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1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report presents the findings of an external evaluation of Oregon State University’s ADVANCE-IT grant, covering the period generally corresponding to the grant’s second year of funding. The ADVANCE-IT grant is designed to be a catalyst for advancing the study and practice of equity, inclusion, and justice for women and others from historically underrepresented faculty groups in the STEM and SBS academy.

The grant’s three objectives and related outcomes are detailed below.

1. **Recruitment and Promotion** - One-year ADVANCE Faculty Fellowships were launched in Year 2 to support the work of tenure-line faculty to embed equity, inclusion, and justice throughout the university. Five Fellows, all women and three at the rank of Professor, were named in the 2016-17 academic year, representing the colleges of Agricultural Sciences, Forestry, Pharmacy, Science, and Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences. The ADVANCE team plans to bring the Fellows together three times during the academic year and have them present to other colleges to help disseminate their work. The Faculty Fellows have significant potential to impact this goal and it will be important to track their efforts in order to assess impacts on recruitment and promotion as the grant progresses.

“Toolkit” data indicate the percent of women hired in STEM at the Assistant Professor rank increased from 29% at baseline to 47% in grant Year 2. Hires in SBS increased from 48% to 67%. The percent of women hired in STEM and SBS fields also increased slightly at each rank, except of Full Professor in SBS where there was no hiring in Year 2. Numbers of STEM and SBS women tenured and promoted remained fairly consistent in Year 2 in comparison to the baseline. Data on the numbers of tenure reviews or denials is not yet available and so it is not possible to determine if rates of tenure are similar for women and men.

2. **Institutional Climate** - Internal evaluation efforts to document progress toward an institutional climate that values equity, inclusion, and justice are underway. Consistent implementation across all activities is needed to strengthen the internal evaluator’s ability to accurately assess progress. Findings from the 2016 climate survey will potentially provide additional insight on progress in this domain. However, providing the findings in a format that is useful to ADVANCE will be essential. Additionally, tracking the work of the Faculty Fellows and the impacts of Seminar Participant Action Plans related to institutional climate will be essential to the evaluation of Goal 2.

3. **Awareness and Actions** – Several activities in Year 2 support Goal 3:

   • **The ADVANCE Seminar**, a 60-hour interactive learning experience for faculty and administrators, focused on analyzing difference, power, and privilege in higher education with particular attention to STEM disciplines. Three Seminars
were held in Year 2, attended by 45 participants, including the Interim Provost and the President. Post-seminar evaluation forms and interviews confirmed that participants’ awareness of difference, power, and discrimination in the academy increased and that the Seminar is fostering a network of people with similar goals and a shared language. Seminar participants reported learning new terminology and concepts and finding discussion, role-playing, the power shuffle, and hearing personal stories to be essential to the learning process. Deans have begun aligning policies and procedures with ADVANCE efforts and discussing the importance of ADVANCE in meetings of the Provost’s Council. Action plans developed by participants show promise in enhancing actions that contribute to equitable, inclusive, and just treatment.

• OSU ADVANCE partnered with other stakeholders to host five **Sponsored Events** addressing injustice, inclusivity, and equality in Year 2. These included speakers with expertise on mentoring, core curriculum, harassment and assault, integrating the arts into STEM education, and advancing equity and inclusion. These events drew both men and women and faculty from all ranks. Attendees’ at three of the events were asked to complete evaluation forms. Dr. Kathryn Clancy’s talk, “The Effects of Sexual Harassment and Assault on Scientists’ Careers” had the highest mean ratings for raising awareness. Open-ended comments for that event showed an increase in participants’ awareness of issues and policies and their willingness to advocate and take action.

• **Roadshows and Influencer Dialogues** were held to raise awareness of and build communities of support around equity, inclusion, and justice issues, with a focus on women in STEM. Data and documentation from the Influencer Dialogues and Roadshows informs the internal evaluation but lack of a uniform protocol or template for reporting and collection data limits the internal evaluator’s ability to assess impacts. Consistent documentation and data collection will be essential moving forward.

**Social Science Research** project is investigating the degree to which participating in the ADVANCE Seminar motivates institutional leaders and faculty to actively contribute to campus climate transformation. About 80% of last-round seminar participants agreed to participate in the study (up from 40% of participants initially). The Research Team has been collecting pre-post survey data from seminar participants and completing post-interviews of last year’s participants. Outcomes will be compared to a control group with similar characteristics as the experimental group. The team anticipates that a Diary component will be added to the study at next summer’s Seminar. This rigorous empirical test of the impact of the Seminar on personal awareness and related actions will produce findings of broad importance to academic communities.
Other Key Findings

Upper administration turnover has created uncertainty for the project. The ADVANCE team plans to actively engage the new individuals who assume these important institutional positions. The lack of a direct line to the Provost’s Office, coupled with the location of the ADVANCE Office in the College of Liberal Arts, likely reduces the visibility and potential impact of ADVANCE at OSU. Lastly, ADVANCE initiatives are complementary to other OSU efforts already in place to support an inclusive climate. Stakeholders stressed the importance of developing a shared vocabulary with these other OSU efforts to enhance synergy and impacts.

Conclusion and Recommendations

In Year 2, OSU-ADVANCE is building on a solid foundation of activities that only require a bit of fine-tuning and consistency. Although it is too early in the process to assess impacts, the ADVANCE Seminar is in high demand and holds promise as a vital mechanism to empower faculty and administrators to take active roles in the transformation of campus climate. Key recommendations include:

- Implement consistent data collection across all activities to support project evaluation and research. Work with the Office of Institutional Research to access specific climate survey analyses in time to prepare for the NSF 3rd Year Site visit.
- Explore ways to align the Seminar Participants’ Action Plans with the work being done by the Faculty Fellows.
- Review Seminar participant demographics to target future seminar recruitment efforts to ensure maximum impact.
- Explore ways to effectively disseminate the successful impacts of work done by Seminar participants and Faculty Fellows to the institution as a whole.
- Re-engage the Internal Advisory Council, build strong relationships with the new Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, and strengthen collaboration with other complementary efforts on campus.
- Consider a leadership retreat focused on preparing for the 3rd Year Site Visit by NSF and/or seek guidance from other ADVANCE institutions that have undergone 3rd Year Site Visits.
2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Organization of the Report

This report is divided into several key sections. Section 2.2 provides a brief overview of the major goals of the Oregon State University ADVANCE-IT grant, followed by a description of the evaluation objectives and methods (Section 3). A summary of key “Toolkit” indicators is presented in Section 4. Section 5 covers the main activities undertaken in Year 2 of the grant, integrating evaluation activities conducted by the internal and the external evaluators. Section 6 provides a summary of Year 2 progress toward the three main objectives of the grant. The report ends with a summary of main findings and key recommendations.

