
Texas A&M University
ADVANCE

NSF Panel Third-Year Site Visit Report

April 25-26, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT
2. LOGIC BEHIND PROJECT INTERVENTIONS
3. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE TO DATE OF IMPACT OF INTERVENTIONS AND PROGRESS TO DATE TOWARD INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE
4. PROGRAM EVALUATION
5. POTENTIAL AND EVIDENCE FOR SUSTAINABILITY
6. DISSEMINATION AND POTENTIAL FOR REPLICATION AS A MODEL
7. SUMMARY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RELATED RESEARCH
8. SUMMARY OF SITE TEAM'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROJECT

Texas A&M ADVANCE NSF Third-Year Site Visit

1. INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

Texas A&M University (TAMU) received an NSF ADVANCE grant in 2010 with a goal to improve workplace climate and to increase the number and the percentage of women in the faculty as well as their success rate in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). Five specific colleges (Agriculture & Life Sciences, Engineering, Science, Geosciences, and Liberal Arts) and 34 specific departments within those five colleges have been targeted. The American Psychological Association's Psychologically Healthy Workplace Initiative has served as the underlying conceptual framework for the TAMU ADVANCE program.

Originally established as an all-male land-grant university, TAMU has a deep-seated tradition and culture. Consequently, the ADVANCE's main strategy has been to offer a series of 12 interrelated interventions and activities intended to create the opportunity for day-to-day dialogues that would change the work environment while also providing female STEM faculty members an opportunity for individual growth. All of these activities seemed well aligned with institutional culture and change strategies and have successfully involved a lot of people. Inevitable changes in committee leadership have at times delayed the progress of some of the committee's activities; nonetheless, the leadership team seems to be managing all of the activities reasonably well, and there was evidence that the team is passionate about its mission and is working well together.

Top administrators and ADVANCE leaders also seem to have a clear understanding of the unique issues facing the institution. Both the President and the Provost are committed to making changes internally in regard to hiring, retaining, resolving climate issues, and resolving community issues. The recent appointments of two female STEM deans (Geosciences and Engineering) and several female vice presidents/vice provosts and associate deans are not only commendable but have been symbolically and practically effective in sending signals to the campus community about the central administration's commitment in this area.

In addition to good leadership and what appears to be a strategy well suited to the TAMU's infrastructure, both the office of Dean of Faculties and the Diversity office are closely partnering with ADVANCE, thus increasing the odds that the effort will be sustained. The newly appointed Dean of Faculties is engaged and committed to understanding and supporting the ADVANCE mission. The Vice President of Diversity has developed a system that links effectively to each college. And campus leaders have noted that the national recognition and prestige ADVANCE has brought to campus has helped them in their efforts to resolve a number of issues. They also reported that ADVANCE has added new dimensions to those efforts (e.g., scholarship, literature, a systematic, data-driven approach), validated their experiences, strengthened their on-going work, advanced it to the next level, and multiplied their efforts in many ways. Furthermore, the University's million-dollar fund to support the Diversity Plan (although originally intended as a merit pool) has served well to incentivize a number of units, encouraging them to make the

changes needed to promote diversity. Going forward, a greater cooperation among different entities and plans for institutionalizing ADVANCE programs into existing and newly developed infrastructure will improve the odds that the current trend will continue.

At the college and the departmental levels, it is encouraging to note that both deans and department chairs are expected to be accountable for their performance in terms of the diversity metrics laid out by their respective supervisors. How these metrics will be translated into hiring and day-to-day practices at the ground level will be critical to implementing the diversity plans. The LEAD program, focusing on training department chairs, seems to have been launched successfully. Because the role of the chairs is critical, more needs to be done to empower and train chairs and make them accountable. While administrators in general have apparently bought in, it remains to be seen whether the faculty has.

At the faculty level, although ADVANCE participants have reported beneficial results (e.g., Scholar's program), little evidence about a general faculty buy-in has been provided, nor has much been presented to show that ADVANCE has had an impact on the behavioral changes faculty have made to improve work climate issues. Unfortunately, recent budget cuts and a hiring freeze have negatively affected TAMU's original intent to substantially increase the number of women on the STEM faculty; nevertheless, it should be noted that the percentage has increased at all ranks, while the total number of tenured and tenure-track faculty in STEM departments has declined by 10% since 2010 (note that the percentage of female faculty members might have increased in some departments at least in part because a number of male faculty members retired).

Besides the challenge to increase the number and success rate of women in STEM, several other challenges remain to be met in order to enhance climate issues. Both the university and the ADVANCE leadership team identified the exceptional barriers posed by the culture of the student body, the local community (College Station and Bryan) and Texas in general. Overcoming the image TAMU currently presents would do much to attract female and ethnic minority faculty members; however, to retain women and minorities would probably require changing the culture. To provide diversity training and in doing so build upon TAMU's tradition of respect, ADVANCE has successfully gained access to FISH Camp (a student-body sponsored freshmen orientation program). A FISH Camp is an excellent opportunity to make a unique contribution to the ADVANCE community-at-large, *if* its impact can be documented and disseminated. ADVANCE team's communication plan to link what ADVANCE is doing to the core issues at A&M should be seen as contributing to overall institutional values and change

The ADVANCE leadership team could also benefit by diversifying its demographic profile. Currently, the ADVANCE leadership team is predominantly white female, and, attracting and retaining ethnic minorities, particularly women of color, seem to pose a greater challenge for achieving ADVANCE goals across STEM colleges, and a special attention must be paid to address this issue. Finally, although a few attempts (some successful) have been made to bring in women from other A&M campuses, there remains a tremendous opportunity to effect positive changes within the system, particularly through the Engineering and Agricultural Experiment Station and Extension's existing infrastructure and networks. No matter what direction the

TAMU academic community moves its campus in the next decade, the future of science, technology, engineering and mathematics in Texas will be greatly affected.

2. LOGIC BEHIND PROJECT INTERVENTIONS

TAMU ADVANCE employs twelve distinct interventions (TAMU Activities). Each is associated with one or more of the five principals of the Psychologically Healthy Workplace: 1) Growth and development, 2) Health and well-being, 3) Involvement, 4) Recognition, and 5) Work-life balance. The TAMU approach is based in part on the assumption that achieving the goals of institutional transformation will require a broad range of interrelated interventions or activities targeting faculty, staff and students. TAMU ADVANCE defines institutional transformation as 1) an improved workplace climate for women on the STEM faculty, 2) an increase in the recruitment, retention and success of women members of the STEM faculty, and 3) a more Psychologically Healthy Workplace. Twelve interventions have been implemented using the PHW framework. Interventions can be categorized according to their intended impact on 1) positive climate change, 2) faculty success enhancement, and 3) improvements in recruitment and retention. While most of the activities thus far have been tailored to suite individual faculty members and faculty groups (e.g. chairs, search committees), staff and student interventions regarding institutional climate were considered necessary and desirable because of the unique culture of the particular institution. Some of the interventions required modification either in content or delivery (e.g. the Merit Pool—in response to the downturn in economy, and Student Diversity Training—in response to feedback on initial efforts). However, the broad scope of the interactions has been realized, and so has their alignment with the five PHW principles.

