

**“What Counts as Success?
Recognizing and Rewarding Women Faculty’s Differential
Contributions in a Comprehensive Liberal Arts University”**

**NSF ADVANCE: INSTITUTIONAL TRANSFORMATION
SEATTLE UNIVERSITY**

**INTERIM REPORT – YEAR TWO
SEPTEMBER 2017-MARCH 2018**

Principal Investigator
Jodi O’Brien

Co-Principal Investigator
Jean Jacoby

Program and Research Coordinator
Sarah Trainer

Administrative Coordinator
Reine Mages

Program Team
Agnieszka Miguel
Jacquelyn Miller
Donna Sylvester
Anna Muraco
(Loyola Marymount)

Internal Evaluator
Kevin Krycka

External Evaluator
Mariko Chang

I – Executive Summary

The aim of the SU ADVANCE program is institutional transformation in the form of:

- cultural shift around the faculty activities that count toward tenure and promotion (with a specific emphasis on promotion for women faculty in STEM and SBE fields);
- procedural change in the form of revised promotion guidelines that clearly include mission-related activities as valued and articulate paths toward promotion (ideally as part of a multi-track, weighted-activity policy); and,
- structural change to include formal mentoring and training for both faculty and administrators as a basis of sustained education and support for the multi-track promotion policy.

SU ADVANCE has completed each of the activities as indicated in the Organizational Plan (December 15, 2016) for the first eighteen months and is on track to complete the Phase One (years 1-2) and transition into Phase Two in the third year as planned. Additionally, through our *participatory action research* (PAR) model, which emphasizes ongoing feedback at multiple levels (within the project team; between the project team and evaluators; between the team and the internal advisory board; and with participants through interviews and related university activities), we have elaborated our program to include:

- greater co-responsibility in program management
- strategies for shared ownership of the program across campus
- enhanced cross-university synergy through the identification of and engagement with corresponding university activities, programs, and offices
- strategies for consistent, effective communication with key stakeholders
- an enhanced plan for ongoing, sustained support of women faculty through the development of a women’s leadership program connected to larger Jesuit university initiatives.

II – Feedback from Year One Evaluations

In the first year of the program, we received formal evaluation feedback from a 1st Year NSF Site visit (April 2017), a 1st Year Internal Evaluator Report and a 1st Year External Evaluator Report (both submitted December 2017). These evaluations commended:

- The SU program’s unique focus as a mission-based institution – an unusual recipient in the NSF IT program and, as such, a program poised to provide significant contributions to national conversations.
- University leadership for its support of diversity in general and SU ADVANCE, specifically, citing examples such as the President’s reception for the program and the participation of Deans and other campus leaders on the team and Internal Advisory Board.
- The enthusiasm, expertise, collaborative spirit, and “gathering ownership of key responsibilities among team members.”

- The very productive process of participatory action research as a basis for ongoing program calibration in response to continual assessment of campus climate on key considerations.
- Our effective achievement of first year goals, including: office set-up, team formation, IRB approval, and launching Phase One activities (strategic communication; perceptions and expectations information gathering).

The evaluators also made similar recommendations, centered primarily around sustainable team management, and coordinated university-level involvement. Specifically, their recommendations include:

- Focus on a team management plan that distributes workload sustainably and is not overly reliant on one or two individuals.
- Consider ways to strategically focus “outward” to share our unique program design and aims.
- Enhance engagement with the Provost’s Office and the Office for Diversity and Inclusion to ensure synergistic coordination of key institutional transformation activities.
- Consider how best to engage the Internal Advisory Board and External Advisory Board.
- Further clarify the role and activities of the Internal Evaluator, especially in terms of effective feedback loops within the participatory action model.
- Identify and pursue key alliances with the ADVANCE network.

The remainder of this report consists of two sections: “Activities to Date” as guided by the Phase One program design, and “Reflections and Adjustments in Response to Evaluations.”

