

REFLECTIVE ESSAY IN SUPPORT OF PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

My research draws on my education, training, and practitioner experience in both human resource management (HRM) and the law, and is driven by my desire to make significant intellectual contributions to the scholarly literature and have a positive practical impact on both the lives of workers and the effective functioning of organizations. This desire has influenced the issues I have chosen to investigate, the range of outlets in which I have elected to publish, and my pursuit of external funding. Table 1, attached, organizes my publications and grants according to their *primary* areas of focus: 1) employee relations, 2) HRM and the law, and 3) organizational staffing (e.g., recruitment, job choice). However, these general areas are interrelated, and I have specific streams of research (e.g., weight discrimination in employment) that involve scholarship that fits within two or all three areas. Therefore, Table 1 also provides notes that attempt to communicate the interdisciplinary nature of most of my scholarship, and the resulting "overlap" that exists among my areas of research. For example, a superscript "1" has been placed next to those publications identified in the *HRM and the Law Scholarship* column that could also be characterized as involving employee relations scholarship. With one exception, all of my published research fits within one or more of the three identified research areas. The exception is a publication in *Human Resource Management* that resulted from an invitation I received to lead a group of scholars in writing a paper addressing future research needs in the field of HRM [REDACTED] (2005).

This reflective statement emphasizes my most significant scholarly contributions since being promoted to associate professor. However, it is likely that some members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee will not be acquainted with the areas of research in question, and even for readers of this statement who are acquainted with the relevant literatures, some recent scholarly contributions are best understood as part of a stream of research. Therefore, I begin by discussing each of the three general areas of research identified above, providing a brief description of the area, highlighting recent publications and grants, and commenting on the impact of my scholarship. I then focus on my two most significant accomplishments in the area of scholarship in recent years: 1) my research and standing in the weight discrimination in employment literature, and 2) my leadership role in a NSF ADVANCE grant titled "Advancing Diversity through the Alignment of Policies and Practices" (ADAPP) that was funded in the amount of 3.98 million dollars. Not coincidentally, both accomplishments involve interdisciplinary scholarship that spans the three general research areas identified in Table 1.

Employee Relations Research

Most of my research in the area of employee relations uses one or more disciplinary lenses (e.g., psychology, ethics, legal) to investigate responsibilities and rights in the employment relationship. I include employment discrimination research in this area because: 1) it typically involves perceived, ethical, and/or legal rights; and 2) discrimination has important consequences for employee-employer relations. My current employee relations scholarship also includes a more strategic examination of the

role of employer-employee relations in developing an inclusive work environment and retaining a diverse workforce (NSF ADVANCE Grant, discussed below). Here, I focus on my psychological contracts scholarship because it illustrates how my interdisciplinary background has provided important insights and it represents one of my areas of significant scholarly contribution.

Psychological contract scholarship. As a lawyer dealing with employees who felt that they had been wrongfully terminated, I observed consistent differences in the actual legal obligations of employers versus employees' subjective beliefs about their employers' obligations. Later, when reading Rousseau's (1989) seminal article addressing the "psychological contract" (PC) construct, I recognized the phenomenon that was being discussed. Although I found the article very interesting and insightful, the article's use of some legal concepts, such as "consideration" (whose meaning has plagued lawyers for decades), suggested that there was an opportunity to contribute to the usefulness of this intuitively appealing construct by carefully examining how it was being conceptualized. This led to a refereed journal publication that traced the origin and early development of the PC construct, and identified key issues in the conceptualization of the construct [REDACTED]. I subsequently demonstrated how the legal perspective, and modern contract law in particular, could help inform the ongoing debate regarding the conceptualization of the PC construct in a chapter [REDACTED] and contributed a legal perspective to a collaborative chapter in a leading HR research series that addressed theoretical issues in employment relations, including the PC construct [REDACTED]. Since my promotion to associate professor, I published an empirical study of the impact of formal HRM policies on employee PCs in a field setting [REDACTED] and an empirical test of alternative, competing conceptualizations of the PC construct [REDACTED]. Both publications appear in the employee relations focused journal that published Rousseau's seminal article addressing the PC construct (Rousseau, 1989), *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*.