The Logic Model, as proposed and as implemented, relies on substantial institutional leadership backing, the significant support of climate survey analyses, and a major commitment from those faculty volunteers who work on activity committees (guided by the ADVANCE Planning Committee) charged with developing and administering each intervention. Within this framework, part of the program's success will depend on its effectiveness at increasing awareness and participation within the broad TAMU STEM community and at defining both short-term and mid-term achievements delivered by some of the interventions, while at the same time addressing very specific needs of women faculty, regarding climate and career advancement, in other interventions.

The review team sees merit in the approach taken in developing the suite of interventions/activities, and it can appreciate the logic of being as inclusive as possible in the implementation of the interventions. The approach is consistent with the model put forth by TAMU ADVANCE in that each intervention would eventually be adopted and continued by one or more of the existing entities within the institutions (e.g. LEAD incorporated into Dean of Faculty programs). The review committee is concerned that this approach will not lead to sustainable programs or activities when NSF funding ends.

3. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE TO DATE OF IMPACT OF INTERVENTIONS AND PROGRESS TO DATE TOWARD INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

LEAD

The LEAD Program, which was identified as “Department Head Training” in the original proposal, offers workshops designed to improve departmental climates by educating department heads about barriers to inclusive excellence, bias-free evaluation practices, constructive approaches to conflict management, and effective approaches to transforming departmental cultures. The distinguishing feature of this Program is its adoption of the University of Washington’s practice of integrating implicit bias training into each training workshop. The LEAD Program is a core institutional activity in the campus-wide efforts to achieve the climate-change objective within the TAMU ADVANCE logic model. Based on information gleaned from the 2006 and 2009 Campus Climate Surveys, TAMU ADVANCE has already offered department heads training on conflict management, mediation, and bias-free evaluation practices.

The outcomes/impacts identified for the LEAD Program within the TAMU ADVANCE logic model include: the short-term impact of improving leadership skills for STEM department heads and emerging leaders, the mid-term impact of increasing awareness of implicit bias among STEM department heads, and the long-term impact of improving workplace climate and enhancing the recruitment, retention, and advancement of women in STEM at Texas A&M. At the time of the third-year site visit, the Program appears to be on track to achieve its short-term impact objectives (as evidenced by the rate at which department heads have been participating). The evidence that progress has been made toward achieving either the mid-term or long-term impact goals is less convincing. During site team interviews, department heads who have been participating in LEAD workshops expressed appreciation for the conflict resolution training they received, but they were unable to recall much of what they had learned about implicit bias training. Indeed, there was little evidence that the participants were aware that implicit bias training was integrated into the workshops they attended and only a few recalled any discussion of issues related to gender and race. Given the intractable nature of unsupportive departmental cultures, the efficacy of LEAD training, achieving its long-term objectives will depend on integrating implicit bias training more explicitly into the workshops going forward.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The LEAD Program should make both implicit bias training on implicit bias and related diversity issues explicitly consistent elements of department head training in order to achieve its goal of transforming department climates.

DEPARTMENTAL MINI-GRANTS

The Departmental Mini-Grants Program provides small, competitive grants to support innovative projects that enhance department diversity efforts, target department-specific challenges that impede such efforts, and pilot effective strategies that promote the recruitment and advancement

of women on the STEM faculties at Texas A&M. The Program is designed to help achieve the climate- Change objective within the TAMU ADVANCE logic model which posits that Psychologically Healthy Workplace (PHW) practices will improve departmental climates in ways that support inclusive excellence for women and minority faculty members in STEM. In 2011 and 2013, 13 proposals were funded at a total amount of \$57,400 plus an additional \$15,750 in matching funds which were distributed across 11 participating departments. Funded projects included travel undertaken to increase research visibility for STEM women, mentoring and networking activities, educational awareness seminars, and professional development sessions on strategies for success.

The outcomes/impacts identified for the Departmental Mini-Grants Program within the TAMU ADVANCE logic model include: the short-term impact of providing opportunities to address department-specific issues that undermine workplace climate for women in STEM, the mid-term impact of STEM departments building innovative strategies that address workplace climate, and the long-term impact of improving workplace climate and enhancing the recruitment, retention, and advancement of women in STEM at Texas A&M. At the time of the third-year site visit, the Program appears to be on track to achieve its short-term and mid-term impact objectives (as evidenced by the rising number of department heads who have submitted applications to date). Most of the awards, however, do not address the more deeply entrenched climate issues. Few of the awards go beyond offering educational awareness activities and fairly common professional development practices within the national ADVANCE community. To achieve its long-term objectives, the Program will most likely have to make a concerted effort to ensure that mini-grants are funding proposals that truly address the most difficult department-level climate problems at Texas A&M, and also make sure that “innovative” projects purporting to pilot new strategies for success constitute truly groundbreaking activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The Departmental Mini-Grants Program should aggressively reshape the selection criteria it uses when granting departmental awards in order to ensure that the awards directly impact department-specific climate challenges and/or deploy truly innovative strategies that promote the recruitment and advancement of women and minority faculty members in STEM at Texas A&M.

ADVANCE SPEAKER SERIES

The ADVANCE Speaker Series, which combines the originally proposed Eminent Speaker Series and the Target-Of-Opportunity Speakers Series, brings 3-6 senior and mid-level career women scientists and engineers to campus each year to present talks pertaining to their technical research and/or their expertise in issues related to advancing women and minorities in STEM. Speakers are selected based on department nominations and STEM women on campus are given structured opportunities to meet with the invitee. The goals of the Speaker Series include creating opportunities for women STEM faculty to network with nationally known women STEM scholars and providing support for the recruitment of senior women STEM faculty to Texas A&M. To that end, the Speaker Series is one of the activities identified as a way to

enhance the recruitment of women STEM faculty within the TAMU ADVANCE logic model. To date, 8 departmentally nominated eminent scholars have presented talks including both national ADVANCE leaders and potential recruitment targets.

The outcomes/impacts identified for the ADVANCE Speaker Series within the TAMU ADVANCE logic model include: the short-term outcome of hosting 3-6 speakers each year, the mid-term outcome of improving networks and professional development opportunities for women STEM faculty, and the long-term outcome of enhancing the recruitment and retention of women in STEM at Texas A&M. At the time of the third-year site visit, the Program appears to be on track to achieve its short-term and mid-term impact objectives regarding the distribution of nominating departments, the number of eminent speakers brought to campus, the high level of campus attendance, and the wide range of participation in networking activities. There is, however, no direct indication that the ADVANCE Speaker Series has impacted the recruitment of senior STEM women to campus.

MERIT POOL INCENTIVES

The goal of the Merit Pool Incentives Program (MPIP) is to provide Texas A&M departments with direct incentives to improve their faculty diversity efforts and participate in ADVANCE activities. With respect to the Psychologically Healthy Workplace (PHW) practices, the program focuses on “4. *Employee Recognition (collective)*,” whereby departments, in recognition of their progress on diversity, are awarded an increase in base funds. The MPIP was intended to be funded separately, independent of ADVANCE, with the university holding back 10% of the merit-raise pool to be used to reward colleges in meeting diversity goals. The Program was presented in p. 1 of the original proposal in bold-faced font, as a sign of institutional commitment to change.

