

Job Advertisement with DEI Language

Assistant Professor of Biology (Organismal Conservation Biology)

The Biology Department at Missouri State University invites applications for a tenure-track Assistant Professor with a commitment to inclusive teaching practices and increasing student diversity and retention. We seek a candidate who conducts field-based research that addresses population or community level questions including, but not limited to work with species of conservation concern, conservation genetics, invasion biology, or reintroduction biology. Requirements include a PhD in Biology or related area, peer-reviewed publications in conservation biology, and excellent communication skills. Primary duties include (1) conducting research in organismal biology with emphasis on conservation; (2) teaching courses in introductory biology and one or more of animal physiology, population or community biology, statistics, or invertebrate zoology, to total 9 contact hours per semester; (3) advising graduate (masters) and undergraduate students; and (4) substantial effort to obtain external funds for research. A letter of application, CV, names and contact information for 3 references, statements of teaching and research experience and interests, a statement of commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion, and copies of all university transcripts should be submitted online at: <https://jobs.missouristate.edu/postings/57614>. The University is committed to building a diverse and culturally competent educational environment. Applicants should include in their materials how their background and experience will further this goal (see <https://diversity.missouristate.edu/>). We encourage applications from members of underrepresented groups. Direct questions to SPMaher@MissouriState.edu. Review of applications begins 1 November 2021. The starting date is 15 August 2022. Employment will require a criminal background check at University expense. EO/AA/M/F/Veterans/Disability/Sexual Orientation/Gender Identity

Rubric for Prospective Faculty Written Materials

About & CV & Cover letter

	Comments
Is this person an Organismal Conservation Biologist?	A "No" response should not be a total disqualifier.
Does this person have a field-oriented research program PhD or ABD?	A "No" response should not be a total disqualifier.
Has the person published something in the last two years?	This is a yes or no question, and a "No" response is a disqualifier.
Does this person identify as an underrepresented group?	A "No" response should not be a total disqualifier.
What does the candidate study?	We should track this, but it should not disqualify someone if they are not
Does this person state interest in teaching multiple courses listed in the ad?	We should track this, but it should not influence the rest of the rubric.
	We should track this, but it should not disqualify someone if they do not

Teaching

	Excellent (4-5 Points)	Average (2-3 Points)	Low (0-1 Point)
Prior Experience	Teacher of record, multiple semesters as TA	Few (2-3) semesters as TA	None or 0-1 semesters as TA
Training and certifications	Has training in pedagogy and has completed a certificate or degree	Has training in pedagogy, but has not completed a certificate or degree	No training or certification
New Courses	States interest in teaching one or more new courses that advance undergraduate and graduate needs	States interest in teaching one or more new courses that would not advance the department or only advance graduate needs	Fails to discuss new courses
Teaching necessary courses	Background to teach at least 3 of introductory biology, animal physiology, population or community biology, statistics, or invertebrate zoology	Background to teach at least 2 of introductory biology, animal physiology, population or community biology, statistics, or invertebrate zoology	Background to teach one of introductory biology, animal physiology, population or community biology, statistics, or invertebrate zoology
Active learning & Classroom	States and provides examples of classroom activity	Brushstrokes over of classroom activity with no examples	Limited discussion of teaching techniques
Pedagogy	Clear educational	Limited ideas about	No philosophy or stated

philosophy and identified goals for instruction, with examples of implementation

educational philosophy and goals, some implementation of techniques

goals, limited to no discussion of implementation

Research

	Excellent (4-5 Points)	Average (2-3 Points)	Low (0-1 Point)
Demonstrated individual achievement in publication	Multiple first author pubs	One first author publication; multiple co-author pubs	No FA pubs; only contributing author pubs
Demonstrated individual achievement in funding	Multiple (>3) small grants; grad or postdoc fellowship(s); PI or Co-PI or contributor on at least one large grant (funded)	Few (2-3) small grants; PI or Co-PI or contributor on at least one large grant (unfunded)	0-1 grants small grants
Potential for research	Forward thinking questions with detailed plan to address them	General questions with plan to address them	Relates on past research without identifying future studies
Feasibility	The research appears to be feasible under current funding and teaching limits; they identify low hanging fruit	Research appears robust, but would require substantial time, money, and/or equipment not readily available	Would not be suitable given the current framework of MSU (e.g. would require substantial equipment investment beyond start-up, field work not consistent with teaching load).
Area of interest	Research would enhance (through collaboration) or expand department	Research would expand department, but little complimentary	Research would duplicate, but not reinforce an area within the department
Graduate student	Clear plan to incorporate graduate students into research	Vague statements about graduate students, or implying PhD students	No or minor mention of graduate students
Undergraduate students	Clear plan to incorporate undergraduate students into research	Vague statements about undergraduate students	No or minor mention of undergraduate students

