

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

**NSF ADVANCE: INSTITUTIONAL TRANSFORMATION
SEATTLE UNIVERSITY**

**INTERNAL EVALUATORS ANNUAL REPORT – YEAR TWO
SEPTEMBER 2017 - DECEMBER 2018**

Internal Evaluator
Kevin Krycka

Executive Summary:

A Descriptive Foundation of the SU ADVANCE Program

This Year Three report focuses on evaluating the Phase One activities and the transition from Phase One to Phase Two occurring between September 2017 and December 2018. The report follows the progression of activities during the past one and a half years, the period I'm calling *Phase One into Phase Two Transition*.

In general, this report addresses the same three basic questions about the SU NSF ADVANCE program (hereafter Program) reported in the Year One Internal Evaluator Report (Submitted Dec. 2017):

1. Is the Program doing what it said it would do to carry out its aims?
2. What is the Program team learning as they are delivering its events and activities?
3. How is ongoing learning informing and shaping the team's decisions regarding future activities and structures of events?

Overview of Program Focus & Progress

As stated in the original grant application and submitted reports, the overall goal of the Program is institutional, structural and cultural transformation. The Program's aims and activities are being shaped by its own activities, ongoing research, and feedback from internal and external sources. Such a multi-level iterative process ideally allows team members to examine the many sources and trajectories of inequity and barriers to promotion, specifically those effecting women faculty in STEM and SBE field, as well as on the hiring and retention of a diverse faculty.

At this point, the Program is moving into Phase Two, Year 3 activities that include the creation of a university level task force to review promotion guidelines and the development of a distinctive approach to mentoring faculty toward successful promotion, called Mentoring the Mentors. The Mentoring initiative is under development but is an example of the responsiveness of the Participatory Action Research methodological foundations of the Program, which aims to learn from its own activities, shaping subsequent initiatives.

This is a complex transition as the Program integrates multiple streams of knowledge from Phase One activities and emerging ones that now appear on the horizon -- some new and some reshaped. In all, this transition is going well. Strategic Communications & Research activities continue, with a newly IRB approved emphasis on the analysis of service statements of faculty who were successful in going up for promotion to the rank of associate and/or full professor.

In early November 2018, the ADVANCE Awareness Faculty Survey was distributed via email to all faculty and faculty administrators. The survey was an outgrowth of iterative feedback mechanisms from all levels of the Project. The survey attempts to measure the impact of Phase One activities, particularly Strategic Communications, among all faculty (full-time, part-time, tenured, or tenure-track). Primarily designed by the Internal Evaluator as an evaluative (not a research) tool, it was refined with the help of the SU ADVANCE Executive Team. Analysis of

the survey results showed a significant positive correlation between advice seeking and service involvement and rank.

Discussion of Status and Results

From September 2017 to December 2018, the SU ADVANCE Program was involved in completing Phase One activities and transitioning to Phase Two activities. SU ADVANCE completed all the activities stipulated in the Organizational Plan of Phase One and is on track as it successfully transitions into Phase Two work. The SU ADVANCE Team has been active on-campus, continuing to raise the profile of the grant and networking with other awardee across the country. The SU ADVANCE Awareness Survey was deployed in November 2018 assessing the level of awareness of the grant by faculty and faculty-administrators. The results have been discussed above and below.

The Participatory Action Research model (PAR) typically yields unanticipated outcomes and developments. In fact, if there were no revisions, expansions, or retractions of planned activities, PAR is probably not occurring. SU ADVANCE has leveraged PAR to its advantage through being intentionally engaged in multi-level feedback loops.

Transitioning from Phase One Strategic Communications to Phase Two Procedural Change. Strategic communication and a variety of diverse research activities, have been delivered more or less as planned – with some changes to accommodate positive developments, such as more interviewees and the expansion of interest into faculty service work. The key to successfully transitioning to Phase Two - Procedural Change is the intentional use of the built-in multi-level feedback process. Feedback in this model may be difficult to quantify, yet the process continuously informs the direction of planned activities, raising the realization that new or revised activities are needed.

Multi-level Feedback. The participatory action research model relies on consistent and high-quality conversations between the various SU ADVANCE Team members and select campus stakeholders to be successful. SU ADVANCE has entered a new phase of integration within the SU community. Included in this integration are new sources of inspiration and knowledge both from within the university and external to it. In addition, clarity has been gained regarding the reporting structure of the SU ADVANCE Program, in which the Program now reports to the Provost directly, instead of to an Associate Provost, as was the prior arrangement.

Renewed Importance of the Jesuit Educational Model to SU ADVANCE. An interesting outcome of the multi-level feedback process in Phase One is a renewed understanding of the character and context of Seattle University as a Jesuit institution. *Magis*, one of the six essential principles of Jesuit education, meaning ‘more’ or ‘greater’, has come to frame the Team’s renewed understanding of the institution as one that emphasizes personal and institutional impact for the greater good of the world. Additionally, two ways Jesuit education ‘cares’ have come to the forefront in Team discussions and meetings with university stakeholders; they are *cura personalis* (care for the whole person) and *cura apostolica* (care for the institution and its mission). In order to support and assist the SU ADVANCE Team in this, Jen Tilghman-Havens from the Center for Jesuit Education has joined the SU ADVANCE team; both she and the SU ADVANCE Pi (O’Brien) are going through a year-long program called the Ignatian Colleagues

Program, which brings together faculty and administrators from Jesuit universities across the country.

Task Force for review and revision of promotion guidelines. A major goal of Phase Two is the formation of a task force whose charge is to study current promotion guidelines and policy documents and suggest changes to the Provost. Through intentional use of the feedback garnered from various activities of Phase One, the SU ADVANCE Team has successfully helped shape the mission of the Task Force with the Provost. At this time, the Provost has appointed taskforce co-chairs, confirmed committee members and has called for first meeting on Feb. 28, 2019.

Mentoring the Mentors. The other major goal of Phase Two is the development and deployment of what is being called the *Mentoring the Mentors* project. At the time of this report, feedback from Program activities is further shaping and refining that project. For instance, it is clear from informal interactions at Program activities and initial thematic analysis of the qualitative research, that service work, and work that doesn't "count" towards tenure and promotion but is pivotal to the mission and daily functioning of the institution is key area of interest to faculty at all levels. Additionally, results from the SU ADVANCE Awareness Survey point to a similar pattern of concern for faculty. These streams of information have resulted in changes to initial ideas for this project. As of this writing, ongoing collaboration between the Team, IAB, and EAB is a key part of planning.

Research. Qualitative research, based on extensive interviews and focus groups with Seattle University faculty, is ongoing. The target is 60 individual interviews has been exceeded. As of this writing 76 interviews have been conducted with an IRB-approved maximum of 120. Additionally, two focus groups have been held, which had a combined attendance of 11 (11 female and 11 professors).

Toolkit Data. Since the Toolkit data have NOT been updated by the university at this time, Faculty Composition data is nonetheless helpful as a general orientation. The main limitation to this data is that it does not adequately allow us to look at any interactions between gender and rank by department. The SU ADVANCE Team agrees that updated Toolkit data is needed but that it would be best to wait to collect it until Phase 2 has had enough time to have an effect. The expected roll out of new institutional data on faculty composition that contains information useful to SU ADVANCE is still expected by late 2019 or early 2020.