Unfortunately, since implementation of the ADVANCE project, no merit-raise pool funds have been delivered to Texas A&M. Thus, the MPIP has not yet been implemented as originally outlined. However, for 2011-13, the VP & Associate Provost for Diversity awarded \$1 million/yr in one-time funds to campus units with respect to accountability, climate, and equity efforts. In lieu of the intended Program, the site visit team finds this to be a notable commitment on the part of the institution and a clear sign that the institution wants to incentivize diversity across colleges.

With respect to either the envisioned or the replacement programs, the site visit team was uncertain as to how the award funds were being used at the unit level. How will these units be made accountable to? Will the Provost, the VP & Associate Provost for Diversity, and/or ADVANCE hold these units accountable?

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- With the promise of a merit raise pool again arriving on campus, the site visit team encourages a return to the model, originally presented in the proposal, of TAMU

administration withholding 10% of the merit raise pool to be used to reward colleges in meeting diversity goals.

FACULTY RECOGNITION

The objective of the TAMU ADVANCE Faculty Recognition Program is to “improve retention of women faculty by providing public recognition of their accomplishments, and to improve workplace climate by highlighting the accomplishments of women faculty.” This component is intended to expand on the Women’s Faculty Network annual luncheon, which recognizes women faculty members who are receiving tenure and/or promotions. With respect to the Psychologically Healthy Workplace (PHW) practices, the Program focuses on promoting “2. *Health and Well-Being*” and improving the workplace climate by highlighting the accomplishments of women faculty members, and by giving “4. *Recognition*” via through awards and public notifications of the achievements of women faculty members. The program is overseen by the ADVANCE Faculty Recognition Committee.

The Committee is implementing the Program in several ways: 1) producing and distributing a brochure, 2) holding a faculty forum, and 3) using ADVANCE website to enhance the recognition of women STEM faculty members. The brochure, “*Awards can Advance Your Career,*” is attractive, informative, and women-focused. It award categories available to TAMU faculty of per rank, and strategies that the potential award recipient can her/himself pursue to increase his/her chances of being nominated or otherwise positioned for an award. The faculty forum was led by a panel of deans, associate deans, and department heads. Faculty attendance was reported to be “low.” The TAMU ADVANCE website hosts an attractive page recognizing women faculty members who have recently received awards and accomplishments (see: advance.tamu.edu/index.php/faculty-in-the-news)

The site visit team repeatedly heard discouraging remarks to the effect that none of the six new University Distinguished Professors at TAMU were women faculty. Indeed, the male-dominated list of all UDP recipients (<http://dof.tamu.edu/node/569>) is male-dominated and illustrates the magnitude of the challenge faced the University. Central to this challenge may be that the process of nomination is controlled solely by the deans and by the Executive Committee of UDPs (see: dof.tamu.edu/sites/default/files/DP/Nomination_Guidelines_for_UDP_12-13.pdf; “November 1st”), who themselves must be enfranchised in the importance of the recognition and advancement of women faculty.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The site visit committee recommends that the Provost and the Dean of Faculties, both of whom serve on the ADVANCE Internal Advisory Board, work with the UDP Executive Committee to review the UDP nomination process, with the goal of enhancing diversity among future UDP recipients.

ADVANCE SCHOLAR PROGRAM

The Scholar Program focuses on junior faculty women of color, matching them with eminent STEM faculty mentors in their disciplines at other institutions. With respect to the Psychologically Healthy Workplace (PHW) practices, the Program focuses on “1. *Growth and Development*” by providing an external mode of guidance to these pre-tenure faculty members, “2. *Health and Well-Being*” through mentorship pertaining to dealing with workplace stresses, “3. *Involvement*” via mentoring on empowerment and autonomy, and “5. *Work-life balance*” through the mentor’s providing guidance as to how to achieve success while maintaining a quality personal/family life. Internal advocates, who are members of the committee that established the program, assist these faculty members in identifying a research scholar of national reputation in order to form a “triangulation” with the advocate and the external mentor working together with the scholar to help reach her goals and achieve success. A letter of invitation is sent to the identified mentor by the Provost and the VP/Assoc. Provost for Diversity; to date, ≈95% of those invited have accepted. ADVANCE provides the external mentor with a small stipend and funds to cover travel expenses as well as similar levels of support to enable the Scholar’s faculty members to travel to the mentor’s campus.

To date, 18 women have been placed into the program. The Scholars with whom the site visit team met report enthusiasm for the program, and all expressed deep appreciation/excitement for this opportunity to work with their external scholars and internal advocates. The Scholars also receive support from each other in working toward common goals; several are in the Writing Success Circle. In October, 2012, ADVANCE also supported a 1.5-day national conference for underrepresented women in STEM, with six of the external mentors in attendance.

During our interviews, the site visit team learned that several of the minority women hires were brought into 50-50 appointments split between two departments, with the tenure decision being held by each respective department. We were not able to parse out the institutional reasons for placing these women of color into these joint appointments: could it be to address the diversity goals set by the two departments through a single, split appointment? Nonetheless, we sensed that these women felt more vulnerable than their colleagues who hold full-appointment in each respective department.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The site visit team encourages continuation and growth of the Scholar Program, which is clearly one of the most successful activities in the TAMU ADVANCE initiative.
- We urge the Provost and Dean of Faculties to examine 50-50 faculty appointments, including evaluation of their success and of the particular benefits/challenges of faculty placed in such appointments.

SUCCESS CIRCLES

The Success Circles program as originally proposed seeks to develop either self-organizing affinity or peer-mentoring groups that would emerge from the identified personal or the professional interests of the faculty. Posed as a complement to formal mentoring programs, the

success circles are intended to develop organically from any number of origination points and could be either short or long term. These circles could potentially derive from an individual faculty member's interest in forging connections related to such life stage developmental stages as child-rearing, or from personal or lifestyle goals such as exercising or camping, or from more professionally oriented activities such as scholarly writing. Success circles depend on faculty interest and engagement, and, they develop and persist depending on the active involvement of each participant and according to how those participants define their conception of what constitutes the norms for involvement.

The conceptual framework for these success circles is that women faculty who participate in such cross-cutting activities (which are based on shared interests) will report a more highly developed perception of well-being and a closer integration of work and life activities and greater overlap of personal and professional identities. The success circles logic model also suggests that there will be peer group learning pertaining to effective work-life balance strategies. Success circles are supposed to involve (and improve) on dimensional practices of the Psychologically Healthy Workplace model: faculty growth and development, faculty health and well-being, faculty involvement, faculty recognition, and faculty work-life balance. An additional assumption is that faculty who participate in success circles will be predisposed to engage in other connectivity and engagement practices as their networks expand and as they come to learn about potential new avenues of collaboration and support mechanisms, including ADVANCE-related programs. This is the synergistic effect mentioned in the proposal: individual faculty members involved in a success circle and wishing to enhance their individual professional development and success may be motivated to participate in other, more specific ADVANCE activities. Linkages to the NSF ADVANCE goals would be the improved retention of STEM women faculty, fuller participation and career advancement through productivity-enhancing activities, and individually implemented career-work balance strategies.