2.2 Summary of Oregon State University ADVANCE

Oregon State University is completing the second year of their ADVANCE-IT grant. The grant seeks to serve as a catalyst for advancing the study and practice of equity, inclusion, and justice for women and others from historically underrepresented groups who are faculty in the academy (STEM and SBS specifically), at three levels of influence: personal, symbolic, and institutional. The centerpiece program, the ADVANCE Seminar, is adapted for STEM senior faculty and administrators from the university’s Difference, Power, and Discrimination (DPD) Seminar.

The three main objectives of the grant include:

1. **Recruitment and Promotion**—Influence academic recruitment and promotion policies and practices to assure equitable, inclusive, and just advancement

2. **Institutional Climate**—Contribute to an institutional climate that reflects a shared value for equity, inclusion, and justice

3. **Awareness and Actions**—Provoke faculty and administrators’ personal awareness of difference, power, and discrimination in the academy and actions that contribute to equitable, inclusive, and just treatment

With permission from the Program Officer, the team has slightly revised their initial list of activities to remove those that were not closely aligned with project goals and enable the team to focus on key activities. Major activities (described in Section 4) to support progress toward the main objectives now include:

- **ADVANCE Seminar**

   As the centerpiece of the project, the 60-hour ADVANCE Seminar is an interactive learning experience for faculty and administrators that focuses on analyzing the operations of difference, power, and privilege in higher education with particular attention to STEM disciplines
• Faculty Fellows

One-year ADVANCE Faculty Fellowships support the work of tenure-line faculty to embed equity, inclusion, and justice throughout the university

• Sponsored Events

Partner with other OSU stakeholders to sponsor events and speakers addressing injustice, inclusivity, and equality

• Roadshows

Presentations at key faculty and administrative meetings designed to raise awareness of equity, inclusion, and justice issues, with a focus on women in STEM

• Influencer Dialogues

Targeted conversations with top administrators build communities, context and structures for support of equity, inclusion, and justice in faculty recruitment, retention, promotion, and advancement

• ADVANCE Journal (to be implemented later)

The proposed ADVANCE Journal will be an online peer-reviewed, open-access journal that will provide a forum for dissemination of ADVANCE-related research and content

• Social Science Research

Using a mixed-methods approach, the primary research question is: Will participating in the DPD seminar empower and motivate institutional leaders and faculty members to actively contribute to campus climate transformation?

Key hypotheses include:

1. Women STEM faculty who complete the DPD seminar will:
   a. have greater awareness and understanding of the power relationships in which they are immersed than similarly situated women STEM faculty who did not participate
   b. report a greater sense of efficacy in managing professional interactions and challenging structural/cultural barriers than similarly situated women STEM faculty who did not participate

2. Men and women STEM faculty who identify along social identity categories that are centered in US culture (e.g., white, able bodied, straight) will:
   a. have a higher level of awareness and understanding of relational
power, and a greater appreciation of what is involved in building authentic alliances across difference after completing the seminar relative to their peers who did not participate

b. take more explicit actions to foster positive and affirming faculty interactions across difference after completing the seminar relative to their peers who did not participate

**Theoretical Framework:**

The project is guided by two theoretical frameworks. A four component social justice lens will be applied with a focus on equity and inclusion, measured as proximal (individual) changes: access, agency, advocacy, and solidarity action, through distal (institutional) processes: participatory democracy, civility, transformative practice, and systemic change (Figure 1, courtesy of OSU ADVANCE).

![Figure 1. Theory of Change](image)

The Transtheoretical Model will be used to assess individual-level change at six readiness levels and the Community Readiness Model will be used to assess institutional-level change at nine readiness levels and across six dimensions (Figures 2 and 3, courtesy of OSU ADVANCE).
Figure 2. Theory of Change, cont.

Individual Level Change

- Precontemplation (Not Ready)
  - Not intending to take action in the next six months

- Contemplation (Getting Ready)
  - Intending to take action in the next six months

- Preparation (Ready)
  - Ready to take action in the next 30 days

- Action
  - Have made overt changes in the past six months

- Maintenance
  - Doing a new behavior for more than six months

- Termination
  - 100% self-efficacy

Transtheoretical Model (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1983)

Figure 3. Theory of Change, cont.

Institutional Readiness Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Dimensions of Readiness</th>
<th>Nine Levels of Readiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current institutional efforts</td>
<td>No awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community knowledge about efforts</td>
<td>Denial/Resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Vague awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional climate/attitude</td>
<td>Preplanning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge about the Issue</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources related to the issue</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stabilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmation/expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalization/ownership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Community Tool Box (University of Kansas, 2014)
3. Evaluation Objectives and Methods

3.1 Evaluation Period and Objectives

This evaluation covers the period between July 1, 2016 (completion of Year 1 annual external evaluation) and September 9, 2016 (completion of most recent ADVANCE Seminars), which corresponds generally to the grant’s second year of funding. Evaluation objectives for this annual report are primarily formative and include:

- Describing implementation activities, successes and challenges
- Monitoring the status of implementation progress toward program goals
- Providing formative feedback to facilitate project refinements
- Enhancing communication among the Leadership Team and stakeholders
- Establishing baseline measures upon which the impact of program initiatives can be measured

3.2 Evaluation Methods and Data

Evaluation activities were undertaken by internal and external evaluators. Internal evaluation efforts were led by Dr. Deborah John (Associate Professor of Biological and Population Health Sciences and Extension Specialist, College of Public Health and Human Sciences). Dr. Mariko Chang, President of Mariko Chang Consulting, Inc., is the project’s external evaluator. In Year 2, Dr. Theresa Westover, former Director of Education and Evaluation Services at UC Davis’ School of Education also contributed to the external evaluation efforts.

This external evaluation report incorporates both quantitative and qualitative data, derived from the following sources:

*Interviews:* Dr. Westover conducted a site visit September 6-7, 2016, conducting interviews with approximately 35 key stakeholders, including the PI, Co-PIs, Interim Provost, Project Manager, Internal Evaluator, Deans, Seminar Participants,¹ Research Team, and Department Heads.

*Institutional Data:* Department-level data on STEM/SBS faculty composition (such as the number of faculty by rank and sex) and other ADVANCE Indicators Toolkit data were provided to the external evaluator.

¹ To collect feedback from some of the seminar participants who were unable to attend the on-campus interviews, they were invited to answer questions by email and 3 chose to do so.
Workshop/Event Evaluations: Evaluation findings from key events and workshops were developed by the internal evaluator and the project team. Findings were provided to the external evaluator and key findings are summarized in this report.