DEIJ (see additional DEIJ doc for more clarification)

	Excellent (4-5 Points)	Average (2-3 Points)	Low (0-1 Point)
Knowledge and Familiarity with DEIJ issues	Candidate has clear knowledge of, experience with, and interest in inclusion of dimensions of diversity that result from different identities, such as ethnic, socioeconomic, racial, gender, sexual orientation, disability, and cultural differences.	Candidate has some knowledge and familiarity of DEIJ issues in academia	Candidate has little demonstrated knowledge of, or experience with, dimensions of diversity that result from different identities.
Demonstrated commitment to DEIJ	Candidate has consistently engaged in activities to address DEIJ-associated disparities in their work.	Candidate has occasionally engaged in activities to address DEIJ-associated disparities in their work	There is no evidence the candidate has participated in any activities that pertain to DEIJ work
Plans for advancing Inclusive Pedagogy	Candidate gives specific examples of how they have promoted or would promote inclusive class/lab/research environment in their work	Vague plans are mentioned to implement inclusive pedagogy in their classroom, mentoring, and teaching, but they are not detailed or specific.	There is no plan for how the candidate would implement inclusive pedagogical practices in their classroom, mentoring, and teaching.

Outreach & Service

	Excellent (4-5 Points)	Average (2-3 Points)	Low (0-1 Point)
University service	Served on 2+ committees or in university-related organizations	Served on 1–2 committees or in university-related organizations	No service on committees or in university-related organizations
Science service	Active member in scientific societies	Member of scientific society, but no obvious engagement	No memberships or service or only contributes reviews
External outreach	Participated or planned events to general public	Engaged in providing information/data to general public	No engagement outside academia

Documentation, Questions, and Rubric for Faculty Phone/Zoom Interviews

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Organismal Conservation Biologist

Name of candidate: _____ Date of phone interview: _____
_____/_____/_____

Introduction:

- **Good morning/afternoon.**
- **Identify the personnel attending the phone interview.**
Deb Finn, Assistant Professor who is in 5th year at MSU and going through the tenure-waiting process
Sean Maher, Associate Professor who is in 8th year at MSU
Shelby Palmer, 1st year graduate student who completed her BS in the department
Avery Russell, Assistant Professor who is in his 3rd year at MSU

Can you please say your name so we know how to pronounce it.

- **If camera is on... Will you please turn off your camera during this time (interviews are conducted via Zoom, and the invitation email specified that cameras should be off).**
- To review, we are interviewing 11 candidates for 30 minutes each, and we'll first summarize information about Missouri State and the Department of Biology and review the position. We will then ask 8 standard questions and, if time allows, you will have the opportunity to ask us questions.

MSU is the second-largest university in the state, with over 20,000 students currently enrolled. The Biology Department has 16 tenured or tenure-track faculty, 5 instructor faculty, over 600 undergraduate Biology majors, and a strong research-based Master's program with an average population of about 35 active students. We are one of the largest departments on campus, and one of the most productive in terms of faculty and graduate student research.

The primary duties for this position include teaching courses in introductory biology, plus some combination of animal physiology, population ecology, statistics, and invertebrate zoology, including some labs. The teaching load for this position is 9 contact hours per semester, which can be a combination of lecture and lab hours. You also will be expected to initiate and maintain an active research program in your area, including supervising graduate and undergraduate student research. Faculty spend some time doing departmental and university service, including serving on committees and academic advising of undergraduate students.

MSU expects to provide a start-up package of \$ _____ and lab space, and our departmental tenure requirements include peer-reviewed, primary-literature publications that result from work beginning at MSU

Questions:

1. Please describe how you will effectively mentor graduate and undergraduate researchers in your lab group.
2. Briefly please describe new projects you will initiate at MSU and where you will apply for funding.
3. Please describe how your research relates directly or indirectly to conservation of organisms.
4. Please describe one specialty course you would like to develop, and how it would enhance the curriculum for MSU Biology students.