My research initially contributed to a greater awareness of the need for further conceptual development of the PC construct, identified the limitations of some attempts to import legal concepts into the PC literature, and provided insights from legal theory regarding which conceptualization of the PC construct is best supported by theoretical considerations. Evidence of my contribution in this regard is provided by references to my work, the most notable reference coming from [REDACTED] widely recognized as the leading PC scholar: "For a very good treatment of the history and development of the concept of the psychological contract, I recommend a fascinating paper by [REDACTED] 1997."

[REDACTED] (2004) finding that employers' formal contract provisions did not influence employees' beliefs regarding employers' obligation to have good reasons to terminate them provides much needed evidence of the discriminant validity of the PC construct. [REDACTED] provides the first and, based on my review, the only attempt to empirically test the competing conceptualizations of the PC construct that have been discussed and debated for over a decade. The study demonstrates that the results of PC research can vary significantly depending on which of the competing conceptualizations of the PC construct is adopted, supporting theoretical arguments made by myself and others regarding the need for researchers to pay greater explicit attention to how the PC construct is defined and operationalized in their research.

HRM and the Law Scholarship

My research in this area (Table 1, middle column) addresses issues arising out of the intersection of HRM and the law, typically combining *behavioral science* scholarship and *legal* scholarship to provide analysis or insights that would not result from adopting only one of the two perspectives. The broad goal of this program of research is to generate knowledge that will improve HRM scholars' and

practitioners' understanding of legal considerations and how they impact HRM decisions and outcomes, and improve the legal field's understanding of the science of HRM.

Using "the tools of science" to understand judicial outcomes. Researchers have used policy capturing approaches to empirically assess factors influencing judicial decisions involving HR concerns (e.g., sexual harassment cases). Prior to 1993, studies reported in several top-tier journals (e.g., *Academy of Management Journal*, *Personnel Psychology*) used this approach in a highly flawed, if not "fatally flawed," manner. However, in order to recognize the flaws, it was necessary to have both a thorough understanding of the law (both the judicial process and the substantive area of the law in question), and an understanding of the policy capturing methodology. As a result of my training in law and behavioral science research, I was able to identify common problems and limitations associated with this approach, and offer specific recommendations for addressing the problems in future research.

published in *Personnel Psychology*, came to be viewed in the HRM literature as establishing new standards for studies using a policy capturing approach to empirically assess factors influencing judicial decisions.

I had an opportunity to put my recommendations into practice when I was invited to participate in a study after it had been rejected from the *Journal of Applied Psychology* (JAP) based on the study's failure to address all of the "dangers" identified in.

My role in the (1997) study of factors influencing outcomes in cases alleging discrimination in the employment interview was to implement my recommendations for addressing the issues raised in

and once we convinced the reviewers and editor that those issues had been adequately addressed the study was accepted for publication in the JAP. continues to be viewed in the HRM literature as establishing the standards for the use of policy capturing approaches to empirically assess factors influencing judicial decisions.

and it has also had a significant influence on these types of studies in the legal literature.

Interdisciplinary reviews and analysis. Traditional reviews of legal issues in HRM focus on legal requirements, are prescriptive in nature ("dos and don'ts"), and tend to be alarmist in tone. In contrast, in addition to addressing legal concerns, the interdisciplinary reviews that I have published integrate one or more behavioral science perspectives to examine some phenomenon of interest in the HRM field that has legal implications (e.g., employment discrimination, 1999, discussed below), and then offer insights for employer practices, future research, and/or employment law policy. Recent examples of this type scholarship include an in depth analysis of weight-based perceived disability claims that integrates relevant law and empirical findings regarding how obese individuals are perceived (2007), and an ongoing State Bar of Michigan supported project that combines an interdisciplinary review and analysis of issues involved in the hiring of ex-offenders together with an original data collection (, work in progress). The contributions of the interdisciplinary reviews I have published are linked to the fact that multiple perspectives are applied to problems that are only partially understood if viewed through a single lens.