4. Summary of Baseline and Year 2 “Toolkit” Data

Baseline and Year 2 data on the representation of women STEM and SBS faculty by rank, hired, retained, tenured, and promoted were obtained from the “Toolkit” Indicator data provided by the OSU-ADVANCE team.

Baseline data for the composition of STEM and SBS women faculty by rank refer to Fall 2014 (Year 1 of the grant). For other data that fluctuate more from year to year and/or have small sample sizes (new hires, attrition, tenures, promotions), baseline data are aggregated across the most recent 3-5 academic years (based on data availability) to level out the annual variation. For the purposes of comparison with Year 2 data, baseline data that covers multiple years is averaged across all baseline years in this report. Year 2 data include data in the 2015-2016 period.

Year 2 data will be compared with baseline data as one critical metric for examining the impact of activities upon the first major objective of the grant to increase the number of women STEM faculty that are equitably and justly recruited, supported, retained, and promoted. Although it would be very early to attribute any changes through Year 2 to OSU-ADVANCE, they are useful for understanding the current situation and will provide a mechanism for assessing change over the course of the grant.

4.1 Composition of STEM and SBS Faculty by Gender and Rank

Women faculty across all STEM departments increased from 23% in the baseline year to 25% in Year 2 (Table 1). The total number of women tenured/tenure track faculty increased from 156 to 168 with most of that increase in Assistant Professors. Also, the number of men in STEM fields dropped by 5 (from 517 to 512)\(^2\) from baseline to Year 2, thereby increasing the percentage increase by women. The percent of women at the rank of Full Professor remained constant at 21% from baseline to Year 2.

Compared with women in STEM fields, the percent of women in SBS fields remains much more balanced between the genders for both baseline and Year 2, at 47% and 48% respectively. In SBS fields across all three ranks there were three more women and six more men in Y2 than in baseline.

\(^2\) Data not shown; data from Table 1 of the Year 1 and Year 2 “Toolkit Data.”
### Table 1. Number and Percent Women Tenure-Track Faculty in STEM and SBS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Women</th>
<th>Percent Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asst.</td>
<td>Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline (2014)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 (2015)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SBS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline (2014)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 (2015)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 Recruitment of Women STEM and SBS Faculty

The number of new hires in STEM from baseline to Year 2 increased for women in all three ranks, but especially at the Assistant Professor rank with an increase from an average of 8.6 to 14 (Figure 4). SBS fields experienced modest increases in the number of women hired into Assistant and Associate Professors ranks (Figure 5).

The percent of STEM women hired also increased, especially at the rank of Assistant Professor. At baseline 29% of new Assistant Professors hired were women and in Year 2, 47% of hires at the rank of Assistant Professor were women. In SBS, women’s percent of Assistant Professor hires increased from 48% at baseline to 67% in Year 2.

---

1 A new year (2014-15) of baseline data was added to the previous report on the four years of baseline data (2010 to 2014).

2 Baseline data were averaged across all five years of baseline data.
A new year (2014-15) of baseline data was added to the previous report on the four years of baseline data (2010 to 2014).

Baseline data were averaged across all five years of baseline data.

4.3 Retention of Women STEM and SBS Faculty

The attrition of women in STEM experienced a slight drop from baseline to Year 2 among both Assistant and Associate Professors (Figure 6). Among Full Professors in STEM fields there is a modest increase for both women (0.3 to 1) and men (2.5 to 4).

As a function of the total numbers of women and men who are Assistant Professors in Year 2 (Table 1), rates of attrition are comparable between the genders in STEM (1/54=1.9% for women; 2/113=1.8% for men). Similarly, attrition rates for women and men who are Full Professors is also very close in Year 2 at 1.5% for women and 1.7% for men (1/66=1.5% for women; 4/242=1.7% for men).

In SBS fields the attrition numbers drop to zero in Year 2 from baseline for both women and men in Assistant and Associate Professor ranks (Figure 7). The pattern for Full Professors is reversed for women and men in SBS, with women at zero attrition at baseline and 1 in Year 2, and men going from an average of 0.5 at baseline to zero in Year 2. However, the numbers in SBS fields tend to be very small, fewer than 20.
Baseline data were averaged across all four years of baseline data.

### 4.4 Promotion and Tenure of Women STEM and SBS Faculty

Tenure among women in STEM was about the same in Year 2 as it was at baseline, 7 vs 7.3 (Figure 8). For men in STEM the drop was more pronounced from an average of 21.7 at baseline to 15 in Year 2. As described in last year's report on baseline data, the numbers of tenure reviews or denials is not yet available. Those data would make it possible to calculate rates of tenure and promotions.
Promotion of women in STEM from Assistant to Associate Professor increased from 3.7 at baseline to 5 in Year 2 and remains stable for men at 14.3 at baseline and 14 in Year 2. Women in STEM promoted from Associate to Full Professor is constant from baseline at 4 at both time points. The corresponding group of men drops from an average of 7.0 at baseline to 6 in Year 2. The numbers for tenure and promotion in the SBS fields is very small for both women and men (Figure 9).

![Figure 8. Tenure and Promotion Approvals in STEM by Gender, Baseline Average\(^1\) and Year 2](image1)

\(^1\)Baseline data were averaged across all three years of baseline data.

![Figure 9. Tenure and Promotion Approvals in SBS by Gender, Baseline Average\(^1\) and Year 2](image2)

\(^1\)Baseline data were averaged across all three years of baseline data except for associate to full where only one year of data were available for baseline.
The percent of faculty promoted from Assistant to Associate Professor who are women increased from 21% at baseline to 26% in Year 2, most of that change coming from the greater number of women at Year 2 over baseline. The percent of women promoted from Associate to Full Professor also increased, from 36% to 40%, however that change is due to the fewer number of men advanced, from 7 at baseline to 6 in Year 2.

4.5 Summary Across Baseline and Year 2 Data Indicators

Figures 10 through 15 summarize the gender composition, percent hired, percent attrition, percent women tenured and promoted in STEM and SBS fields for each of the three ranks. There is a noticeable increase in the percent of women hired in STEM at the Assistant Professor rank from an average of 8.6 or 29% at baseline to 14 or 47% in Year 2. The pattern is similar for hires in SBS, from 2.6 or 48% at baseline to 4 or 67% in Year 2.

The percent of women hired in STEM and SBS fields increases slightly in Year 2 from baseline at each rank, with the exception of Full Professors in SBS where hiring dropped to zero in Year 2 (though in 2 of the 5 baseline years, 2010-11 and 2011-12, there were no women hired as Full Professors in STEM).