The materials provided by the TAMU ADVANCE team indicate that the success circles fall within the individual activity focus colloquially described as "teaching them how to swim." The Success Circles activities are available to faculty members in 34 targeted departments across five schools. Quantitative data on the number of participants or success circles and participation rates or individual persistence measures were not available during the site visit. It was also difficult to determine how many success circles were initiated (including those that did not persist) as a result of the faculty's organically testing which areas of interest could be potentially solidified into a group-level activity and which ones could not. The information provided indicates that a New Moms group emerged and meets regularly. A third writing success circle is planned, and an Elder Care Success Circle was identified as being in the planning stages. Two writing success clubs were formed, one emerging from a faculty interest in applying the writing-effectiveness methodology developed by Dr. Patrica Goodson, professor in the School of Education and Human Development. This method, described as POWER (Promoting Outstanding Writing For Excellence in Research), advocates that successful writers commit to writing daily, group accountability and feedback. The Writing Success circles have scheduled weekly group writing sessions. Participants meet to write in community with each other and to report out on progress made toward achieving prescribed writing goals. Another writing success circle (the AWESOME Writing group) arose from a departmental mini-grant awarded to a group of women on the faculty of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. This grant supports ongoing work

being done by the AWESOME network, an organization created by the female members of the faculty in a STEM school. The ADVANCE program director takes primary responsibility for organizing and providing logistical support for the Success Circles.

The site visit team met with the Writing Success Circle participants and with the people who organize and implement the POWER model approach to writing. Participants meet on a fixed schedule and at a specified place. The group members vary depending on their availability. According to the providers and participants, the writing circles have been the most successful circles as measured by consistency of participation and the participants' perceptions that their involvement has improved their writing in terms of effectiveness, productivity, a sense of control and progress on academic writing projects. Participants indicated that they gained a lot of writing momentum by needing to be accountable to their peers for their explicitly stated writing commitments. They identified psycho-social support as a main overall positive outcome of their participation, reporting that they no longer felt alone or isolated. They experienced less anxiety, established friendships and were more likely to ask for help from peers. One participant indicated that she has produced more papers and grant proposals since joining the writing circle. She now encourages graduate students to participate in the POWER writing workshops. Among those individuals who have persisted in the writing group there is a palpable sense of energy and engagement, and an appreciation for the overall impact the experience has had on their academic careers. There is evidence of individual impact for writing success circles. The site visit materials also noted that a group of new mothers was being formed; however, the site visitors did not meet with any of its members.

Overall, the Success Circles activities did not develop as predicted in the proposal. Success Circles were intended to create heterogeneous, faculty-driven groups organized around a shared interest and emerging organically from the faculty's assessed needs. While it is difficult to ascertain the many factors that may have suppressed demand for such success circles, apparently a few such circles have formed in the first three years and the most successful are those narrowly focused on a pre-existing academic writing program. However, success circle's participants noted that some individuals did not consistently attend the scheduled meetings due to waning interest or competing demands on their schedules. A group that proposed combining physical exercise and writing practice was not as successful, according to participants.

Meeting these challenges may depend on how one assesses the concept of organically derived self-help, peer-driven circles. The absence of more and differentiated circles may simply be a result of lack of faculty need or interests. But given the original proposal's broader conceptual scope (that of a grass-roots process), other challenges may be noted. Even in the face of perceived needs, individual faculty members may be hard-pressed to add additional activities to their portfolios even if those would benefit the individual or the group. Many faculty members are already over-scheduled at work, and at home, many may find it difficult to carve out additional time to devote to success circles. Additionally, while the success-circle mechanism may work for individuals who are intrinsically drawn to collective, work-related activities, it may not for those who draw sharp distinctions between professional and personal social interaction. Some women may find success circles a means of building affinity groups based on identity, whether race or ethnicity or gender based, but others may regard such affinity-based circles as problematic or stigmatizing in that they might call attention to a collective activity based on gendered or ethnic affiliation or even because they focus on those needing help. For the

latter, these circles may work against a sense of belonging or connectivity. Indeed, as a way to maintain a sense of work-life balance, they may prefer non-work rather than university based activities and groups.

This leads to observations about possible contradictions in the success circles model, which encourages increased participation as a way to create balance and individual success, but may also require more time and effort. Whether this contradictory aspect has inhibited the growth of differentiated success circles should probably be examined further. It could be that these success circles may only appeal to a limited subset of faculty participants rather than a broad cross-section. As a professional group, faculty members are often characterized as highly autonomous in orientation when compared to other professionals. Generating a group level activity within the envisioned model may for this reason to be more difficult than it would be in other professions, and, that same characteristic might inhibit individual professional development outcomes. There should be ways to reframe issues associated scope and participation rates. Given the small numbers, it is difficult to ascertain whether climate, well-being and other dimensions of the PHS model would be substantially transformed as a result of the success circles. Perhaps fewer and more sustainable circles with higher levels of logistical supports would lead to greater program success.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Review the strategy for Success Circles formation. Balance the proposed intent to have grounds-up group formations against the relatively low participation rate. Depending on results decide on a modified formation strategy.
- Identify current Success Circles with potential for impact on the PHS outcomes and scale those. The Writing Success Circle may be a viable candidate.
- Explore possibilities of virtual Success Circles if there are topics that would be amenable to this format. This may bring faculty women on board who would otherwise have time or other constraints on face-to-face meetings. Perhaps the modality could include relatively short-term circles focused on short-term issues or problems.
- Capture/leverage the energy and flow of those participants who are enthusiastic adapters.

STUDENT DIVERSITY TRAINING

Student Diversity Training is a subset of climate change activities. According to the proposal, the level of change is focused at the collective level. The original strategy for reaching students was adapted from the University of Michigan's Center for Research on Learning and Teaching interactive, participatory theatre. The Division of Student Affairs and the Performance Studies department would cooperate in producing these theatre and script-writing activities, and they would then occur strategically during new student orientation activities and during the student-driven venue of "FISH Camp," which is a four-day orientation program organized and implemented by student leaders and student groups and involving 9,000 incoming students (up to 90% of all new students) and 400 student counselors. The original model drew on the TAMU

traditions of respect and civility as core cultural values socially embedded through student-run programs and within a social-norms framework where to be an Aggie demanded specific behaviors and self-regulated values. The logic model proposed a layering of social and psychological research on issues of implicit bias, gender and race prejudices, and stereotyping within the student culture at TAMU in order to convey the message that the Aggie way precluded acting on such gender biases and disrespectful treatment. Knowledge about the existence and negative impact of implicit and explicit biases would then lead to increased self-awareness and fewer insensitive comments about women and fewer incidences of a threatening nature in classrooms led by women. The objective was "to improve the workplace climate by teaching students that respecting all faculty members is part of the culture of Texas A&M and by increasing student awareness of unintentional bias and how it can manifest in a prejudiced behavior toward women and minority faculty."