III – Activities To Date

A. PHASE ONE

The central activities of the SU ADVANCE program are inter-related and intended to be mutually supportive toward institutional cultural change, structural shift, and procedural revision. The first two years consisted of Phase One activities centered on “strategic communication” with various stakeholders, and gathering information on “perceptions and expectations” among faculty regarding experiences and tensions in the tenure and promotion guidelines and processes.

1. *Strategic Communication.* This initial phase involved formal meetings with university-level leadership groups to share information about the program and gather first impressions. In terms of participatory action research, this form of communication is intended to encourage awareness and engagement with the program and to solicit input from stakeholders (community leaders) about directions for the program. To date we have met with all of the administrative groups listed in our organizational plan: The Provost’s Council (which includes the Chief Diversity Officer and the Deans as well as various other representatives from the University Cabinet, N=24); the Academic Assembly (N= 15); the College of Arts and

Sciences (CAS) Faculty Senate (which includes the CAS Collegium Mentoring Director, N= 12); the Wismer Faculty Diversity Liaisons (N=8); the College of Science and Engineering (CSE) Executive Committee (i.e., the department chairs, N=9), and the Council of Associate Deans (N=9). In total, we have formally engaged with 74 colleagues who hold faculty and/or administrative leadership positions. Each of these conversations was facilitated by the PI, plus either the Co-PI or team members, Dr. Miller or Dr. Miguel. The Program and Research Coordinator (PRC) joined the CSE meeting.

These conversations have yielded rich discussion that indicate overall strong enthusiasm for the program. Convergent theme points across these conversations include the need to recognize and reward “invisible work.” In recent months, we have focused on systematically reviewing the information gathered from these discussions to articulate convergent themes as well as information for going forward with the design of the interviews and focus groups. Themes include, strong enthusiasm for the general aim of the program; strong agreement of the need for cultural shift in addressing gender and race inequities across faculty opportunities for advancement; bias regarding the persistent (mostly implicit but occasionally explicit) use of R1, elite markers as indicators of scholarly achievement; and evidence of contradictory beliefs in terms of awareness that these markers do not necessarily reflect the holistic SU mission, but less awareness of the way in which they continue to be applied uncritically in tenure and promotion processes.

2. *Perceptions and Expectations.* The IRB process for this faculty interview and focus group phase was more drawn out than we anticipated, but has resulted in a robust protocol that strongly ensures voluntary, confidential participation, with particular attention to protecting interviewees from faculty supervisor/administrator access to the information they share. The aim of this aspect of the program is to gather information on faculty impressions and experiences of the expectations for tenure and promotion and to learn how they calibrate their professional priorities and work-life balance. To date, the PRC (the only person with IRB approval to have full access to all stages of participant recruiting and interviewing) has conducted 62 semi-structured faculty interviews, each lasting 90-120 minutes. The interview pool includes men and women across ranks and disciplines, but the bulk of the interviews are with Associate Professors and recently promoted Professors in STEM and SBS fields. These interviews are currently being transcribed (by an external transcription service to ensure confidentiality) and the PI and the PRC plan to begin an in-depth content analysis in early summer. The PRC has compiled thematic findings and we are in the process currently of using these as a basis for organizing rank-based focus group discussions. These focus groups will take place in Spring 2018 and be conducted by the PRC, the

PI, team member Jacquelyn Miller (Center for Faculty Development), and collaborative consulting partner, Anna Muraco (Loyola Marymount University). We are on track to complete this phase by summer/fall 2018.