Attrition for both STEM and SBS fields in the Assistant and Associate Professor ranks remains small and drops a bit from baseline to Year 2. As mentioned above, women’s attrition is small for both STEM and SBS fields for all three ranks. As a percentage, tenure increases slightly in Year 2 from baseline for STEM fields (25% at baseline and 32% in Year 2) and SBS fields (41% at baseline and 100% in Year 2). Promotions from assistant to associate increase for women in STEM, and for SBS, though the numbers are small (3.7 or 21% at baseline and 5 or 26% in Year 2). The count of promotions to Full Professor in STEM remains constant at 4 for both baseline and Year 2.
For “% Hired” a new year (2014-15) of baseline data was added to the previous report on the four years of baseline data (2010 to 2014). Baseline data for “Hired” were averaged across all five years of baseline data; for “Attrition” were averaged across all four years of baseline data; and for “Tenured” and “Promoted to Associate” were averaged across all three years of baseline data.
For % Hired, a new year (2014-15) of baseline data was added to the previous report on the four years of baseline data (2010 to 2014).

Baseline data for “Hired” were averaged across all five years of baseline data; for “Attrition” were averaged across all four years of baseline data; and for “Tenured” and “Promoted to Associate” were averaged across all three years of baseline data.

Figure 12. Women Associate Professors in STEM Baseline Average\(^1,2\) and Year 2 (number of women in parentheses)

\[\begin{array}{cccc}
\% \text{ in STEM} & \% \text{ Hired} & \% \text{ Attrition} & \% \text{ Promoted to Full} \\
22\% (44) & 16\% (0.8) & 22\% (0.5) & 36\% (4.0) \\
23\% (48) & 0\% & 0\% & 40\% (4) \\
\end{array}\]

\(\text{Baseline (averaged)}\) \hspace{1cm} \(\text{Year 2}\)

---

For % Hired, a new year (2014-15) of baseline data was added to the previous report on the four years of baseline data (2010 to 2014).

Baseline data for “Hired” were averaged across all five years of baseline data; for “Attrition” were averaged across all four years of baseline data; and for “Tenured” and “Promoted to Associate” were averaged across all three years of baseline data.

Figure 13. Women Associate Professors in SBS Baseline Average\(^1,2\) and Year 2 (number of women in parentheses)

\[\begin{array}{cccc}
\% \text{ in SBS} & \% \text{ Hired} & \% \text{ Attrition} & \% \text{ Promoted to Full} \\
45\% (13) & 50\% (0.2) & 0\% & 0\% \\
52\% (15) & 60\% (0.3) & 0\% & 0\% \\
\end{array}\]

\(\text{Baseline (averaged)}\) \hspace{1cm} \(\text{Year 2}\)
For ‘% Hired” a new year (2014-15) of baseline data was added to the previous report on the four years of baseline data (2010 to 2014).

Baseline data for “Hired” were averaged across all five years of baseline data; for “Attrition” were averaged across all four years of baseline data; and for “Tenured” and “Promoted to Associate” were averaged across all three years of baseline data.

Figure 14. Women Full Professors in STEM Baseline Average$^{1,2}$ and Year 2 (number of women in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>% in STEM</th>
<th>% Hired</th>
<th>% Attrition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21% (65)</td>
<td>21% (66)</td>
<td>24% (1.2)</td>
<td>11% (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% (1.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baseline (averaged) | Year 2

Figure 15. Women Full Professors in SBS Baseline Average$^{1,2}$ and Year 2 (number of women in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>% in SBS</th>
<th>% Hired</th>
<th>% Attrition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% (10)</td>
<td>45% (10)</td>
<td>50% (0.2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baseline (averaged) | Year 2

$^1$For ‘% Hired” a new year (2014-15) of baseline data was added to the previous report on the four years of baseline data (2010 to 2014).

$^2$Baseline data for “Hired” were averaged across all five years of baseline data; for “Attrition” were averaged across all four years of baseline data; and for “Tenured” and “Promoted to Associate” were averaged across all three years of baseline data.
5. Findings from Year 2 Activities

Key activities undertaken in Year 2 include:

- ADVANCE Seminar
- Faculty Fellows
- Sponsored Events
- Roadshows
- Influencer Dialogues
- Research

5.1 ADVANCE Seminar

The centerpiece of the grant’s transformation activities is the ADVANCE Seminar, which was adapted for STEM faculty and administrators from the Difference, Power, and Discrimination (DPD) Summer Seminar, which had been successfully operating at OSU. The ADVANCE Seminar is also the focus of the Social Science Research (section 5.6), which examines the effectiveness of the Seminar as a mechanism of institutional transformation. The findings of the Social Science Research will also therefore contribute to the evaluation of the seminar’s impact.

The ADVANCE Seminar was launched in June 2015, during the grant’s first year and has continued into the second year. During grant Year 2 (July 2015-September 2016), three Seminars were held and attended by 45 participants. In fact, because demand was so high (they received 70 applications for 30 slots), they added the third additional seminar for Assistant Professors (a group they were not originally targeting at this stage of the project). The Interim Provost and the President also participated in the Seminar in Year 2.

One key outcome of participation is the development of action plans to apply the knowledge gained in the Seminar. To support accountability and help participants meet the goals of their action plans, the Leadership Team is now requiring participants to meet together three times in the academic year following the Seminar. At the first meeting participants will present and revise their action plans.

Evidence of Impact: Seminar Evaluation Forms

Formative feedback was collected at the end of the seminars. Participants were able to point to several concepts they learned as a result of participation. Intersectionality was mentioned most often as a new concept learned. Many participants also mentioned learning new terminology and vocabulary.

Discussion was the most frequently identified mechanism that fostered participant learning and discussion was also identified as a strength of the seminar. Besides
discussion, role playing, the power shuffle, and hearing personal stories were also mentioned frequently as essential to the learning process.

Participants indicated a variety of ways they intended to integrate knowledge beyond the seminar. Several participants focused on student-level outcomes that are beyond the scope of ADVANCE (for example, “revise my course syllabus and include a discussion on the first day about my expectations/hope for an inclusive learning environment/classroom”). Faculty-level actions were also mentioned by participants (for example, “mentoring of new hires” and “my cohort is working on a letter of commitment and support for three policy initiatives regarding faculty retention”).

Participants’ suggestions for improvement focused primarily on the length and/or scheduling of the seminar:

“Please, please have this class in 1 week or less format so that others agree to take it.”

“Having one full workday off from the seminar would have helped me meet with students and catch up on the mountain of emails. Or perhaps having one half-day in the second week. My anxiety about keeping up with my other work sometimes was distracting me.”