This focus on changing the social climate by changing the student culture is a potential innovation in the work on ADVANCE and is well customized to fit with current TAMU student life and culture. The early history of the university as a military academy in which adaptation to group norms through the authoritative socialization of recognized leaders continues to be a force in the modern co-educational institution.

Changes in the original proposal occurred because certain key barriers or areas of resistance were not predicted. During the site visit, participants, including senior staff members from the Office of Student Affairs, reported that the interactive theatre mechanism did not prove successful because it did not gain traction with students. The reason most consistently cited was that students perceived these interventions as externally imposed by the administration and theatre faculty without the recognition that students were to control and lead the orientation process, especially as established during the four day FISH Camp. The Office of Student Affairs dean noted that the culture of high student autonomy was misrecognized in the initial approach and that this delayed planned interventions. Modifications of the proposal focused on involving the student leaders who were elected by their peers to organize FISH camp. SWAMP, a student led movie production and script development group was commissioned to develop brief diversity videos for the new student orientation conferences.

For the former, the project team developed a request for a script competition based on the topic of respect for women faculty. The 4 best of these scripts, as judged by a student-administrator panel, are to be selected for development and performance during the summer 2013 FISH camp. The plan is to cycle through these scripts at subsequent camps. This process has been well received by students. While the recognition of the need for student engagement came late in the process, it appears that the student diversity training program is now on track for implementation with student leader buy-in. Student leaders who presented to the site visit team said that they were highly satisfied with the collaborative process in its new iteration. This work can be easily scaled because up to 90% of new students will view the performances and engage in follow-up discussions. Over the remaining two years or so of the grant upwards of 13,000 students each year could view the performances during student orientation activities.

The diversity training program does face an unintended consequence. It will create an intervention that focuses on a single element of respectful behavior: using the term, "Dr." to

address both male and female faculty members. This is to say that the successful scripts do not seem to integrate well the complex research literature on implicit bias, stereotyping, or gender attribution. It could be that the ADVANCE team does not intend to present all the elements of such findings; nonetheless the goal of the proposal is to increase knowledge and raise awareness. The scripts as described may raise awareness of what to call a woman professor, but they do not seem to delve any further into other aspects of implicit cognitions or explicit stereotyping. This trade-off between the benefits of involving students and conveying key, research-based information may lead to increased polite behavior, but it may not get at the other dimensions (threatening behavior, gendered power and disrespect) identified in the proposal. Further, discussions during the site visit did not bring to the surface other potential unintended outcomes of this training, such as potential resistance or backlash against terms of address that may counter the social norms that men and women should be differentiated as a way to mark the highly gendered AGGIE way of respect. Benevolent behavior could potentially be characterized as civil so long as women are not perceived as inappropriately holding power, knowledge and authority.

As one participant noted, the "Corps mentality" continues to be a powerful driver of shared student norms. Whether such norms can include an embracing student awareness of inclusive excellence and female authority will need to be part of the dialogue about long term climate change, especially if this change is perceived as fundamentally changing Aggie culture.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- For the student diversity activity, recommend ongoing dialogue about the Aggie traditions of hospitality, courtesy and friendliness to deepen the alignment with issues of power, gender, race and ethnicity inside and outside the classroom.
- Recommend that the ADVANCE team decide how the intersectional issues of race or minority status within gender and professorial roles will best be integrated into the student-designed diversity training. In the "call her doctor campaign" for example, are the conditions different for women of color compared to white women with regards to incivility and the forms it takes? Also, recommend for the student diversity initiatives, that the ADVANCE team further explore where the resistance issues emerge and where incorporation occurs. This inquiry should help to further clarify whether or when - the main factor to be addressed is indeed one of process (i.e. student-led change initiatives work best, especially at individual-level) and when there are inherent organizational contradictions embedded in the understood cultural and historical values of Aggie culture.

4. PROGRAM EVALUATION

Project evaluation has been carried out by an internal team of experts drawn from the Office of the Dean of Faculties and the Texas A&M Bush School of Government and Public Service. The internal evaluation was designed to be closely linked to the social science study and to rely heavily on the study's data analyses in order to determine the project's efficacy and impact. A

baseline climate survey, developed with input from the social science research team, was administered in 2009 with a plan to administer subsequent surveys at three-year intervals to track institutional progress. At the time of the site-team visit, the first of the three-year subsequent surveys had just been administered and revisions to the next iteration of the survey were under development. Additional baseline analyses include a completed salary survey, a space allocation study, and a full analysis of retention and promotion rates. The baseline analysis of space allocation was delayed due to issues associated with the data, but the analysis is ongoing at this time. The formative analysis strategy is primarily comprised of participation-rate tracking and satisfaction surveys. The summative analysis was designed to be derived from the social science study findings and ongoing climate survey analysis.

TAMU ADVANCE has adopted a “difference-in-difference” analysis as a means of determining institutional impact. This approach measures a department’s “exposure” to ADVANCE (intent to treat) and also that department’s “engagement” with ADVANCE (treatment on the treated). Degrees of exposure and engagement are mapped onto rates of improvement in climate, salary, retention, start-up, and space allocation. The rationale for this “holistic” approach is the assertion that the project encompasses a series of interrelated interventions and “untangling the degree to which the various interventions interact with one another would be nearly impossible.” Although the site team finds this to be an innovative approach, the team notes that the TAMU logic model identifies specific impact metrics for each intervention that cannot be adequately measured by a global difference-in-difference approach. The ability to measure specific impacts per the logic model will be foundational in determining which activities should be sustained beyond the NSF funding period in order to ensure ongoing institutional transformation. At this time, the site team is concerned that the internal evaluation team’s ability to track the impact of distinct interventions has been impeded by an unnecessary degree of marginalization within the larger research project. Indeed, the social science study’s data sets should be made fully available to the internal evaluators at this time so that they can immediately begin tracking how these interventions might be changing the institutional climate of the university and achieving specific impacts.

Dr. Sarah Larsen, co-director of Ethnography & Evaluation at the University of Colorado at Boulder, is the TAMU ADVANCE external evaluator. She is a well-qualified evaluator with extensive experience with NSF ADVANCE. Since Dr. Larsen only serves in an intermittent advisory capacity for the project, there is no direct external evaluation activity. Dr. Larsen has reviewed the initial evaluation design, and she meets with the project leadership each year, reviews project reports, and provides a brief annual report that provides commentary on progress to date. In her Year 2 report, Dr. Larsen’s comments in her Year -2 report were generally positive and in particular emphasized the project team’s success in establishing and branding TAMU ADVANCE in a timely manner. She notes, however, that in general, the initiatives that direct resources and support to individual faculty members and departments are moving forward more quickly than are the strategies designed to shift the collective understandings, values, norms, and practices that impede the advancement of women and minorities in STEM. The site team members share Dr. Larsen’s observation that, like many other ADVANCE IT projects, Texas A&M has been slow to take up the deeper, more difficult work of institutional transformation. She concurs with the team’s conclusion that most of the evaluation being done by ADVANCE relies too heavily on participation rates and satisfaction surveys and also agrees

that not much evidence of culture change and program impact has been offered. This deficiency, coupled with the internal evaluation team's primary focus on a difference-in-difference evaluation, means the project is at risk of having no evaluation that will definitely show which interventions were effective unless they are given access to the social science data sets. The site team also strongly recommends, as does the external evaluator and the External Advisory Board, that assessment activities must incorporate more meaningful analyses to determine how interventions impact women of color and also to determine the effectiveness of the collaboration with Prairie View A&M University and whether implicit bias training has produced any immediate improvement for faculty of color in STEM.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The social science study's data sets should be made fully available to the internal evaluators so that they can begin tracking progress toward the mid-term outcome/impact metrics identified in the TAMU ADVANCE logic model.
- The internal evaluation team and/or the external evaluator must develop a robust evaluation plan for assessing the impact of interventions on women of color as well as the efficacy of project activities specifically designed to recruit and advance faculty of color at Texas A&M.