Organizing frameworks promoting the understanding of law and its limitations. The complexity of law, real and perceived, and its potential relevance to every aspect of HRM, presents a significant challenge for HRM practitioners and academics teaching HRM courses – including those who have legal backgrounds. For example, fellow PhD and lawyer, and I had each struggled independently to make sense of the myriad factors and principles influencing the application of employment laws to multinational employers when operating outside of their "country of origin." Together, we reviewed and analyzed hundreds of reported cases and numerous secondary legal sources, and then developed an overall framework and a specific decision making tool to be used in determining what country's laws can be expected to apply in specific circumstances.

[REDACTED], 2006, published in *Personnel Psychology*). [REDACTED] (2006), published in *Human Resource Management*, addresses the broader problem of “legal-centric decision making,” which we defined as decision making that does not involve legal requirements (i.e., a specific course of action is not strictly mandated by the law) but gives primacy to legal concerns to the extent that other organizationally relevant non-legal considerations (e.g., company values, employee morale) are ignored. Drawing on the behavioral sciences and the legal literature, factors contributing to legal-centric decision making are identified and discussed, and a general decision making framework and specific recommendations for making better informed, or “organizationally sensible,” decisions are provided. More recently, [REDACTED] (2008) identified and organized the primary sources of law potentially influencing HRM practice in multinational operations, providing readers a foundation for understanding the legal environment of HRM in a global context. Scholarship of this type makes an intellectual contribution to the literature, but its most significant contribution is promoting a more thoughtful, functional understanding of the law and litigation risk among academics teaching HRM courses, students, and practitioners. For example, my employment law course includes an exercise and a group project based on [REDACTED] (2006) organizing framework that are used to develop students’ critical thinking with regard to legal considerations and legal advice.

Staffing Related Research (Recruiting and Job Choice)

I have practical experience in staffing, taught a staffing course for over 12 years, and made some significant scholarly contributions to the recruiting and job choice literatures. With others, I have published six studies that focus exclusively on recruitment and/or job choice issues (Table 1, far right-hand column). In addition to those six studies, five of the publications that I have classified as focusing primarily on employee relations or legal issues also investigate staffing-related issues (see Table 1, note 2). I view staffing-related research as important and interesting, and I will continue to teach a staffing course as needed by our School. However, six years ago I decided that my future research in this area would be limited to staffing related issues that either overlap with my research interests in employee relations and/or the law, or directly contribute to my teaching in the classroom. Consistent with that decision, my ongoing scholarship involving staffing-related concerns includes: 1) research supported by the Michigan State Bar examining legal and HR issues associated with hiring ex-offenders [REDACTED] (ongoing, in progress); 2) the NSF ADVANCE grant, ADAPP (discussed below); and 3) a longitudinal study of the role of trustworthiness perceptions in job choice decisions and subsequent employee-employer relationships [REDACTED] (in progress).

Leadership in the Weight Discrimination in Employment Literature

Seminal article. In conducting a review of the literature investigating discrimination in employment interviews [REDACTED], 1999) I was struck by the particularly strong effect of weight bias in the two studies that manipulated the weight of interviewees. This caused me to reflect on my experiences as a HRM practitioner witnessing managers openly disparage overweight job applicants and employees. From my years practicing law in Michigan, I knew that weight was a protected characteristic under state law, but I could not recall a single legal case involving weight discrimination in employment. It appeared that weight discrimination in employment was a widespread phenomenon, yet it received very little attention in behavioral science literature or the law. [REDACTED] (1999), published in *Personnel Psychology*, made several significant contributions. First, it provides the first comprehensive review of the empirical evidence regarding the nature and extent of weight-based discrimination in employment. This required an expansive review of diverse literatures (e.g., psychology, education, management, sociology, medicine, economics). Second, it conducts a traditional legal analysis of the extent to which the law provides protection against weight-based

discrimination, and then compares the findings resulting from the review of empirical studies with the conclusions based on the legal analysis. The comparison reveals that there is evidence of widespread discrimination against overweight employees, and only in very limited circumstances is that discrimination likely to be viewed as illegal. Third, drawing on existing theory and relevant empirical findings, and incorporating insights from reported legal cases (e.g., common situations given rise to weight discrimination claims, justifications offered by employers), I proposed the first conceptual model of the primary factors and paths by which job applicants and employees are discriminated against based on their weight (based on my recent review, it remains the only published model). Finally, [REDACTED] (1999) represents the first systematic effort to identify gaps in weight discrimination in employment research and set forth a research agenda for the emerging literature.