Course title:

5. Please describe how you would teach an upper-division course (with a low to moderate class size) and an introductory class with large enrollment in the same semester.
6. Please describe an example of a teaching situation when you have encountered an obstacle or experienced a failure and how have you handled it.
7. Please describe how you would contribute to diversity, equity, and inclusion in your research, service, and teaching as an MSU faculty member.
8. Please describe two examples of future service or outreach you would like to do and how one or both would contribute to the MSU public affairs mission.
 - 1.
 - 2.
9. What questions do you have for us?

1. Please describe how you will effectively mentor graduate and undergraduate researchers in your lab group.

SCORE	5-4	3-2	1-0
	<p>Description of a mentoring strategy and/or how they have had success. Provides examples and clear expectations.</p> <p>Individualized strategies for student needs and goals.</p> <p>Understands differences between graduate and undergraduate participation.</p>	<p>Brief description of a mentoring strategy without detail, and more of a list of success.</p> <p>Individualized strategies for student needs and goals may not be evident</p> <p>Emphasis heavily on graduate student support, with little regard for undergraduate participation.</p>	<p>Little specific plans for mentoring of students or just stating numbers of mentees.</p> <p>Expectations for students are vague or fit for PhD students, or with little understanding of individualization.</p> <p>Fails to consider undergraduate students as independent researchers.</p>

2. Please briefly describe new projects you will initiate at MSU and where you will apply for funding.

SCORE	5-4	3-2	1-0
	<p>Clear plan for multiple projects that should yield publications within the tenure window. Should represent new datasets (or new analysis on available datasets). Field-based data collection is feasible under the teaching load.</p> <p>Could be one big project with many avenues for publications.</p> <p>Aware of funding avenues beyond federal programs and acknowledges low funding rates.</p>	<p>Only able to describe a single project idea that is feasible and should yield a pub within tenure window</p> <p>Alternatively, describes multiple projects that may not be feasible under the teaching load, but would be substantial contributions</p> <p>Funding suggestions are biased towards federal programs, perhaps without acknowledgement of low funding rate</p>	<p>No plan or general plan for papers that lack specific, regional details (with respect to field research). Emphasis on past research and little big picture.</p> <p>Idea of funding agencies but not linked to the missions of specific granting agencies or panels or research projects. Ignores regional and smaller funders</p>

3. Please describe how your research relates directly or indirectly to conservation of organisms.

SCORE	5-4	3-2	1-0
	<p>Clear statement of how past research directly informs conservation, or recent research intends to address a problem.</p> <p>If past research is emphasized, also must demonstrate a continued focus.</p> <p>Provides examples of how findings were applied or where they would inform applied efforts</p>	<p>Clear statement of how research could inform conservation but lacks examples of application or where they would inform applied efforts.</p> <p>Past research applied in conservation and little indication of a continued focus.</p>	<p>Research only weakly tied to conservation and it does not (or is not intended to) inform applied efforts.</p> <p>No past history of applied conservation questions.</p>

4. Please describe one specialty course you would like to develop, and how it would enhance the curriculum for MSU Biology students.

SCORE	5-4	3-2	1-0
	<p>Identifies a new course that is not among those on the ad list or from our catalog and provides context for why the content is important and how they will integrate with various majors.</p> <p>Best would understand different majors and the comprehensive options.</p> <p>Includes development for grad and undergrad students.</p> <p>Provides detail about lecture & lab components.</p>	<p>Identifies a course, perhaps from our catalog but not from the ad list, and provides context for why the content is important or how they will integrate with various majors.</p> <p>May fail to understand different majors and the comprehensive options but has the right idea that we have different types of interests.</p> <p>Emphasis on only grad or undergrad students.</p> <p>Provides some detail about lecture & lab components.</p>	<p>Describes a course from the ad.</p> <p>Fails to recognize degree options.</p> <p>Provides little detail regarding lecture & lab components.</p>

5. Please describe how you would teach an upper-division course (with a low to moderate class size) and an introductory class with large enrollment in the same semester.

SCORE	5-4	3-2	1-0
	<p>Describes two distinct scenarios that incorporate appropriate learning activities and goals for each course.</p> <p>Identifies communication and/or grading strategies for large courses (e.g. how to deal with quantities of email and assignments)</p>		<p>Describes similar approaches for both courses and/or does not differentiate with appropriate in-class activities.</p> <p>Fails to identify communication and/or grading strategies for large courses (e.g. how to deal with quantities of email and assignments)</p>

6. Please describe an example of a teaching situation when you have encountered an obstacle or experienced a failure and how have you handled it.