5. POTENTIAL FOR AND EVIDENCE OF SUSTAINABILITY

ADVANCE at TAMU incorporates sustainability structures as a part of the proposed front-end logic model. Departments, offices and staffs and faculty leaders already in place at the university are partners in the implementation of the program's initiatives. There is evidence that these offices are taking on stewardship of these ADVANCE programs to ensure future sustainability. The assumption is that at the end of five years, ADVANCE activities will have been fully adopted by the respective offices and units. This sustainability approach assigns each of the 12 activities to one of three overall categories (i.e., Climate Change; Recruitment and Retention, and Success Enhancement) to specific institutional units whose leaders appear as signatories on the letters of support sent to the NSF and who are already conducting aligned or similar projects as a part of their organizational responsibilities. Furthermore, key leaders and staff members from these units are serving on the internal advisory board and currently involved in program development and implementation activities. E One board member, the Vice President for Diversity, has made funds available to reward colleges/departments who meet diversity goals that they have identified as part of the organization's key performance indicators. The ADVANCE scholars program provides external mentors to WOC STEM faculty members. That program is also coordinated by the office of the Vice President for Diversity. Also in the interests of sustainability, the Dean of Faculty is very much involved in the STRIDE curriculum and the direct training of STEM departmental heads. The Administrative Fellows program relies on involving the involvement of senior leaders who agree to mentor the fellows and provide them with leadership development opportunities within its office to the fellows. There is already evidence that recipients have been incorporated into leadership responsibilities within their internship offices after the ADVANCE sponsored period ended. Similarly, the Dean of Student Affairs promotes sustainability by serving as the lead administrator in working with students on

the diversity training project. The dean intends to continue this training in the post-ADVANCE period as an ongoing activity within the student orientation programming. The change strategy of Psychologically Healthy Workplace provides an organizational best practice within the Human Resources sector. At TAMU the Office of Human Resources will adapt this model in order to apply it across the institution. UHR staff members take the lead role in developing curriculum and interventions for supervisors and other managers to implement as members of the Faculty Staff and Interaction Activity Team.

That a sizable number of people at the university advocate for the ADVANCE program indicates a potential for sustainability. These advocates include: members of the faculty and staff who occupy roles and hold responsibilities aligned with ADVANCE goals. Cross-university activities, such as the Diversity Operations Committee, Student Orientation Programs, and the Women's Faculty network appear to have been improved or broadened in scope as a result of their engaging in ADVANCE, and these entities now have ADVANCE team members either on committees or the taskforce. Perhaps most important of all, the provost has expressed ongoing involvement with and support for the ADVANCE program's goals. She has had a long career at TAMU as a faculty member and then as senior administrative leader at both the school level and the central level. The provost's commitment to the program, and her deep understanding of the program's capacity and the challenges it faces should help drive the sustainability strategy by aligning resources, by helping to establish a forward direction, and by generating motivation and leveraging influence among senior institutional leaders and at the school and departmental levels.

6. DISSEMINATION AND POTENTIAL FOR REPLICATION AS A MODEL

Although Texas A&M has made remarkable strides in diversity, it is steeped in the legacy of what was once an all-white, all-male, conservative-Christian, military land grant institution. The university has a deep sense of its tradition, and this is cultivated among incoming freshmen at FISH Camp and during other orientation activities. About 95% of the undergraduate student body is from Texas, and, hence, Texas A&M is viewed as definitively "Texan."

It is in this context that TAMU ADVANCE is striving to make a positive change on the campus, both in the recruiting and retaining of more women faculty members and by increasing diversity among its faculty, with a particular focus on recruiting and retaining women of color. The project also aims to work with undergraduate students to create a respectful and productive environment for all faculty members, regardless of gender or color. The TAMU ADVANCE team is committed to effecting this change and has developed interventions that, if successful, could be replicated at other institutions steeped in exclusionary traditions (including religious traditions) and struggling to increase diversity. Much here is novel, and it should not only be applauded but also applied at other institutions of higher education.

We are impressed with the skills and the depth of intellectual talent demonstrated by the members of the ADVANCE team. They have disseminated their programs, initiatives, and successes across the TAMU campus and its affiliated institutions. They must now show that their interventions have indeed been effective and that the results are attributable to ADVANCE.

Separating the contributions made by ADVANCE from those made by parallel initiatives currently underway at TAMU will be difficult and may require the use of control groups. We urge the evaluation team to tease out “research” from evaluation. We encourage the ADVANCE team to make a greater effort to conduct research and publish.

The ADVANCE website is engaging, easily navigated, and focused on highlighting the many successes of women on the STEM faculty at TAMU. The brochures distributed to members of the faculty are informative and should be useful to all readers, regardless of gender. TAMU ADVANCE appears to be widely known across the STEM departments, but we wonder how widely known it is across the entire campus, where the same challenges impact non-STEM faculty members who are women and especially those who are women of color. The Social Science team has reported one journal paper in preparation. Seven peer-reviewed papers (all conference papers) have so far been attributed to the ADVANCE project; of these, however, six were limited to venues in Texas: five at one conference in Houston and one at a conference in San Antonio. It is time to publish program initiatives and research results more broadly. The TAMU ADVANCE team is positioned to disseminate the unique aspects of this project and doing so would most likely seed collaborative research involving faculty at institutions elsewhere.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The site visit team urges greater rigor in the TAMU ADVANCE team’s approach to research, with broader dissemination and journal publication being immediate targets.
- We encourage the TAMU ADVANCE researchers to connect with other ADVANCE institutions that are doing related work, so as to develop collaborations and share/contrast research results.

7. SUMMARY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RELATED RESEARCH

Texas A&M planned an ambitious series of six studies in their original proposal. The first study was designed to assess faculty perceptions of bias from students and staff, and concomitant faculty well-being before and after gender-bias workshops were initiated for students and staff. Parallel comparisons were planned for both male and female members of the STEM faculty, to be achieved by evaluating relevant constructs gleaned from the Faculty Campus Climate Survey. The survey is administered every three years including “pretests” in 2006 and 2009. The initial “posttest” round of the climate survey was to be collected in 2012/2013.

