points per product) A poster within a symposium is one in which the presenter provides an oral presentation to the full symposium audience at some point during the presentation (e.g., Q&A after participants have viewed posters, initial introduction to poster, etc.).

(Include presentations in APA format. Clearly state if you are the presenter or co-author; identify whether it is an international, national, regional or local meeting and if the paper/poster is refereed or non-refereed)

Use * to indicate student authors

Chair or Co-Chair of a poster or paper symposium (5 per symposium)

Presentation of a poster at a professional meeting (2-4)

Invited speaker at a national or International conference

Invited speaker at an organization or university
Other research presentation

### TEACHING

#### COURSE ACTIVITY (20–40 points per course)

Please complete the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>COURSES TAUGHT</th>
<th>COURSE INFORMATION</th>
<th>SIRS COMPOSITE</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List courses and enrollment for spring, summer, and fall semester. Include independent studies, dissertation credits, etc. Means of the SIRS composites on the student evaluations are to be noted in the provided columns. Listed at the bottom of the page are several items regarding your teaching assignment. If any or all apply to you, please insert the appropriate number in the &quot;NOTES&quot; column.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>COURSE NO.</strong></td>
<td><strong>COURSE TITLE</strong></td>
<td><strong>NOTE S</strong></td>
<td><strong>Invol</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NOTES

1 - New Preparation or Substantially Revised  
2 - TA Assisted  
3 - On-Line Course  
4 - Off-campus  
5 - Extra Comp.

OTR in grade distribution includes grades of "W", "WF", "I", or "CR".
Comments

Describe any substantial revisions or other notes:

Teaching awards (5-10 per product)

Student teaching award- student for whom you are a primary mentor (5-10 points per product)

Other similar evidence (5-10 points per product)

### STUDENT COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF STUDENT</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>STAGE (indicate completion of proposal, comprehensive exam, defense)</th>
<th>GRADUATED (leave blank if still active)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF STUDENT</td>
<td>STAGE (indicate completion of proposal, defense)</td>
<td>GRADUATED (leave blank if still active)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF STUDENT</td>
<td>STAGE</td>
<td>GRADUATED (leave blank if still active)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GRADUATE COMMITTEES

Member of Committee (2-4 points per committee)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF STUDENT</th>
<th>Masters or Doctoral?</th>
<th>GRADUATED (list whether proposed, defended, completed comps)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER MENTORING ACTIVITIES** (E.g. involvement of students in research, etc.; Describe) (1 – 10 points per mentoring activity)
SERVICE

Journal editor (20-80 points)

Associate editor, Editorial board member, editor of a special issue, panelist, other similar activities (5-20 points)

Federal Grant Review Panel Service (include here if you are an appointed member of a standing committee such as NIH, IES, include the name of the committee) (40 points)

Other Grant Review Panel Service External organization, foundation, other (include here if you are an appointed member of a standing committee; include the name of the committee) (20 points)

Other Grant review activity (list the number of proposals reviewed and for what funding source/agency; note internal or external grant reviews) (1-10 points per product)

Leadership in Professional Service (2-15 points per activity)

(Position on an affinity group board, board of directors or advisory committee, conference session organizer, committee service in professional organizations such as NCFR, NAEYC, SRCD, AAMFT, etc. Please do not include chairing sessions at professional meetings.)

Service to a scholarly professional society (e.g. committee member on an NCFR subgroup)- specify

Significant national outreach demonstrating national/international reputation (e.g. provision of expert testimony to Congress, provide expert information to a White House commission; describe) (5-25)

Served as a designated paid consultant on a federally funded grant. (5 points)

Site visitor (XX Points)
Manuscript reviews, external reviewer for RTP documents of scholars at other universities; other similar activities (Describe activities) (1-10)

Department, college or university committee chair (5 points per committee)

Department, college or university standing or ad hoc committee member (1 point per committee)

RTP Chair (in year with candidates (10 points)

Search Committee, chair (15 points)
Search committee, member (10 points)

Administrative position such as Graduate Director, Associate Chairs, Program Director, Clinic Director, CDL Research Director (30-75 points)

Area group leader (30 points)

Nominator for external or internal, recognition award for a faculty member or a student; Describe (5 points per activity)

Faculty advisor to a student group (5 points)

Outreach to the public, service to public organization related to academic scholarship (5 points, per activity) (List presentations and trainings to the public and to community partners, etc.)

Other similar service (e.g. mentoring colleagues contributing to university initiatives, participating in events such as Grandparent's University, etc.) (1-10 points per activity)
Appendix B

Examples of Journals with Impact Factors 1.0-6.0
(see attached Excel files)
APPENDIX C

HDFS Faculty Mentoring Program Draft

We propose a two-pronged mentoring approach in which: 1) individually, each faculty person at the assistant or associate level is supported in developing a network of primary research mentors to meet specific needs and goals identified by the faculty member as a means to enhancing research productivity and excellence, and excellence in teaching and service/outreach; and 2) collectively, all faculty have access to secondary professional development mentors, who are local scholars who can address needs and goals shared by multiple faculty.

I. Goals

The goals of the HDFS mentoring program are to

1. Facilitate assistant and associate level faculty to develop a network of primary research mentors (inside and outside MSU) which collectively meet their research mentoring needs. For example, these primary research mentors may be federally funded scholars, or members of review panels. The primary research mentors are people with whom the faculty member can establish long-term relationships focused on shared interests and goals.