“Some of the days got very long toward the end. You could have the seminar over 10 instead of 9 days and end at 3PM rather than 4PM or something along those lines.”

“I found it difficult to keep up with the reading, etc. given that my ‘job’ did not pause while here. If we attended 8 to 3 instead, we would be able to catch up on things before COB each day.”

Evidence of Impact: Interviews

In interviews, participants mentioned several significant impacts of the training, as detailed below:

- **Increasing personal awareness, including awareness of one’s own privilege:**

  “I always thought STEM fields were reasonably ‘fair’—a meritocracy—but the deck really is stacked against women and minorities. Those of us who are white males are fish swimming in the water and can’t appreciate the challenges of others—we have to listen to them (personal stories as well as studies) to even begin to understand.”

  “For me among the most valuable things has been hearing some very candid and difficult stories from our colleagues, and barriers they’ve encountered, and inappropriate things people have said or done.”

  “I’ve witnessed great learning, increased awareness and understanding.”
“This builds on the context of my life and makes me reflect on who I am and how I act. And how I can act differently.”

• **Facilitating a network of people with similar goals and a shared language:**

  “A very positive aspect is getting to know colleagues from across campus, as people, and as people of common concerns. I think that’s been very valuable.”

  “Common language is huge. Having people in the room who had been through the seminar, who could form a critical mass and speak the same language really changed the conversation at a recent faculty meeting.”

  “I think it’s critical to create a network to keep the connections going not only within this cohort, but with other cohorts as well, so that we know that we have that support system. Among us we can have peers with whom we can discuss ideas and work together on larger action plans. That would be, from my perspective, valuable.”

  “We need to have allies to build a larger coalition at every level of the institution, so that essentially from the bottom up, top down, we’re working in ways we haven’t in the past, and the more allies the better.”

  “The whole network thing is important. ADVANCE has so far three to six cohorts of people who have gone through this training. I actually met one yesterday that I didn’t realize had gone through the training, and it was almost like somebody was in the club. It’s creating a network of people that have been through a really intense experience, and I think there’s some shared values in that. I think that can’t be underestimated. There is a way of recognizing the allies you currently have, and there’s a way of recognizing the people you want to become your allies.”

• **New policies and procedures, with support from administrators**

  “After the Dean of my college went through the seminar, he required all of his Department Heads to go through the seminar…. Heads have a lot more authority and power than Chairs that rotate, so the fact that he’s requiring all Heads to go through is a really great thing.”

  “Some of the Deans who went through the program made changes to some of the processes within their colleges—for example requiring a Search Advocate be present during every single one of the meetings for the search committee—and have influenced other Deans who have not been through the program to do the same.”
“I’ve heard ADVANCE mentioned in the Provost’s Council many times because of the Deans who have taken the training. It’s impacted statements and policies at OSU.”

“Several from our college were in the seminar I participated in, so we had the opportunity during the two weeks to develop action plans, so by the end of the two weeks we were able to have a pretty well-honed and developed plan to take back to the college...It covered position descriptions and doing a better job of recruiting underrepresented minorities and women.”

Several participants also mentioned they had been encouraged to attend by prior seminar participants, suggesting that word of mouth about the seminar is extremely positive and effective for recruiting participants.

Participants’ Suggestions for Improvement:

Consistent with the post-seminar evaluation forms, participant suggestions focused on the length of the seminar. Although a minority said they did not think the seminar could be shortened without losing some of its impact, the more frequent comment was that the length of the seminar is too long, as it is difficult to be away from work-related duties for two weeks. Participants mentioned spending their evenings trying to catch up on their work responsibilities and have reported sometimes being distracted during the seminar because they were concerned about the work they needed to get done.

Other suggestions offered during interviews included:

- Additional focus on the more recent time period, current examples, and personal experiences specific to the OSU community (especially African Americans and those with disabilities)
- Providing participants with daily learning objectives or daily goals
- Informing participants ahead of time that they will be expected to develop an action plan

While the ADVANCE Leadership Team acknowledges the challenge of asking faculty and administrators to devote two weeks to the seminar, they are seeking to maintain the fidelity of the proposed training content and the resulting research on the training’s effectiveness, for which consistency in programming is critical. They also note that the length of time is appropriate given the objectives of the seminar.

One challenge with respect to implementation (which has implications as well for evaluation and research) has been inconsistencies in implementation of the seminar content across facilitators. Especially problematic was that action plans were not included as an activity for one of the seminars. The team is in the process of discussing strategies to improve uniformity moving forward.
Recommendations:

- Proceed with plans to collect and analyze data on participant action plans and the impact of those plans on ADVANCE-related goals. Findings will be valuable for guiding future evaluation efforts (being able to assess the potential impact of the plans). As part of the analysis, consider examining the “uptake” of action plan components within and outside the participants’ home department/college and/or how action plans change over the course of the year and why.
- Work with the Social Science Researchers and evaluators to discuss possible strategies for collecting additional data to evaluate the impact of the Seminar without undue burden on the research participants.
- Assemble participant demographics to examine the scope of impact and target recruitment efforts for future seminars to ensure maximal impact.

5.2 Faculty Fellows

As part of the reorganization of workload and desire to embed ownership of faculty commitment to equity, inclusion, and justice, the Faculty Fellows Program was launched at the end of Year 2. (This component was not part of the original proposal and is funded with a portion of returned overhead.) Open to tenure-line faculty, the one-year fellowships are designed to further initiatives within the Fellow’s home college that are congruent with the objectives of OSU’s ADVANCE Program. Thirteen applications were received, representing 10 organizational units.

Five Fellows were named for the 2016-17 academic year, representing five colleges (Agricultural Sciences; Forestry; Pharmacy; Science; Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences). All Fellows are women and three of the five were Professors (Table 2).

Table 2. Characteristics of 2016-17 Faculty Fellows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor³</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL Number** | **5**

³ One of the Professors is also Department Head.
Fellows will undertake project actions in the following areas:

- Analyzing results of a departmental climate survey to shape future efforts to enhance equity and inclusion, including departmental recruitment and mentoring policies
- Data gathering and analysis of promotion rates for clinical faculty (and examining any gender disparities) to shape promotion guidelines for clinical faculty for the college and university
- Developing departmental faculty mentoring groups and extend efforts to support broader college-level equity and inclusion goals
- Developing a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Plan for the college
- Establish more formal, sustained mentoring practices within the college that emphasizes equity, inclusion, and justice

The ADVANCE team intends to bring the Fellows together three times during the academic year, require their attendance at an ADVANCE team meeting and an Internal Advisory Council meeting each quarter, and that they do a presentation to another college to help disseminate what they have done. Bringing the Fellows together can also potentially provide support and accountability for the Fellows’ action plans and opportunities for synergy and dissemination of ideas. Meetings of the Fellows may also provide an opportunity for OSU-ADVANCE to collect data on their experiences (changes observed, interest among colleagues and across administrative boundaries, etc.).