Subsequent publications and ongoing research. My subsequent published scholarship in addressing weight discrimination area includes: 1) *original empirical studies* examining sex differences in perceived weight discrimination in a national sample ([REDACTED], 2007), the contribution of sex differences in weight discrimination to the “glass ceiling” effect ([REDACTED] et al., 2009), and the relationship between body weight and personality traits (providing evidence tending to refute common stereotypes about the personality traits of obese individuals, [REDACTED] & [REDACTED] 2008); 2) *the analysis of ethical issues* associated with the consideration of weight in employment decisions ([REDACTED], 2002B); and 3) *the review and analysis of more specific legal concerns*, including weight-based perceived disability claims under the ADA ([REDACTED], 2007), and the arbitration of weight-related claims ([REDACTED] 2008).

As original studies accumulated in this area, I conducted a meta-analysis of experimental studies investigating weight discrimination in employment settings ([REDACTED], under review). This study provides: 1) the first meta-analytic testing of several moderator proposed moderators of the weight – employment discrimination relationship (e.g. target sex, target qualifications); 2) the first meta-analytic testing of methodological issues associated with investigating weight discrimination in simulated employment settings (e.g., weight manipulation); and 3) an identification of remaining gaps in the literature and suggestions for future research directions. We received an encouraging revise and resubmit decision from the *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, and the manuscript has been revised and resubmitted. In both experimental and field settings researchers have focused on relatively direct expressions of weight bias in employment (e.g., refusal to hire, ratings of competence). However, there is reason to believe that weight discrimination often takes more subtle forms (e.g., verbal harassment, rudeness, social exclusion), *especially for women*. A study in progress examines the extent to which working adults experience subtle forms of weight-based employment discrimination, and tests the hypothesis that sex differences in the experience of subtle forms of weight-biased employment discrimination are greater than sex differences in more direct forms. Preliminary results indicate strong support for the hypothesis [REDACTED]

Impact of weight-discrimination research. [REDACTED] (1999) played a seminal role in the emergence of the weight discrimination in employment literature, a literature that has tremendous “real world” relevance. My research in this area continues to be referenced across literatures, including management, psychology, law, and the medical/obesity literatures. Recognition of my leadership in the weight discrimination literature is reflected in the invitations that I have received to address weight discrimination in employment topics, including invitations from: 1) the *American Obesity Association* (to present my recent research findings at their Annual Meeting, Washington D.C., 2000; 2) *National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health* (to address weight discrimination and fairness/legal issues in the administration of employer wellness plans at their Conference on Work-Life, Washington, D.C., 2007); 3) *Massachusetts State House, The Committee on Labor and Workforce Development* (to testify

regarding evidence of weight discrimination in employment, Boston, 2006); and 4) *Yale University Rudd Center for Food Policy and Obesity* (to present my recent research findings, New Haven, 2008).

The “real world” relevance of my weight discrimination research, important to MSU’s land grant mission, is evidenced by the attention that it has received in popular media outlets. Notable print, TV, and radio outlets include: *Wall Street Journal* (front page coverage), *New York Times* (multiple occasions), *Forbes*, *The Chicago Tribune* (multiple occasions), *CBS News*, *Psychology Today*, *Los Angeles Times*, *National Public Radio* (multiple occasions), and *BBC News*. On a more personal level, I have received numerous communications from obese individuals from as far away as Australia and including leaders of size acceptance groups [REDACTED] *Council on Size and Weight Discrimination*), thanking me for my conducting my research. In summary, on several levels, my weight discrimination research has had an impact far beyond anything I could have imagined when my experience as a social scientist, lawyer, and HRM practitioner led me to pursue research in this area over 12 years ago.