SCORE	5-4	3-2	1-0
	<p>Acknowledges a challenge and describes a relevant resolution that demonstrates a willingness and ability to learn from situation.</p> <p>Demonstrates that they behaved with respect and treats students as peers-in-learning</p>	<p>Challenge or obstacle is not well described or something that could have been avoided with appropriate planning.</p> <p>Describes a relevant resolution that may or may not demonstrate a willingness and ability to learn from situation.</p> <p>Demonstrates that they behaved with respect and treats students as peers-in-learning</p>	<p>Says they have never encountered an obstacle or failure, or does not describe how they handled it, or describes student or situation dismissively or disrespectfully</p>

7. Please describe how you would contribute to diversity, equity, and inclusion in your research, service, and teaching as an MSU faculty member.

SCORE	5-4	3-2	1-0
	<p>Describes own background and experience in relation to DEIJ goals.</p> <p>Highlights specific past and anticipated future service and activities at the classroom, research, and university level, as well as at the scientific community or public level.</p>	<p>Focused only on one aspect of the job description. E.g., DEIJ described only for research, or only for teaching, or only for service.</p>	<p>Grasps DEIJ in only basic terms ('diversity is important'), generally supportive without highlighting specific examples of past or future support.</p> <p>Does not address how they would actively support DEIJ in their classroom, research or societies.</p>

8. Please describe two examples of future service or outreach you would like to do and how one or both would contribute to the MSU public affairs mission.

SCORE	5-4	3-2	1-0
	<p>Clear idea of MSU public affairs mission and articulates opportunities and resources available at MSU and/or in the broader Greene Co. community.</p> <p>Highlights specific past service and community based activities.</p> <p>Provides contributions to the scientific community as a whole beyond basic expectations.</p>		<p>General interest in service, but without substantiated examples.</p> <p>Describes no past service or only focuses on past service.</p> <p>Scientific service emphasized as peer-review.</p>

9. Do you have any questions for us?

SCORE	4-5	2-3	0-1
	<p>Has questions about living in Springfield, resources available at the university in support of classrooms and/or research, teaching, and service obligations.</p> <p>May inquire about nature of department and college including stability, turnover, and leadership.</p> <p>May inquire about annual support for faculty such as travel, research, or summer support</p>	<p>Asks primarily about how we like living in Springfield, with little interest in the department structure or extra details.</p> <p>And/or focused only on one aspect of the job description. E.g., questions only about research, or only about teaching, or only about service.</p>	<p>Has no questions or questions show an obvious lack of awareness about the mission of MSU, the department, and the job advertisement.</p>

Documentation for Setting up the Prospective Faculty Research Talk

For the research guidelines, here is the basic set up we asked applicants to consider:

- You should spend ~30 minutes speaking about past research results
- You should spend ~15 minutes speaking about at least one project that you would initiate at MSU
- We will reserve the remaining time of 1 hour to questions.

- The target audience for the talk is our MS students.
- Within the section of past research results, we would like you to include a conceptual diagram.

- We will evaluate the talk using a rubric that relates how you present information. We provided them the Rubric ahead of their talk.

- Evaluation will fall under four themes... 1) Communication to a broad audience of a concept, 2) Strength of proposed research, 3) Teaching effectiveness based on communicating past research, and 4) Ability to answer questions.

- The talk will occur over Zoom, and we plan on recording each candidate. For those invited to campus, we will share this recording. Once the search is complete, we will delete the recording but can share it with you if you would like.

- Most MSU people will be watching together in a lecture hall.

Rubric for Prospective Faculty Research Talk

Communication to a broad audience of a concept

Did the candidate communicate a broad concept and research motivation effectively (target is our MS students)?