The research team made careful and significant changes to the Faculty Campus Climate Survey for the 2012/2013 administration. To avoid survey fatigue they shortened the instrument by removing questions on sexual harassment and constructs with low base-rates in 2009. They also consolidated questions/constructs that were redundant. They improved the validity of the survey by switching to questions/constructs that had been previously validated in the literature. The 2012/2013 Faculty Campus Climate Survey was conducted as planned; however, the gender-bias workshops designed for students and staff were significantly altered and also delayed, making the 2012/2013 Faculty Campus Climate Survey ineffective as a tool for collecting post-

intervention data. The interventions that were designed for students -- interventions that were supposed to be CRLT-like, interactive theater experiences and were to be given at the two freshmen orientation events -- became failed attempts at guerrilla theater. These interventions have been re-imagined and are to take place during the two freshmen orientations; this time they are to be student-written and performed skits/videos, all with the single message to use the proper title of "Doctor" for female faculty members. (More details about the changes to this intervention can be found elsewhere in this report.) The first introduction of this intervention will take place in the summer of 2013. The proposed gender-bias training of staff has also undergone significant revision. Initially Staff Development Training was described as focusing on "helping participants understand the institutional and societal barriers and challenges (e.g., gender bias and inequity, the accumulation of male advantage) that negatively impact women faculty in the STEM fields" with the stated goal to "improve the workplace climate by making departmental support staff aware that intentional or unintentional bias toward faculty because of gender or identity is not acceptable." However, Staff Development Training has changed significantly, as described elsewhere in this report. For the purpose of the social science research, relevant changes include a format whereby faculty/staff pairs are identified, then given a seminar on mutual respect, and then encouraged to return to their departments to disseminate what they have learned. Scholarly preparation for these seminars has been extensive and the first round of seminars was initiated in the spring of 2013, after the administration of the Faculty Campus Climate Survey. As a result of these changes and the ensuing delays, no post-test data yet has been collected.

Although the goal of shortening the survey instrument is laudable, the site visit team is troubled by the removal of questions concerning sexual harassment and the exclusion of questions on threats/hostility/micro aggressions. Although these constructs were not found at significant levels in the previous administrations of the in the Faculty Campus Climate Survey, they seem critical to the project's theoretical framework of the project, the Psychologically Healthy Workplace (PHW), and should be retained for theoretical reasons. The site visit team also expressed concern that changes to the proposed gender-bias training sessions have led to manipulations that are too diluted to initiate change in attitudes or behavior. The student training session now has but a single issue, calling female professors "Doctor." This is an extremely narrow interpretation of a gender-bias intervention. Furthermore, this inoculation is to occur only once or twice for incoming freshmen. The TAMU ADVANCE Research Team implied that other "respect-based" interventions are in the planning stage; however, the site visit team remains concerned that without a focused effort the changes may be too little too late for the purposes of the social science during the life of the ADVANCE grant. Similarly, the staff intervention sessions no longer focus on gender-bias; some participants are unable to identify any gender-based message whatsoever. There is concern that the emphasis on "mutual respect" between faculty and staff will add further bias against female STEM faculty by differentially raising the expectations of deference from the female faculty toward the staff rather than from all faculty. The plan calling for the faculty/staff pairs to return to their departments and disseminate what they have learned is unstructured and leaves the social science researchers with little ability to determine who has gotten an intervention and what intervention they have gotten. A more systematic departmental dissemination is recommended. The research team also expressed difficulty getting STEM departments to participate in the faculty/staff seminar; steps should be taken, perhaps at the Dean's level, to insure that all STEM departments participate.

As described in the original proposal, the second planned study “will consist of a qualitative content analysis of undergraduate students’ open-ended comments on all possible STEM women faculty’s teaching evaluations before and after material on gender bias is incorporated into student orientation activities... for negative and positive themes and explicitly inappropriate statements...” The proposal also described the intention to “link the frequency of students’ positive and negative comments to women faculty’s well-being assessed via climate surveys.” A subset of male STEM faculty evaluations would also be assessed for comparison.

This study has suffered the same delays as those described above due to the postponement of the student gender-bias training sessions; however, data are continually being collected and analyzed. Comparisons of student evaluations of male and female faculty members have been made but no differences have been found thus far. The research team has since forgone an early attempt to do a manual content analysis and switched to a text analysis program, Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC.) The TAMU ADVANCE Research Team is in the preliminary stages of utilizing this software. The site visit team echoes its previously mentioned concern that changes to the proposed gender-bias training have led to manipulations that are too diluted to initiate change in attitudes or behavior. The site visit team also hopes that the LIWC software proves more sensitive to possible differences in student evaluations based on the sex of the faculty member and is able to evaluate difference along constructs that are relevant to the PHW and implicit bias. It is important that the research team does not lose sight of the overarching theoretical foundations of the TAMU ADVANCE institutional transformation project.

The third study outlined by TAMU ADVANCE proposed to compare the “well-being, self-efficacy, indicators of success as coded from participants’ CVs (e.g., publications), social networks on campus (i.e., number of collaborators and informal relationships with faculty), and multiple mentoring criteria...” of all newly hired STEM faculty members who would be randomly assigned to either the existing mentoring program run by the Dean of Faculties or to the TAMU ADVANCE Success Circles. This experiment was deemed infeasible for two primary reasons. The first reason was the near freeze on hiring and the second was the organic change experienced in the Success Circles program. As described in more detail elsewhere in this report, the self-directed actions of the Success Circle participants have reduced the scope of the program. To serve as a replacement study, the TAMU ADVANCE Social Science Team has chosen to conduct a meta-analysis of gender differences in student course evaluations studies while looking at moderators not previously explored (e.g., STEM discipline, sex of student.) While this study sounds fascinating and potentially important, it is unclear to the site visit team how this study fits into the paradigm of the ADVANCE TAMU proposal (e.g., PHW, implicit bias.) It is also unclear why a more similar study to compare mentoring programs was not initiated.

The fourth study described in the initial proposal involved a string of case studies of women who participated in the Administrative Fellows Program. Each Fellow would be interviewed before, during, and after participating in the program. The interview protocol was to include “expectations of what the assignment will be like, how their lives (work and home) will change, and their beliefs about administration” before their assignment and “positive and negative aspects associated with participating in the program, the skills and abilities they developed

during the process, how participation affected their well-being, and ways the program could be improved” during and after their participation. Interviewees would also be asked in the final interview to reflect on their pre-participation views. The stated goal of this investigation was to “examine the degree to which participants experienced an increase in self-efficacy for leadership roles, felt empowered, felt they grew professionally, felt included in university decision-making, and experienced higher levels of wellbeing rewards as a result of participating in the program.” The research team also planned to interview the administrative host or an administrative colleague to see if their views of women in administration had changed. To date, the research team has conducted interviews on participants and administrative hosts/ colleagues for two, year-long rounds of the Administrative Fellows Program. The process of data collection seems to be progressing well with few hitches in execution. Plans have been made to extend the data collection for an additional year follow-up for participants such that each Fellow will be interviewed a fourth time.