Leadership Role in the NSF ADVANCE Institutional Transformation (IT) Grant (ADAPP)

The NSF’s ADVANCE IT Grant program seeks to promote hiring, advancement, and retention of women faculty in the STEM field (science, math, engineering), and requires institutions receiving funding to commit to making the institutional changes needed to achieve those goals. I responded to an email soliciting the participation of interested MSU faculty in an initial meeting to explore the possibility of a collaborative effort to write an ADVANCE grant proposal for three reasons. First, the challenges addressed by the ADVANCE grant program involve core employee-relations concerns, staffing issues, and legal issues (e.g., federal and state constraints on “affirmative action”), my three general areas of research interest (Table 1). As a result, I was very interested in the focus of the RFP and I believed that I might be able to make a significant intellectual contribution. Second, I assumed that if funded, there would be opportunities to pursue my research interests in a field setting, including the collection of longitudinal data. Third, if funded, the grant would provide me an opportunity (working with others) to have a significant positive practical impact on the MSU community by addressing issues I feel passionate about.

We began work on the proposal in early fall, 2007, submitted the proposal in December, 2007, and were notified in early September, 2008, that we would be funded in the amount of 3.98 million over 5 years. The grant focuses on three colleges: Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Engineering. However, [REDACTED] the Principal Investigator, subsequently committed over one million additional dollars to extend the grant’s activities to 10 additional MSU colleges. As a result, the funds committed to the broader project now exceed 5 million dollars. My involvement in helping meet the requirements of the grant has dominated my scholarship over the past two years, and I believe that my role in the ADAPP project provides the “best available evidence” of my ability to effectively perform the role of a full professor at MSU. Therefore, I describe my role in some degree of detail below.

Independence and leadership in the area of scholarship. The first meetings of those interested in responding to the request for proposals (RFP) involved brainstorming with as many 13 people, including faculty from the natural sciences and education, and administrators with some responsibility for diversity or women’s advocacy. I was the only academic faculty member from the HRM or organizational behavior disciplines. Many suggestions were offered. However, as the number of people attending the meetings dropped off, reaching a low of two at one meeting, it was still not clear how the various suggestions might be organized into an overarching framework, or meet the RFPs requirement that our approach be “innovative.” Therefore, I took the initiative to conduct a systematic review and

analysis of the approaches taken by all previous ADVANCE IT grant awardees. Based on the RFP requirements, an initial review of several proposals, and my knowledge of HRM, I developed a coding form that I used to assess each previous awardee's proposal and website providing details of their grant activities. My analysis revealed that almost all prior grants focused heavily on increasing awareness of diversity issues on campus, and improving or adding new supportive policies and practices that applied to all faculty, but were expected to differentially benefit women faculty (e.g., increasing flexibility in the tenure process, improving mentoring). I was surprised at the lack of a HRM perspective, and in particular, the relative lack of attention to: 1) increasing the structure of key academic HRM practices, and 2) the issue of strategic HR alignment (alluded to in several proposals, but never discussed in depth and never made the focus of a proposal).

Based on my analysis, and after "reacquainting" myself with the strategic HRM literature (not an area of my expertise within HRM), I proposed a conceptual approach to institutional transformation that focuses on and integrates: 1) alignment of organizational policies and practices with the diversity value (a strategic HRM concept), 2) increasing the structure of HRM practices (a micro-HRM principle), and 3) providing supportive policies and practices (a typical focus of ADVANCE IT grant awardees). There was keen interest in the concepts of alignment and structure among the evolving grant team, and once the concepts were explained and discussed, strong support for the proposed model.

Of course, providing a conceptual approach to institutional transformation that was viewed as innovative and persuasive is only one aspect of a successful proposal; the efforts of many individuals contributed to the success of our proposal. In particular, [REDACTED] provided critical "grantsmanship" expertise and was the driver of the grant writing process. I view my contribution as necessary, but by no means, sufficient for the success of the proposal. I also view my role in writing the proposal as demonstrating both *independence* in scholarship (e.g., taking the initiative to assess prior proposals, identifying "gaps" in prior awardees' approaches, proposing our initial conceptual model) and *leadership* in the area of scholarship (convincing an interdisciplinary group of scholars of the intellectual value of the proposed conceptual model and leading them in refinements of the model).