3. *Internal Advisory Board and Participatory Action Research.* Following the advice of our External Evaluator and the NSF Program Officer, we have convened an Internal Advisory Board (IAB) consisting of faculty and administrators representing various positions and a diverse range of offices and programs, each of which we consider to be key to the coordination and communication necessary for sustained cultural and procedural transformation across the university. The IAB is chaired by the Dean of Nursing, who has considerable expertise in a number of ADVANCE-related concerns, and who now meets regularly with the Program Team. Prior to fully activating the IAB, we had several conversations with both our Internal and External Evaluators, as well as other ADVANCE colleagues, about how best to use our IAB. Given the unique focus of our project, which requires multiple, converging streams of engagement in order to achieve the river of cross-campus awareness necessary for foundational cultural transformation, we decided that a central function of our IAB is an expanded form of PAR. To this end, we provide the IAB with thematic summaries of information gathered from interviews and other sources and ask them to puzzle through some of the tensions and contradictions that we're grappling with in our institutional cultural and practice. These bi-quarterly gatherings have resulted in lively and useful conversations that serve as a basis for next step consideration as we plan for the mentoring programs and Task Force work in Phase Two. For instance, in a recent meeting we discussed the observation that many faculty feel they're "working all the time," and "love the mission" but that none of this work seems to "count." This led to a spirited, insightful discussion of the Jesuit Educational mission values of "magis" and "curas apostolic" – which, when applied in this realm, shift the emphasis from "hidden service" in which faculty are wrestling with "doing too much" to a "impactful activities that serve as care for the university." Previously, we worked with articles that extend Boyer's models of teaching as scholarship to include other ways in which faculty expertise builds and sustains university life through service and leadership. These conversations not only familiarize key stakeholders with a deeper understanding of the program, but also draw on their thoughtful expertise and experience as campus change-makers to move the program forward.
4. *Subcommittee on Multi-Path Information Gathering.* In Fall 2018 we formed a subcommittee of six members drawn from the Program Team and the Internal Advisory Board and led by Co-PI Jacoby. This Subcommittee was tasked with gathering and analyzing information from universities that appear to have some form of multi-path structure to tenure and promotion. The group has been meeting regularly and in early

March, gave a preliminary presentation of its findings to the Program Team and Internal Advisory Board. This presentation included information gathered from 50 universities, with six detailed case studies, and also provided summary thematic information from the “strategic communications” and “perceptions and experiences” aspects of the program conducted to date. The aim was to get feedback from the IAB before finalizing the presentation for a wider university audience, including leaders across the various positions as identified in the Phase One strategic communication design. This presentation is intended as a next level of communication/feedback with key stakeholders and, ideally, will be broadcast university-wide in the Provost’s Fall Convocation as part of Phase Two/Year 3 preparation for convening a Task Force on Promotion Guidelines.

B. PROGRAM INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS

In response to the NSF Program Director’s 1st Year Site Visit observations about the unique and potentially promising national-level contributions of the SU program, we have expanded our information and communication work to be more “outward” facing. Led by team member, Donna Sylvester (Mathematics), this work has included the development of a website, and, most impressively, a substantial data-base consisting of NSF ADVANCE and related research materials that are being annotated and thematically organized and intended as a resource for anyone interested. This is a huge undertaking, and one that has already received positive feedback from fellow ADVANCE-IT universities. We are currently exploring best platforms for making this research accessible. Dr. Sylvester is preparing a poster-session presentation on this innovative project for the Annual Association of Women in Science meeting this fall (AWIS – which is the professional presentational forum for ADVANCE).

C. NETWORKING

The SU ADVANCE team has had an active networking year. Four team members attended the national AWIS conference in Washington, D.C. in October 2017 (Krycka, Mages, O’Brien, and Trainer). This was our opportunity to meet fellow ADVANCE project teams and we found it exciting to learn about the extensive transformational activities that are taking place around the country. We also learned that our SU program is considered a “trail-blazer” program within this NSF community and came away eager to become more engaged in the ADVANCE network. At the request of the NSF, PI O’Brien participated as a member of the review team for the 3rd Year Site Visit to University of Houston. In addition to performing the required evaluation activities, this was an opportunity to observe the specific details of another ADVANCE program. The UH program is noteworthy in several ways, especially regarding hiring and retention of diverse faculty. PI O’Brien also visited the Montana State University ADVANCE program (just completing its final year). The intent of the visit was to provide consultation on the MSU tenure and promotion process, but it was also an opportunity to learn first-hand about yet another program. In March of this year, Co-PI Jacoby and PI

O'Brien were invited by the SU President to attend a Board of Trustees quarterly dinner and to present an overview of SU ADVANCE. This opportunity to share details of the program at this level of university administration is a strong indicator of the extensive engagement of our leadership.

D. SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

In November 2018, PI O'Brien, and PRC Trainer visited Loyola Marymount University to meet with our social science research project collaborator, Anna Muraco (Sociology). As part of the visit and for the purposes both of networking and gathering information from a comparative institution, Dr. Muraco scheduled meetings with faculty and department chairs in STEM and SBS departments; with the LMU Office of Intercultural Affairs; the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs, and the Deans of Science and Engineering, and Liberal Arts. In April 2018, Dr. Muraco will visit SU for further work on our social science research project, including planning for a Summer 2018 research and writing focus. Because of the participatory action research (PAR) model we are using, this information and our collaborative discussions with Dr. Muraco serve both to enhance our general program aims, and are part of the social science research process.

IV. Reflections and Adjustments in Response to PAR and Evaluations

In accord with our *participatory action research* (PAR) model, we are continuously tracking our activities, and discussing and adjusting. In response to the NSF 1st Year Site Visit, we have re-calibrated our communications and networking to enhance the potential for sharing our program developments beyond the university. We have also articulated a more formal team organizational plan and corresponding distribution of responsibilities with the aim of a more sustainable co-sharing model. Additionally, we have re-formulated our approach to the External Advisory Board, creating instead an External Advisory Network.

A. TEAM ORGANIZATION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

After considerable deliberation of the most appropriate form of program management for our particular project focus and scope, we have settled on a highly workable program management structure and have begun to hit our stride as indicated by our effective work in the activities listed above. This past summer (2017) we held a Program Team retreat focused on articulating the various dimensions of our program and assigning responsibilities within each dimension. These include: program management, program development, research, external facing/networking, NSF reporting/compliance, and operations.

1. *Program Management.* We have divided the Team into an Executive Team and a Project Team. The Executive Team, consisting of the PI, Co-PI, PRC, Administrative Coordinator, and Internal Evaluator meets weekly. The PRC has primary responsibility, along with the Administrative Coordinator, for program management, which includes oversight for all other dimensions, scheduling meetings, facilitating our

internal feedback loop processes, supervising the interns, and coordinating the activities of the various team members (e.g., website and database development under Sylvester, multi-path subcommittee work under Jacoby, External Advisory Network under Miguel, etc.). The Administrative Coordinator, together with the PI and the PRC, has also spent considerable time and effort building infrastructure internally to support the financial and reporting requirements of the grant, another area where R1 expectations need to be translated to the SU infrastructure.

2. *Intern Program.* To support information development and communications and related office management activities, we determined that internships would provide us not only with needed office help, but would be an opportunity for women students in STEM and SBS to be involved in the program from the ground up. This program satisfies both a staffing need and is a form of programmatic mentoring that not only engages women students in science mentoring, but expands our campus network to the faculty advisors who are eager to send their students to work with us. To date, we have had five different interns: two from Computer Science, one from Psychology, and two from Sociology. We anticipate bringing on two more (both from Computer Science) in Fall 2018. The interns have had primary responsibility for developing the website, developing the informational research archive, and content analysis of faculty CVs.
3. *Program Development.* This dimension includes oversight of the IAB, External Advisory Network, and strategic engagement with SU leadership – activities that are coordinated by the IAB Chair (Dean of Nursing), team member Miguel (Electrical and Computer Engineering) and the Co-PI. The development of mentoring and training programs is also included in this dimension and is coordinated by the PI, Co-PI, and team member Miller (Center for Faculty Development)
4. *Research.* This area covers both the research phases of the transformation program and the social science research project. Activities include interviews, focus groups, participant observation, field notes for PAR, conferences, white papers, briefs and related communications, and formal scholarly papers. The PRC and the PI oversee this area.
5. *External Facing/Networking.* This dimension includes the website, and annotated research literature and archives, and has overlap with *research* in publications and conferences, and also with the External Advisory Network. Team member Sylvester (Mathematics) coordinates this area with assistance from the PRC and the interns.