Some stakeholders mentioned that because funding for the Fellows Program relies primarily on returned overhead from the Deans, the program is potentially vulnerable.

Fellows are just beginning their efforts and the Fellows Program will be evaluated in the next external evaluation report.

Recommendations:

- Explore ways to align the seminar participant action plans with the work being conducted by the Faculty Fellows
- Continue to reach out to senior male faculty and to departments/colleges that were not represented in the first round of Fellows applications, encouraging them to apply for future Fellows positions
- Work with the internal and external evaluators to decide what additional data to collect to assess the impact of the Fellows and how to collect it. For example, to track dissemination of the Fellows’ work to other departments/colleges, consider providing a template to Fellows for documenting dissemination and other potential impacts of their work.
5.3 Sponsored Events

In Year 2, the following events were sponsored by OSU ADVANCE:

- Dr. Tim Cowles and Dr. Rob Holman (College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences), “Thoughts on Mentoring” (January 8, 2016)
- Dr. Kathryn Clancy (Department of Anthropology, University of Illinois and Urbana-Champaign), “The Effects of Harassment and Assault on Scientists’ Careers” (January 26, 2016)
- “The CO• ‘STEM to STEAM’ Symposium,” a transdisciplinary conversation on the challenges and rewards of integrating the Arts into STEM Education (April 8, 2016)
- ADVANCE Annual Lecture: Dr. Kelly Mack (Vice President for Undergraduate STEM Education and Executive Director of Project Kaleidoscope), “Catalyzing Transformation: Individual and Institutional Actions to Advance Equity and Inclusion” (April 11, 2016)

Participant background information is self-reported from the evaluation forms. Events are drawing both men and women and faculty at a variety of ranks (Table 3).

### Table 3. Characteristics of Event Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thoughts on Mentoring</th>
<th>NCFDD Webinar</th>
<th>Effects of Harassment and Assault</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans/Gender Non-Conforming</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank/Faculty Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Faculty or New to OSU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Faculty or Have been here a while</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhere in between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Faculty or Administrator</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Graduate Student$^4$</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number Attendees; # Surveys Collected</strong></td>
<td>N/A; 9</td>
<td>9; 2</td>
<td>29; 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation forms were designed by the internal evaluator and distributed on site at the “Thoughts on Mentoring,” NCFDD Webinar, and Dr. Clancy events. The event evaluation questions were designed to explicitly address the social justice lens and...

$^4$ This category was included only for the “Harassment and Assault” event.
dimensions of readiness that form the theoretical framework guiding the project. Findings from these evaluation forms were provided to the external evaluator and are summarized in Table 4. Participants were asked to select their level of awareness for several statements using a scale of 1 to 9, with 1 representing “No/Not at all/Completely Unaware” to 9 “Own it/Yes Completely aware.”

Table 4. Mean Self-Reported Level of Awareness* for Sponsored Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thought on Mentoring</th>
<th>NCFDD Webinar</th>
<th>Effects of Harassment and Assault</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raised my awareness/knowledge of issues around <strong>equitable, inclusive, and just policies</strong> for women and men.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised my awareness/knowledge of current efforts around <strong>equitable, inclusive, and just policies</strong> for women and men.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised my awareness/knowledge of the <strong>need for transformative practices</strong> to support <strong>equitable, inclusive, and just policies</strong> for women and men.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised my awareness/knowledge of the <strong>need to change the system</strong> to support <strong>equitable, inclusive, and just policies</strong> for women and men.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to my perception of <strong>access</strong> for all women and men to <strong>equitable, inclusive, and just policies</strong>.</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to my perception of <strong>my rights and ability to voice concerns</strong> (i.e., agency) with regard to <strong>equitable, inclusive, and just policies</strong>.</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to my perception of <strong>having the skills to effect change</strong> (i.e., advocacy) with regard to <strong>equitable, inclusive, and just policies</strong>.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to my perception that there are <strong>opportunities to work with others</strong> (i.e., solidarity action) with regard to <strong>equitable, inclusive, and just policies</strong>.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response categories ranged from 1 (No/Not at all/Completely Unaware) to 9 (Own it/Yes Completely aware)

| Number Attendees; # Surveys Collected | N/A; 9 | 9; 2 | 29; 26 |

5 Bolded text (reproduced here) is in the evaluation form.
As shown in Table 4, Dr. Clancy’s talk, “The Effects of Sexual Harassment and Assault on Scientists’ Careers” had the highest mean ratings for raising awareness. Open-ended comments for that event also suggest that participants’ level of awareness of issues and policies increased, as did their willingness to advocate and take action, for example:

“I’m grateful to the SAFE project for putting a spotlight on these issues and advocating for safe spaces for women and POC.”

“Made me aware I need to network and assess our practices on campus, challenge the status quo, advocate for people in general and not just respond.”

“Action!”

“How can students advocate for this change of culture while we are in school so we don’t have to wait until we have power in our careers? What movements are there?”

While a strength of the evaluation forms is that they are directly aligned with the project’s theory of change, a few respondents found the terminology (“own it”) confusing or the questions vague or hard to understand.

Information from interviews revealed other impacts of Dr. Clancy’s talk:

“Two Deans coming together, they had everybody, their faculty, read Dr. Clancy’s paper. Many of them went to her talk and then they had a faculty meeting where individual labs drafted their statement around sexual harassment in the field.”

Recommendations:

- Consider whether minor re-wording of some questions or response sets on the evaluation forms might reduce respondent confusion without compromising the integrity of the data for research purposes
- Consider changing the question on evaluation forms about faculty status to reflect title (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor) rather than a mixture of rank and length of time at OSU to be consistent with how faculty rank is reported in the Toolkit Data

5.4 Roadshows

Roadshows at key meetings of faculty and administrators are designed to raise awareness of equity, inclusion and justice issues, with a focus on women in STEM. Seventeen presentations were made throughout the university during Year 2 at new
faculty orientation sessions, department meetings, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, and the Faculty Senate.

Notes and documentation from the Roadshows inform the internal evaluation efforts. Stakeholders mentioned that inconsistency in the application and collection of evaluation data from each Roadshow impeded the internal evaluation efforts.