4–5	2–3	0–1
<p>Provides necessary information to understand the research, including defining relevant terms</p> <p>The broader field of inquiry was established and clear how questions relate back</p> <p>Specific hypotheses and predictions were presented clearly</p>		<p>Terms are not defined, assumes the audience knows field-specific concepts</p> <p>Talk subject is narrowly focused and does not attempt to place the research in a broad context or talk is so broadly focused that research questions are poorly motivated</p> <p>Fails to distinguish hypothesis from predictions</p>

Teaching effectiveness based on communicating past research

Demonstrates effective pedagogy in discussing research

4–5	2–3	0–1
<p>Purpose of each slide is clear and the premise is visually and/or textually indicated</p> <p>Repeats and redefines main ideas throughout</p> <p>Transitions between slides create a continuous sequence of connected ideas that build to conclusions</p>		<p>Audience is not oriented to figures or tables</p> <p>Audience is inundated with data with little interpretation</p> <p>Presenter rushes through slides</p>

Communicates methods and analytical approach effectively to audience

4–5	2–3	0–1
<p>Identifies why approach is warranted (e.g. control for repeated measures, nonlinearity, etc.)</p> <p>Clear flow from data collection to analysis to result to conclusion</p>		<p>Does not explain why approach was necessary</p> <p>Uneven or incomplete information about how data collection and analyses answer question</p>

Demonstrates a broad perspective and evidence of collaboration where appropriate

4-5	2-3	0-1
<p>Explains the importance of results and links conclusions back to broader ecological questions</p> <p>Clearly acknowledges where collaborators and mentees contributed</p>		<p>Impact of the research on the field is not explained</p> <p>Motivation for research questions are not explained</p> <p>Role of collaborators unclear</p>

Strength of Proposed Research

Proposed research is achievable and sustainable at Missouri State University

4-5	2-3	0-1
<p>Describes how undergraduates and graduate students would contribute</p> <p>Proposed projects are clearly linked to broader lab questions</p>		<p>No mention of suitability of projects for undergraduate and/or graduate students</p> <p>Projects are one-offs that are not connected to broader lab questions (little evidence of long-term planning)</p>

Research plans demonstrate awareness of resources available at Missouri State University

4-5	2-3	0-1
<p>Discusses how multiple specific supports (existing University facilities and programs) could be used to enhance their research program with MSU trainees</p> <p>Research plan(s) address conducting science locally with trainees</p>		<p>Only discusses projects that would be achieved with resources outside of the University</p> <p>Demonstrates little awareness of specific kinds of University support that could be used to build their research program</p>

Addressing questions

Treats questioners with respect and demonstrates thoughtfulness in answers

4-5	2-3	0-1
<p>Acknowledges flaws or problems pointed out by questioner</p> <p>Questioners are allowed to finish and questions clarified as needed</p>		<p>Interrupts questioners, dismisses questions</p> <p>Answers do not address question and are either too short or are off topic</p>

Communication to a broad audience of a concept

Did the candidate communicate a broad concept and research motivation effectively?

Score _____

Teaching effectiveness based on communicating past research

Demonstrates effective pedagogy in discussing research

Score _____

Communicates methods and analytical approach effectively to audience

Score _____

Demonstrates a broad perspective and evidence of collaboration where appropriate

Score _____

Strength of Proposed Research

Proposed research is achievable and sustainable at Missouri State University

Score _____

Research plans demonstrate awareness of resources available at Missouri State University

Score _____

Addressing questions

Treats questioners with respect and demonstrates thoughtfulness in answers

Score _____

If you thought potential proposed projects were unfeasible, describe how here:

If possible, please provide something you like about the seminar...

If possible, please provide something that would improve the seminar...

Rubric for Prospective Faculty Campus Visit

Personal interactions are often prone to subjectivity and bias. Questions that are vague or gauge “fit” are especially problematic. A primary aim of these questions was to identify “red flags”.

Candidate’s Name:

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

- Read candidate’s CV
- Read candidate’s scholarship (publications, etc)
- Attended candidate’s job talk
- Met with candidate
- Attended meal with candidate
- Other (please explain):

Please rate the candidate on each of the following **based on in-person interactions**:

	excellent	neutral	poor	unable to judge
Ability to relate with others				
Able to relate to and get on well with faculty				
Able to relate to and get on well with students				
Research interests as a faculty member				
Motivated to continue research productivity				
Motivated to pursue research funding				
Motivated to pursue collaborations				
Contributions to the Department				
Motivated to make positive contribution to department’s climate				
Motivated to recruit and supervise graduate students				
Motivated to recruit and supervise undergraduate researchers				
Motivated to teach and advise undergraduates				
Cares for the well-being of students				
Contributions to the University				
Motivated to contribute to outreach efforts to diverse on or off campus groups				
Interested in university and/or community diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts				
Motivated to be a conscientious university community member				

Other comments?