2. Connect all interested faculty with secondary professional development mentors (typically within department or college) who can address common challenges faced by multiple faculty seeking to achieve promotion expectations established by the College of Social Science and the university. For example, these scholars might represent expertise in managing large classes, serving on review panels, working with community research partners, or preparing for the tenure review process. The secondary mentors are people from whom the faculty member may seek advice or guidance on a specific issue, rather than someone with whom the faculty member will have a sustained mentoring relationship. This advice or guidance could be provided in a group setting or individually.

II. Outcomes

1. The departmental level measurable outcomes of this plan will be:
   A. Increase in publications, particularly those in high-impact journals
   B. Increase in grants submitted
   C. Increase in grants funded as faculty members are supported in building mentoring networks and enhancing their publication records.
   D. Increase in numbers of faculty in positions of leadership in their fields and professions, appropriate to their levels.
   E. Increase in connections to community partners for research and dissemination efforts.
   F. Increase in quality of teaching at the graduate and undergraduate levels, reflected in teaching evaluations.

2. The individual level measurable outcomes of this plan will be:
G. Increase in collaborative connections to successful scholars within and outside the department
H. Increase in faculty perception of being supported and mentored successfully
I. Increase in faculty perception of sufficient resources to meet professional goals and achieve promotion expectations established by the College of Social Science and the university.

III. Processes

1. New faculty entering the department are oriented to the department mentoring process by the Chair. There is no assignment of a specific internal or external mentor to new faculty; instead faculty are informed of the mentoring process and encouraged to begin seeking (or maintaining) connections within and outside of the department, college, and university. If the faculty member requests an internal mentor to assist in making initial connections or becoming oriented to the department or campus, the Chair will appoint a mentor from among the tenured faculty in the HDFS department.

2. Annual Individual Reflective Process on Mentoring Needs and Resources:
   A. Each Fall semester, faculty at the assistant and associate levels fill out a survey which asks them to define their mentoring needs and their mentoring resources, in relation to their current goals (e.g. securing federal funding; serving as an associate editor). Faculty are given a series of questions to respond to, asking about their perception of their own needs for mentoring in each of a number of areas (e.g., grant-writing, teaching, advising, work-life balance), and their current mentoring resources in each area (e.g., who would they go to for advice on mentoring graduate students; who they would ask for feedback on a grant proposal). A final set of questions ask faculty to identify the gaps between their mentoring needs and resources, which, if filled, would help them achieve their goals. These questions also ask faculty to identify how these needs could be met (e.g. by spending time with a particular established scholar, traveling to visit a program officer, securing additional time for grant-writing). This survey process can be accomplished either as a group process or individually; however, each participating faculty member will produce the responses to the questions and their summary statement as part of their annual review materials submitted in late Fall or early Spring.
   B. In conjunction with the department’s annual review process, the Chair and the Department Advisory Committee (DAC) review the mentoring plan of each faculty member, in parallel with their annual materials submitted, and provide input on the mentoring plan, specifically noting whether the individual’s mentoring plan seems appropriate to advance his or her career at the current phase. The DAC may recommend changes to the mentoring plan which will be part of the Chair’s review of the faculty member’s annual progress.
   C. Negotiation of resources – from the department or college – to meet the mentoring needs of the faculty will take place as part of the annual review meeting between the individual faculty member and the Chair. Examples of these resources are travel expenses to receive intensive mentoring at external institutions, funding support to attend conferences that will increase the networking of faculty with federal funders and mentors, etc. At this point, if the DAC or Chair have recommended changes to the mentoring plan, those changes will be discussed with the faculty member.
   D. The Chair meets with each pretenured faculty member individually once per month and meets with all preturnure faculty as a group once per month. The goals of these meetings are to provide feedback on progress, provide support, and to monitor the status of the mentoring process.
3. Informal Professional Development Mentoring  
   A. As common mentoring needs are identified across multiple faculty, the DAC or an appointed ad-hoc committee, seeks out local (within MSU) experts to serve as professional development mentors. Informal mentoring will take the form of workshops or group discussions which are topically-focused. These discussions will be open to all department faculty. For example, if multiple faculty members identify a gap in mentoring to improve teaching large seminar courses, faculty within the department who are successful at this skill will hold a workshop-style discussion on the topic. This group of local experts will also be available for more individual advice and support. The topics and leaders for them will be identified by the Department Advisory Committee (DAC) as they review the annual review materials.  
   B. For faculty in the HDFS department, serving as a “professional development mentor” is acknowledged as mentoring-related service to the department, and will be reflected in the mentors’ annual reviews.

IV. Evaluation and Ongoing Development of the Mentoring Program  
   1. All faculty members’ annual review materials which report on numbers of publications, grants, community collaborations, and leadership roles, as well as quality of teaching evaluations, will be used to measure the department-level outcomes, A through F above.  
   2. The annual mentoring needs survey, submitted as part of the annual review materials, produces the metrics to be used to measure the individual level outcomes of the mentoring plan. Faculty members’ connections to established scholars (inside and outside MSU) are assessed in their answers of questions regarding whom they can go to for mentoring (Outcome G). Their ratings of support and need in each area, and the ratings of success of their mentoring experiences thus far are used to outcomes H and I.  
   3. As part of an overall effort to improve upon this mentoring program, we will engage highly successful Human Development & Family Studies (or similar) departments at peer institutions in discussions about their mentoring programs.

APPENDIX D
College of Social Science Faculty Development Policy  
(See attached pdf)