Leadership in grant implementation and administration. The co-principals, grant director, research assistants, and other individuals highly involved in implementing the grant have met weekly since being funded. However, it was determined that because of the scope of the overall project and the number of individuals involved, it was important to have a smaller "executive committee" that would, in addition to meeting weekly with the larger grant team, also meet separately each week to identify and screen issues to be brought to the larger group, and engage in higher level planning. I was asked to serve on the executive team and have been doing so for the past two years [REDACTED]

Other, more specific examples of my leadership in the grant's implementation and administration include: taking the lead role in 2 of the 5 ADAPP work groups ("Faculty Search" and "Work Environment Survey"), providing the first draft of the *ADAPP Research, Scholarship, and Authorship Guidelines* and leading the grant team in the revision and adoption process, and leading the development of a comprehensive *MSU Faculty Search Toolkit*.

Ongoing ADAPP research. The scholarly contribution of our conceptual model has received significant external validation through the NSF review and funding process. Ultimately, however, its contribution will depend on the extent to which there is empirical support for its propositions. To establish base-lines, inform interventions, and allow testing of specific relationships in our model, over the past two years we have engaged in a massive data collection effort involving all co-PIs, a full time director, three research assistants, and support staff. In terms of testing our overall model at the

institution level, our data collection might be viewed as an incredibly in depth case study. However, we will also be able to test proposed mediating mechanisms in the model and the role of individual differences using longitudinal data collected from multiple sources (e.g., faculty, administrators at various levels, archival data), using multiple methods (e.g., surveys, focus groups, interviews), across highly variable colleges and subunits within MSU. Examples of research questions related to the model include: Does greater alignment of policies and practices with the diversity value (both "*actual alignment*" and *perceived alignment*) lead to positive outcomes as predicted in our conceptual model? To what extent does increasing the structure of specific HR policies and practices (e.g., the performance review process) result in the positive outcomes predicted in our model (i.e., increased clarity of expectations, perceived consistency, increased faculty diversity)? The project is also providing opportunities to conduct research that is relevant to the grant, but does not directly involve testing of specific links in our model. For example, the workplace incivility construct is of keen personal interest because it appears to have great potential to contribute to the understanding of workplace relations (co-worker, supervisor-subordinate) and how they may differentially impact women and underrepresented groups. However, the incivility construct is at a relatively early stage of its development, and there is need for further conceptual development and construct validation. As a result of advance planning, we are uniquely positioned to examine the incivility construct and its nomological network using multiple incivility measures and multiple source, longitudinal data.

In summary, although my involvement in ADAPP has initially resulted in a decrease in scholarly output in terms of refereed journal publications (as forewarned by others who have received large NSF grants), my level of involvement in scholarship has never been greater. I have every reason to believe that as we continue to move from an emphasis on establishing base-lines and implementing interventions, to a greater emphasis on evaluation and dissemination of our findings, our investment will yield a stream of publications for several years to come.

Future Research Priorities

Completing the various studies that will result from the ADAPP project is a high priority. However, the studies with the greatest potential, those involving longitudinal data, await the administration of the second faculty survey and the assessment of post-intervention outcomes. In the meantime, I am moving forward in other ways with research investigating strategic approaches to diversity and inclusivity management. I involved a junior colleague and strategic HRM scholar, [REDACTED] in writing a grant proposal for support (\$25,000) to conduct an exploratory study in a private sector company with geographically dispersed offices that will contribute to my understanding of the issues associated with aligning HRM policies and practices with the diversity value. This proposal was very recently funded at the research is underway. [REDACTED] and I have also started work on an NSF ADVANCE PAID grant proposal that will include diversity scholars from other institutions, and if funded, will provide a conceptual and empirical investigation of "strategic diversity and inclusivity management" (including alignment concerns). In the area of weight discrimination, after completing ongoing studies, I plan to lead a team in providing an interdisciplinary assessment of the fairness and effectiveness of employer sponsored weight loss programs that will include legal, ethical, weight management/medical, and HRM perspectives. Finally, building on [REDACTED] (2006) "organizationally sensible" framework, I look forward to developing the concept of "legal wisdom" in the context of global HRM, moving from my current working definition of the *concept* to a theoretically defensible and empirically testable scientific *construct*. In summary, I will continue to pursue research that draws on my interdisciplinary background to make intellectual contributions that, I believe, will have a positive practical impact on both the lives of workers and the effective functioning of organizations.