6. *NSF Reports/Compliance.* External and Internal evaluations are included in this area along with reports and site visits. The PI, PRC and Evaluators work together on these activities. The Internal Evaluator meets bi-monthly with the Team and monthly with the External Evaluator, who is also included on regular updates shared with the IAB and External Consultants.
7. *Operations* includes budget, staffing, scheduling, and communications with the Office of Sponsored Projects and is overseen by the Administrative Coordinator in coordination with the PI, Co-PI, and PRC.

B. INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ADVISORY GROUPS

The 1st Year Site Review recommended that we focus on establishing advisor groups that reflect the unique scope and focus of our program. Accordingly, we have taken the following steps:

1. *Internal Advisory Board.* As we described above, we have compiled a robust, active Internal Advisory Board consisting of campus leaders and faculty change-makers from across several schools and colleges. This group meets twice each quarter with an agenda that includes program updates and announcements, requests (e.g., assistance in soliciting interviewees and focus group participants), advisory discussions (e.g., strategies to enhance cross-campus communications regarding the program), and discussions regarding framing for next steps (as an aspect of PAR).
2. *External Advisory Network.* Initially, we followed the typical practice of inviting experts from universities around the country to sit on an External Advisory Board. Team member Agnieszka Miguel has a national reputation as a leader in engineering education and was able to put together an impressive roster of faculty experts. However, we soon realized that, as a comparatively smaller ADVANCE program, it made more sense to reformulate the EAB into a more administratively nimble “network” of external advisors. In February 2018, after consultation with NSF, Miguel formally announced this shift to all the Advisors and made the relevant adjustments. The Network of External Advisors consists of Michael Quinn (SU), Eve Riskin (UW), Dana Britton (Rutgers), Jenna Carpenter (Campbell), Roger Green (NDSU), Daryl Chubin (Independent Consultant), Teri Reed (Univ. of Cincinnati), Sarah Rajala (Iowa State), Laura Kramer (Monclair), Klod Kokini (Purdue), Laura Grindstaff (UC Davis), Bevelee Watford (Virginia Tech). Of these, Riskin and Britton, who have the most extensive experience with ADVANCE programs, have been most actively involved in offering guidance on different aspects of SU ADVANCE. However, Miguel has been strategic in asking for advice of the others

at key points. Kokini, for example, provided our subcommittee with important information on Purdue’s multi-path process to advancement.

C. TRANSITIONING UNIVERSITY LEADERSHIP

PI O’Brien meets bi-weekly with the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs for one-on-one meetings and is a member of the University Directors group (faculty administrators overseeing university-wide centers and programs), which meets semi-quarterly. Currently, SU has an Interim Provost, with the newly hired Provost expected to begin July 1, 2018. In her 1st year report, the External Evaluator recommended that SU ADVANCE report directly to the Provost. The current Provost’s office is amenable to this and has been helpful in providing opportunities for the PI and Co-PI to meet with the incoming Provost and to assure that he is aware of the significance of SU ADVANCE as a foundational program within Academic Affairs. All evaluators recommended the need to demonstrate coordination with the Office for Diversity and Inclusion. We are eager to partner with this excellent office and to integrate the expertise of the Chief Diversity Officer and are taking steps to enhance that connection.

V – Upcoming Activities for Summer/Fall 2018

Over the next six months, our activities will be focused on four interrelated areas. The first will consist of analyzing the information gathered in Phase One (via strategic communication, interviews, focus groups, and participant observation). We will also be preparing our first set of working papers and conference presentations based on the Phase One information, as well as on research dissemination and networking outside our home institution. Additionally, within Seattle University, we will be working closely with the new Provost and other university leaders to initiate the development of a center for women’s leadership, intended to sustain our program into the future. Lastly, we will formally begin Phase Two of our ADVANCE Program in Fall 2018.