The fifth study proposed by the TAMU ADVANCE team would ask university administrators to complete hypothetical job offers (e.g., salary, lab space, start up funds, teaching load) to job candidates who varied by sex, race, and parental status. The administrators would be asked to complete these offers before completing STRIDE-like implicit bias training, immediately after receiving training, and one month after training. Little progress has been made on this research study in part because the STRIDE training of administrators and hiring/tenure/ promotion committee members has not progressed significantly. The TAMU ADVANCE Social Science Research team has abandoned the plan to ask administrators to complete three fictitious job offers and is currently seeking a way to assess the efficacy of the proposed training. Since the training has gained little traction, the research team has the time needed to put a research plan into place. The site visit team is resolute in its contention that the Social Science Team should find a way to assess the efficacy of implicit bias training for administrators and decision-making committee members.

The sixth and final study proposed by the TAMU ADVANCE Social Science Team was intended to measure the effects of negotiation training on the final job offer letters given to workshop participants as compared to matched control groups consisting of other potential female and male STEM faculty members who did not participate in the workshop. The Roadmaps workshop was to target future women faculty members by looking at late-stage graduate students and post-docs. Job-offer letters would be compared on the basis of salary, lab space, start-up funds, teaching load and other relevant variables.

Two rounds of workshops have been conducted, and data collection is progressing well. Data is being collected before participation, immediately after the completion of the workshop, and one year after the workshop, and an additional round of collection is also scheduled for two years past the workshop. The scope of the workshop has been expanded to include early career faculty. This change in scope of the workshop cannot be reconciled with the intention of the original study; it is too late for the job offers made to current faculty members to be influenced by negotiation training. As such, the stated goals of the workshop have been changed to “support departments in recruitment of early career academics and provide professional development training, mentoring, and networking opportunities.” The TAMU ADVANCE Social Science Research Team has also noted a failure to obtain the matched sample of potential

STEM female faculty members, but the team has have devised a new strategy for obtaining this control group. The site visit team is firm in its support of the TAMU ADVANCE Social Science Research Team's efforts to obtain the desired control group. This is an essential component of the study. It is also important to the site visit team that data be collected from enough postdocs and late-stage graduate students that the original study can be carried out as planned.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The TAMU ADVANCE research and implementation branches must keep both gender and the overarching theoretical foundation of their original proposal, the Psychologically Healthy Workplace, at the center of every activity and study. There are no adequate reasons to remove the focus on gender in any ADVANCE-funded activity or to remove the influence of the theoretical foundation upon which the TAMU grant was awarded.

8. SUMMARY OF SITE TEAM'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROJECT PROGRAMS

- The LEAD Program should make both implicit bias training on implicit bias and related diversity issues explicitly consistent elements of department head training in order to achieve its goal of transforming department climates.
- The Departmental Mini-Grants Program should aggressively reshape the selection criteria it uses when granting departmental awards in order to ensure that the awards directly impact department-specific climate challenges and/or deploy truly innovative strategies that promote the recruitment and advancement of women and minority faculty members in STEM at Texas A&M.

ADVANCE SPEAKER SERIES

- With the promise of a merit raise pool again arriving on campus, the site visit team encourages a return to the model, originally presented in the proposal, of TAMU administration withholding 10% of the merit raise pool to be used to reward colleges in meeting diversity goals.
- The site visit committee recommends that the Provost and the Dean of Faculties, both of whom serve on the ADVANCE Internal Advisory Board, work with the UDP Executive Committee to review the UDP nomination process, with the goal of enhancing diversity among future UDP recipients.

- The site visit team encourages continuation and growth of the Scholar Program, which is clearly one of the most successful activities in the TAMU ADVANCE initiative. We urge the Provost and Dean of Faculties to examine 50-50 faculty appointments, including evaluation of their success and of the particular benefits/challenges of faculty placed in such appointments.

SUCCESS CIRCLES

- Review the strategy for Success Circles formation. Balance the proposed intent to have grounds-up group formations against the relatively low participation rate. Depending on results decide on a modified formation strategy.
- Identify current Success Circles with potential for impact on the PHS outcomes and scale those. The Writing Success Circle may be a viable candidate.
- Explore possibilities of virtual Success Circles if there are topics that would be amenable to this format. This may bring faculty women on board who would otherwise have time or other constraints on face-to-face meetings. Perhaps the modality could include relatively short-term circles focused on short-term issues or problems.
- Capture/leverage the energy and flow of those participants who are enthusiastic adapters.

STUDENT DIVERSITY TRAINING

- For the student diversity activity, recommend ongoing dialogue about the Aggie traditions of hospitality, courtesy and friendliness to deepen the alignment with issues of power, gender, race and ethnicity inside and outside the classroom.
- Recommend that the ADVANCE team decide how the intersectional issues of race or minority status within gender and professorial roles will best be integrated into the student-designed diversity training. In the "call her doctor campaign" for example, are the conditions different for women of color compared to white women with regards to incivility and the forms it takes? Also, recommend for the student diversity initiatives, that the ADVANCE team further explore where the resistance issues emerge and where incorporation occurs. This inquiry should help to further clarify whether or when - the main factor to be addressed is indeed one of process (i.e. student-led change initiatives work best, especially at individual-level) and when there are inherent organizational contradictions embedded in the understood cultural and historical values of Aggie culture.

PROJECT EVALUATION

- The social science study's data sets should be made fully available to the internal evaluators so that they can begin tracking progress toward the mid-term outcome/impact metrics identified in the TAMU ADVANCE logic model.

- The internal evaluation team and/or the external evaluator must develop a robust evaluation plan for assessing the impact of interventions on women of color as well as the efficacy of project activities specifically designed to recruit and advance faculty of color at Texas A&M.

SUSTAINABILTY

- Review the strategy for Success Circles formation. Balance the proposed intent to have grounds-up group formations against the relatively low participation rate. Depending on results decide on a modified formation strategy.
- Identify current Success Circles with potential for impact on the PHS outcomes and scale those. The Writing Success Circle may be a viable candidate.
- Explore possibilities of virtual Success Circles if there are topics that would be amenable to this format. This may bring faculty women on board who would otherwise have time or other constraints on face-to-face meetings. Perhaps the modality could include relatively short-term circles focused on short-term issues or problems.
- Capture the energy and flow of those participants who are enthusiastic adapters.
- For the student diversity activity, recommend ongoing dialogue about the Aggie traditions of hospitality, courtesy and friendliness to deepen the alignment with issues of power, gender, race and ethnicity inside and outside the classroom.

DISSEMINATION AND POTENTIAL FOR REPLICATION AS A MODEL

- The site visit team urges greater rigor in the TAMU ADVANCE team's approach to research, with broader dissemination and journal publication being immediate targets.
- We encourage the TAMU ADVANCE researchers to connect with other ADVANCE institutions that are doing related work, so as to develop collaborations and share/contrast research results.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RELATED RESEARCH

- The TAMU ADVANCE research and implementation branches must keep both gender and the overarching theoretical foundation of their original proposal, the Psychologically Healthy Workplace, at the center of every activity and study. There are no adequate reasons to remove the focus on gender in any ADVANCE-funded activity or to remove the influence of the theoretical foundation upon which the TAMU grant was awarded.