Scholarship in the Context of Overall Performance as a Faculty Member

I have always understood that scholarship is emphasized in promotion decisions. However, MSU's policy and our School's by-laws also include teaching and service as important promotion criteria. Therefore, I believe it is relevant and fair to observe that my accomplishments in the area of scholarship have not been achieved at the expense of excellence in other faculty performance areas. I have received the highest performance rating in each area (scholarship, teaching, service) each year that I have been at MSU – an overall performance record that is very rare in our School. In fact, although I have many outstanding colleagues, over the ten years I have been in the School I am the only academic faculty member who has received the highest rating in each performance area each year that he/she has been on our faculty.

TEACHING

Constants in Past and Current Teaching

Over my career I have taught undergraduate and graduate students in a wide range of settings (labor and industrial relations schools, business schools, state universities, an Ivy League university, MSU Dubai, courses surveying all of HRM and delivered to several hundred students in a lecture hall, small courses focusing on a relatively narrow area of HRM or the law). Across students and settings, there have been five constants. *First*, I approach teaching as an important aspect of my role as a faculty member, and I actively strived to improve my teaching skills (e.g., invited the director of the undergraduate program at Cornell to attend my lectures and provide feedback, sought input from senior faculty who demonstrated excellence in teaching, attended Lilly teaching workshops at MSU). *Second*, I draw on my practitioner experience in HRM and the law to engage students and provide examples, anecdotes, etc. that illustrate and help reinforce key learning objectives. *Third*, my research helps inform my teaching, beginning with the HRM courses I taught as a doctoral student (e.g., incorporating my research relating to the employment at-will doctrine and PCs into relevant lectures), and continuing through my teaching of employment law this semester [REDACTED] "organizationally sensible" approach as a primary course theme). *Fourth*, I enjoy my interactions with students. With very few exceptions (e.g., a cheating incident), my interactions with students have been fun and personally rewarding. *Fifth*, across students and settings, I consistently receive above average student ratings of my teaching. As indicated above, since coming to the School of Human Resources and Labor Relations I have received the highest rating in teaching each year (as assessed by the Director and Faculty Performance Review Committee based on student ratings and other submitted relevant evidence of teaching).

Courses Taught in the MSU School of Human Resources and Labor Relations

I have taught the following courses: Staffing Organizations (LIR 891), Training & Employee Development (LIR 811), Employment Law (LIR 868), HR Professionals & the Law (Special Topics LIR 891), Organizational Behavior (LIR 823).

Advising and Mentoring

In addition to the masters students that I am formally assigned to advise each year, I develop informal mentoring relationships with a small number of masters students that continue on after they graduate and begin their careers in HRM. In terms of doctoral students, I have served on 10 dissertation

committees while at MSU (5 in our School), and chaired one committee.

SERVICE

As indicated above, I have also received the highest performance rating in service each year that I have been employed in the School (as assessed by the Director and Faculty Performance Review Committee). Here I will focus on only my *leadership roles* in the area of service since 2004.

Leadership in Service to the Profession

- Served as Executive Editor for *Human Resource Management* (2004-2008), a high quality peer reviewed HRM journal.
- Currently serving on the editorial boards of *Human Resource Management*, *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, and the *International Journal of Conflict Management*.
- Elected by to membership to serve on the Executive Board of the HR Division of the Academy of Management (2010 to present).
- Served as chair of the following HR Division committees or subcommittees since 2004: Junior Faculty Consortium, Distinguished Executive Award, Doctoral Student Consortium.

Leadership in Service to the School of Human Resource and Labor Relations

- Chair of Research and Scholarship Committee
- [REDACTED] led a major revision of the curriculum for our masters program.
- Served as Interim Academic Associate Director on two occasions, one semester each time, when the “regular” Academic Associate Director became unavailable to serve.
- Served on the Faculty Advisory Committee (an elected position).
- Chaired multiple faculty search committees.
- With [REDACTED] leading our School’s evaluation and planning efforts with regard to our Dubai master degree in HRLR program.

Leadership in Service to Michigan State University. Related to the ADAPP grant, but beyond the scope of the grant’s requirements, and as a service to MSU, during the past two years I have played a leading role [REDACTED] in developing and conducting multiple academic HR-related workshops for chairs and other faculty leaders. I have also met and worked with leaders in specific units not covered by the grant to assist them in improving their faculty search process and/or understanding data regarding climate and diversity issues in their unit.