Recommendations:

- Ensure consistent data collection and assessment is occurring for Roadshows to support project evaluation
- Consider providing a template and/or shared document for roadshow presenters to facilitate consistent and timely data collection

5.5 Influencer Dialogues

To target key administrative leaders, the Leadership Team scheduled conversations with the President, Provost, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Chief Diversity Officer (interim) and Dean of the College of Science. Documentation of the Influencer Dialogues informs the research being conducted by the internal evaluator.

One challenge identified by stakeholders is that there was an initial lack of protocol for collecting data about the Dialogues (when they were held, with whom they were held, the topic(s) addressed, etc.).

Recommendation:

- Document the Influencer Dialogues consistently to facilitate the internal evaluator’s assessment of the impact of the Dialogues

5.6 Social Science Research

The social science research is a central component of the grant, contributing to its intellectual merit and broader impacts. The research uses a mixed-methods approach to examine whether participating in the ADVANCE Seminar will empower and motivate institutional leaders and faculty to actively contribute to campus climate transformation (through improving their interpersonal interactions). Methodology includes validated survey instruments (the Intercultural Development Inventory, or IDI, and the CQ Cultural Intelligence Scale) and intensive interviews (surveys and interviews each have a pre- and post- component).
The Research Team has been successfully recruiting people from the seminar to participate in the study (at first about 40% of participants agreed to participate in the research and in the last round, about 80% of participants agreed). They also have a comparison group (an intentionally-chosen group with similar characteristics as the experimental group).

The Social Science Research Team has been actively collecting data from seminar participants and are just completing the post-interviews for last year’s participants. The Diary component has not yet been implemented as it still needs to be approved by IRB. The team anticipates the Diary component will be in place for next summer’s seminar.

The data are incredibly rich, and includes the recounting of very personal experiences. Consequently, the data must be rendered de-identifiable before it can be shared with the rest of the project team, including the evaluators. The evaluation of the seminar has focused on collecting formative feedback (e.g., suggestions for improvement and how participants intend to use the information presented at the seminar) and collecting participants’ action plans for analysis.

When data and/or findings from the Social Science Research are ready to be reported (with all identifying information removed), they will be shared with the rest of the team and findings can be used to inform project activities.

5.7 Other Key Findings

1. Transition in Upper Administration

Transition in upper administration has been a source of uncertainty for the project. Provost Randhawa left OSU in Spring 2016 and Interim Provost Adams will serve until a new Provost is named. The Interim Provost is viewed as supportive of ADVANCE and the team is hopeful that a new Provost will be a strong advocate for ADVANCE moving forward.

In addition to the departure of Provost Randhawa, there was turnover in the position of Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and an interim Chief Diversity Officer in the newly created Office of Institutional Diversity. The team intends to engage with those offices as positions are filled.

The departure of Dr. Warner as Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs (Dr. Warner has returned to her faculty position) has also left OSU-ADVANCE without a formal tie to the Office of the Provost.

Stakeholders reported that the change in upper administration has slowed policy efforts in the areas of Promotion and Tenure and also Work-Life.
Some transition occurred on the Leadership Team as well. One Co-PI (Dr. Saturn) left OSU and was replaced by Dr. Gaines. PI Dr. Shaw took a sabbatical at the end of Year 2 and Dr. Warner is assuming the role of PI in her absence.

2. Internal Advisory Council
The Internal Advisory Council has not been meeting regularly, but the Leadership Team is assessing how to best utilize the Council and seeks to re-engage them moving forward.

3. Climate Survey
The Office of Institutional Research has been conducting on-going climate surveys. While these surveys are not restricted to faculty (they also include staff), they can potentially be used to assess the impact of ADVANCE and guide programmatic efforts. In partnership with the Office of Institutional Research, ADVANCE contributed additional questions to the most recent survey—conducted in April 2016—to help assess the impact of ADVANCE over time. However, ADVANCE does not have access to the raw data and has not yet received findings from the survey.

While the survey may be potentially useful for directing and evaluating ADVANCE efforts, stakeholders worry the response rate for faculty may be low. Stakeholders also reported concern about the climate survey because “no one owns it” and there has not yet been advocacy from the Deans or Department Heads encouraging faculty to take the survey and promising that the results will be used to make changes. Stakeholders hope the new Provost will help advocate for the importance of the next climate survey.

4. Structure and Location
The lack of a direct line to the Provost’s Office, coupled with the physical location of the ADVANCE Office in the College of Liberal Arts, likely reduces the visibility—and potentially the impact—of ADVANCE at OSU.

5. Complementary Efforts at OSU
ADVANCE is not the only effort on the OSU campus to support an inclusive climate for faculty and students. Many interviewees mentioned existing OSU policies, programs, and grants that are aligned with ADVANCE goals. Most commonly mentioned was a recent Faculty Senate ruling instructing colleges and departments to consider faculty members’ “diversity” activities in annual and tenure reviews. While those who mentioned this ruling counted it as a significant step in recognizing the value of an inclusive climate on campus, there was some concern that the policy
has not yet been translated into specific guidelines and requirements and that this ruling is not applied with consistency across colleges or departments. There is anecdotal evidence that ADVANCE participants may be more likely to move forward on implementation of this directive in their respective departments and colleges. Further, ADVANCE has been active in disseminating materials (e.g., examples of “evidence” of equity and inclusion activities) to facilitate the process as well as addressing this issue in the Seminars.

OSU also has an existing program called “Search Advocates” which provides specifically trained individuals who serve as the “diversity” voice in faculty searches. Search Advocates have not been universally required in all searches, although some Deans do have that requirement within their college. It appears that including Search Advocates on faculty searches is spreading among the colleges and, to some extent, this may be a result of ADVANCE, particularly those activities that have engaged the Deans (e.g. ADVANCE Seminar, influencer dialogs, etc.). Similarly, there is a pre-existing Provost Diversity Hires initiative that funds faculty hires to promote increased faculty diversity, although this pre-dated ADVANCE and it is not clear if it has been directly influenced by ADVANCE activities.

Stakeholders mentioned the importance of developing a shared vocabulary with other complementary efforts at OSU to enhance opportunities for synergy.

6. SUMMARY OF YEAR 2 PROGRESS TOWARD PROGRAM GOALS

6.1 Goal #1: Recruitment and Promotion

Goal 1 is to influence academic recruitment and promotion policies and practices to assure equitable, inclusive, and just advancement.

The activities undertaken in Year 2 that could have the most direct, significant impact on this goal are the launching of the Faculty Fellows Program and development of Seminar Participant Action Plans. Given that the Fellows Program is just beginning, the Fellows’ ability to impact these areas will need to be assessed as the program progresses. It will be important to track and assess the work undertaken by Fellows and seminar participants that address recruitment and promotion efforts.