A. ANALYZING PHASE ONE INFORMATION

This spring, we will begin reviewing the transcribed interviews, fieldnotes, focus group transcripts, and related feedback for convergent themes. Consistent with our PAR methodology, we will share initial observations and themes with the IAB as a basis for further input and discussion. Through the summer we will outline the working framework for the Task Force and the Mentoring Programs that make up Phase Two. In addition to the internal working papers that we intend to write and circulate for these activities, we will begin writing related research papers with at least two foci: (1) papers describing and analyzing our specific ADVANCE project and (2) papers connected to our social science research project.

B. RESEARCH DISSEMINATION & NETWORKING

The experience and information we have gathered to date exceeds our initial expectations and encourages us to share broadly. Members of the Program Team are already pursuing opportunities to discuss SU ADVANCE at related

conferences, including the annual meetings of the Association of Women in Science (AWIS, Full Team), Electrical and Computer Engineering Department Heads Association (Miguel), American Society of Electrical Engineering (Miguel), and Pacific Sociological Association (O'Brien). Dr. O'Brien has been invited by Vice President of Mission Integration for the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (Stephanie Russell) to address the Association's Provost's Council (representing 28 colleges and universities) regarding the program. Long range, we are already working on panel proposals for both AWIS and the National Association of Women's Studies conferences.

C. CENTER FOR WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP

Seattle University is somewhat unique among NSF ADVANCE institutions because of the comparatively high number of women already in leadership positions as Chairs, Program Directors, and Associate Deans. A recent ABET review, for example, highlighted the prevalence of women in leadership as one of the noteworthy features of our engineering departments (since all of them, along with Computer Science, are chaired by women). Consistent with our project proposal, however, is our observation is that while SU has many women in leadership positions, there is little in the way of training, support, and ongoing mentoring for them. A consequence of this is that these women tend to lag behind men in going up for promotion, and they also report experiencing considerable isolation and burn-out. Our long-term aim for institutionalizing the transformational work that we accomplish through SU ADVANCE is the formation of a center for women's leadership, as well as formal support and mentoring for women, based on principles and practices learned and established during our ADVANCE years. In early 2018 we invited women leaders from potentially connected centers to begin thinking about the infrastructure for this program. Participants included the Chief Diversity Officer and the Executive Director of the School of Business Center for Leadership Formation, as well as directors in university mission education programs. The Vice President of Mission Integration for the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (Stephanie Russell) is keenly interested in working with SU ADVANCE not only to develop this center, but to identify peer institutions that could partner with us. In the coming year, we intend to produce a proposal for this center, to circulate among key stakeholders, including University Advancement. These initial efforts are being overseen by the PI and by IAB member, Jen Tilghman-Havens. Tilghman-Havens, currently the Associate Director of the Center for Jesuit Education at Seattle University, was formerly the Director of the Women's Resource Center at Boston College (another Jesuit institution). She is gathering comparative information on women's leadership programs across a wide range of universities.

D. PREPARATION FOR PHASE TWO

Our aim is to commence Phase Two in Fall 2018. This phase includes the formation of a President's Taskforce on Tenure and Promotion Guidelines and the development of (1) mentoring programs for faculty and (2) training programs for department chairs and evaluator committees. The Taskforce will be guided by

the information generated by Phase One, so Summer and Fall 2018 will include focusing on data analysis, preparing internal reports based on this information, and working with the President, the Provost, and the IAB on the selection of the taskforce members. This preparatory work will also include more research into existing models of differentiated promotion and tenure guidelines from other colleges and universities (currently under way and mentioned earlier in this report). The development of the mentoring and training programs will be coordinated with the Center for Faculty Development (team member Jacquelyn Miller is the Associate Director of the Center), and, ideally, the Office of Diversity and Inclusion.