“Toolkit” indicator data (Section 4) shows that the number of new hires in STEM increased at all ranks and increased in SBS at the ranks of Assistant and Associate Professor (Figures 4-5). The percent of STEM women hired also increased, especially at the rank of Assistant Professor. At baseline 29% of new Assistant Professors hired were women and in Year 2, 47% of hires at the rank of Assistant Professor were women. In SBS, there was an increase in women’s representation of
hires at the rank of Assistant Professor, from 48% at baseline to 67% in Year 2. The increase in the percent of Assistant Professors hired who are women will help prime the pipeline for increasing the representation of women at all ranks (assuming there is equity in promotion and retention).

The number of women tenured and promoted remains fairly stable in STEM and SBS from the baseline to Year 2 (Figures 8-9), although data on the number of tenure and promotion denials are not yet available.

Both baseline and Year 2 data indicate attrition is small for both women and men (Figures 6-7), although the attrition of men at the Associate and Full Professor ranks has increased from the baseline average to Year 2 in STEM.

6.2 Goal #2: Institutional Climate

Goal 2 is to contribute to an institutional climate that reflects a shared value for equity, inclusion, and justice.

The internal evaluation efforts are well-aligned with documenting progress toward Goal 2. Insuring fidelity of implementation will strengthen the ability of the internal evaluator to assess progress. And, it will be important to track and assess the work of the Fellows and the Seminar participant action plans that address climate as part of the evaluation of Goal 2.

The 2016 climate survey should provide the team with additional data to track progress. However, ensuring access to findings (housed within the Office of Institutional Research) in a form that is useful to ADVANCE will be essential.

6.3 Goal #3: Awareness and Actions

Goal 3 is to provoke faculty and administrators’ personal awareness of difference, power, and discrimination in the academy and actions that contribute to equitable, inclusive, and just treatment.

The ADVANCE Seminar is the activity that is most directly aligned with Goal 3. Data from post-seminar evaluation forms and interviews suggest the Seminar is indeed increasing participants’ awareness of difference, power, and discrimination in the academy. The action plans are also promising mechanisms for supporting and enhancing actions in support of an equitable, inclusive, and just institution. The Social Science Research will provide a rigorous empirical test of the impact of the seminar on personal awareness and related actions.

With the Social Science Research underway, the team will be in a strong position before the end of the grant to determine whether Goal 3 has indeed been achieved.
Internal evaluation efforts focusing on the action plans can provide a valuable and complementary lens to the Social Science Research.

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The signature activity of OSU-ADVANCE, the AADVANCE Seminar has been in place for two years. While the Social Science Research will evaluate the effectiveness of the Seminar as a mechanism of institutional transformation, evaluation data collected to date suggest the Seminar is increasing personal awareness among participants, fostering a network of people with similar goals and a shared language, and facilitating new policies and procedures consistent with the goals of OSU-ADVANCE. Participation in the seminar by Deans and Department Heads is especially impactful. Participants report the Deans are aligning policies and procedures with ADVANCE efforts and are discussing the importance of ADVANCE in meetings of the Provost’s Council.

Requiring Seminar participants to develop and execute action plans should support the desired longer-term impacts of the Seminar. The action plans are also useful data for evaluation to assess impact and institutional dissemination. Providing opportunities for participants to meet together post-Seminar is also likely to be very beneficial for supporting networks of institutional change agents, disseminating practices across units, and sustaining new practices. Efforts to enhance the fidelity of the Seminar’s implementation will strengthen the research and evaluation efforts.

By the end of Year 2, Faculty Fellows replaced the subcommittees as a structure for implementing key objectives in areas such as recruitment, mentoring, and policies and procedures. This model has the potential to enhance faculty ownership of the process of institutional change and to build a cadre of ADVANCE allies throughout the institution. It also helps synergistically to link ADVANCE goals with other related university efforts. One potential limitation of this model is that any efforts and impacts may be localized at the departmental and/or college level. Building mechanisms to ensure that successful local impacts are disseminated to the institution as a whole will be necessary to support institutional transformation efforts.

Other strengths (not mentioned above) include:

- Alignment of internal evaluation efforts with the project’s theoretical framework
- Strong interest among faculty and administrators in the Seminar
- Successful recruitment of Seminar participants into the Social Science Research
The main challenges experienced in Year 2 include:

- Turnover in top administration
- Lack of formal connection with the Office of the Provost
- Lack of strategic engagement with the Internal Advisory Council
- Variation in Seminar content (including lack of action plans for one group of participants)
- Inconsistencies in data collection for some activities

**Key Recommendations**

The following recommendations are intended to build on the accomplishments to date, support engagement with key stakeholders, and institutional transformation efforts:

*Data Collection and Evaluation*

- Review evaluation-related data collection efforts planned by the internal and external evaluators to ensure they are strategically aligned and mutually-supportive
- Ensure consistent data collection is occurring for all activities to support the project evaluation (and research being conducted by the internal evaluator)
- Work with the Social Science Research Team, internal evaluator, and external evaluator to discuss possible strategies for collecting additional data to evaluate the impacts of the Seminar without undue burden on the research participants
- Work toward a shared understanding with the Office of Institutional Research concerning the specific climate survey analyses needed and timeline for delivery to prepare for the NSF 3rd Year Site visit

*Support Synergy of Local Efforts and their Institutional Dissemination*

- Explore ways to align the Seminar participants’ action plans with the work being done by the Faculty Fellows
- Review Seminar participant demographics to assess the scope of impact and target recruitment efforts for future seminars to ensure maximum impact
- Support mechanisms to ensure that successful impacts of work done locally by Seminar participants and Faculty Fellows are disseminated to the institution as a whole

*Engagement with Stakeholders*

- Proceed with plans to re-engage the Internal Advisory Council, providing them with a clear charge
• Proceed with plans to build strong engagement with the new Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs
• Continue to strengthen synergy with other complementary efforts on campus through shared vocabulary and collaboration

**NSF 3rd Year Site Visit**

• Work closely with the internal and external evaluators to plan for the 3rd Year Site Visit by NSF. The team might consider a leadership retreat focused on preparation for the site visit and/or seek guidance from other ADVANCE institutions that have undergone 3rd Year Site Visits.

In conclusion, OSU-ADVANCE has laid a solid foundation upon which to build. The fine-tuning of activities in Year 2 is allowing the team to focus on their central mission and build capacity. Although it is too early to assess impact, the ADVANCE Seminar appears to be a promising mechanism for empowering and motivating faculty and administrators to actively contribute to campus climate transformation.