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SUMMARY

From June 1, 2013 to August 31, 2013, the 11-member Leadership Team (see below) continued to meet every other week as they have since the beginning of the grant. In general, these meetings are a time to come together as a cohesive group, problem-solve issues that may arise, and generate ideas for further program development. Specifically, these meetings are used to discuss progress on each of the twelve activities, the social science studies, and the evaluation plan. They are also a time for the Team to focus on overarching issues such as implicit bias or intersectionality (discussed at June 20 meeting) and strategize on ways to further raise bias literacy on our campus. Other meeting topics may include institutionalization, language used in interventions, communicating with the larger ADVANCE community, and strategizing on engagement with the units involved with ADVANCE. In essence, this “think-tank” is focused on issues impacting women STEM faculty from a number of perspectives.

TAMU ADVANCE Leadership Team
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Key accomplishments during the reporting period for members of the TAMU ADVANCE Leadership Team and the larger ADVANCE community included writing and submitting a proposal for supplemental funds related to the NSF Career-Life Balance/ADVANCE initiative, fielding for the first time diversity videos at New Student Orientation and skits at Fish Camp, and preparing responses to the NSF’s 3rd Year Site Visit report. This reporting period is further characterized by extensive planning for program activities as well as other events such as the University’s 50 Years of Inclusion of Women and African-Americans Celebration that is being held this fall, the September 5 Leadership Team Retreat, the September 19-20 visit from our External Evaluator Sandra Laursen, the September 23 Internal Advisory Board meeting, and the October 11 TAMU ADVANCE Community Retreat.

The Social Science Studies and Evaluation teams continued to stay in touch and meet periodically in order to make progress on the research and evaluation plans. The Social Science Studies Team prepared the 2013 Climate Survey data file for analyses by cleaning the data and creating a detailed codebook, learned how to use a new text analysis software program, developed a code sheet for the course evaluation meta-analysis, and transcribed interviews for the second cohort ADVANCE Administrative fellows. In addition to work on six studies, the Social Sciences Study team conducted some initial preparations for submissions to the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology conference, prepared an extensive response to the
NSF site visit report, the leader of the Social Sciences Studies team continues to meet with the Leadership team biweekly, and the three core faculty members of the team attended the Leadership retreat. The Evaluation Team focused on compiling data needed for analysis of institutional transformation, monitoring implementation of the Student Diversity Workshops, cleaning and compiling the administrative data on space allocations and conducting a preliminary analysis of the same, surveying faculty regarding student-faculty interactions, conducting a formative evaluation of the Roadmap Workshop, and conducting a preliminary analysis of the 2013 climate survey.

ENGAGING THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY
Engaging the university community is a priority for the success of the ADVANCE Program, and it is accomplished on many levels. The ADVANCE Leadership Team regularly engages their respective colleges on behalf of ADVANCE and related activities. The ADVANCE Evaluation Team meets with college-level and university-level administrators to discuss analyses that are part of the ADVANCE Program. The Principal Investigator sits on the TAMU Diversity Operations Committee (DOC) and the Program Director was recently added to the DOC membership. The Program Director continues to attend monthly campus Work-Life Committee meetings to focus on workplace climate issues. She also attends the Women’s Faculty Network meetings to aid in identifying synergies and planning of events. Perhaps most importantly, there are approximately 170 faculty and staff who voluntarily serve on ADVANCE committees, advocate for ADVANCE in their units, and engage members of the Leadership Team on a regular basis. In fact, the Program Director attends all committee meetings and has developed closed ties with the ADVANCE advocates and works to maintain consistent contact with them.

In addition to this more “routine” engagement, the members of the ADVANCE Leadership Team engaged the university community on a number of fronts during the reporting period. The Program Director sits on the committee that is planning the 50th anniversary celebration of integration at Texas A&M University. This anniversary is a semester-long celebration with a number of key events. She also worked with the TAMU Women’s Administrator Network on the June 7 TAMU-Baylor Exchange Day. This was a day-long event that allowed administrators from both campuses to network and learn about issues facing women administrators. (ADVANCE Administrative Fellows were invited to participate in this event.) Further, the Program Director was invited to give a 2 hour presentation on implicit bias during New Student Orientation for graduate students at the Bush School of Government and Public Service. Approximately 50 students attended and the event was well received.

Now that the College of Medicine (COM) is part of the university, the ADVANCE Center has been working to foster a relationship with them. At the invitation of the COM, the Principal Investigator (PI) and the Program Director (PD) provided a presentation on implicit bias to the Dean’s staff on July 9. This event laid the foundation for adding the COM to the ADVANCE community. The COM has also requested that the PI and PD meet with their women faculty (September 5); they have also requested a STRIDE Team presentation for search committee members (September 27). The ADVANCE Center is currently in negotiations with the COM to establish funding for incremental costs associated with their full participation in ADVANCE.

Lastly, efforts to partner with other campus stakeholders on augmenting child care services continued. The Program Director and Social Science Studies Team Leader Dr. Stephanie Payne continued working with the Dean of Liberal Arts (and ADVANCE IAB member / Administrative Fellow Program Activity Leader) who is championing this effort.
ENGAGING THE ADVANCE COMMUNITY
The AIM network continues to be an invaluable venue for information sharing and networking. In addition to continued participation in monthly AIM meetings and ongoing communication with the AIM community via email and phone, members of the TAMU ADVANCE Team continue to work with the University of Houston (UH) ADVANCE proposal team as they move ahead with their efforts to resubmit their ADVANCE proposal in 2013. Further, the Program Director participated in an External Advisory Board Meeting with Louisiana Tech’s ADVANCE Team on August 14.

UPCOMING EVENTS
• The ADVANCE Leadership Team is planning two retreats: one for the Leadership Team (September 5) and one for the ADVANCE Community (October 11). The purpose of these retreats is to reflect on progress to date, strategize for the second half of the grant period, further engage the ADVANCE community, and allow members of the ADVANCE community to network with each other. Former NSF ADVANCE Program Officer Kelly Mack and Northeastern University’s ADVANCE Director Jan Rinehart will participate in the October 11 event.
• The Program Director will meet with University of Houston’s ADVANCE Proposal Team and their University President on September 25.
• The next Internal Advisory Board meeting is scheduled for September 23.
• A visit with External Evaluator Sandra Laursen is scheduled for September 19-20.
• Carol Jordan, EAB Member and former president of the TAMU Women’s Former Student Network (WFSN is a constituency group of our alumni association), will visit the ADVANCE Center on October 16. The ADVANCE Center has invited Carol, other WFSN leadership, and senior STEM women to a luncheon in honor of this year’s WFSN Eminent Scholar awardee.
• ADVANCE is partnering with the 50 Years of Inclusion Committee, the Colleges of Engineering and Science, the Math Department, and Women in Science & Engineering (WISE) to bring Truth Values: One Girl’s Romp through MIT’s Male Math Maze to campus on October 30.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
Overview: There are a total of 12 ADVANCE activities that are designed to increase gender equity by transforming Texas A&M University for women STEM faculty. Each activity is aligned with one or more of the five Psychologically Healthy Workplace (PHW) practices – the underlying, evidence-based framework for this initiative. The activities are organized into 3 broad categories: Climate Change, Success Enhancement and Recruitment and Retention. Each category has two Co-Chairs that oversee the related activities, an Activity Leader, and a committee made up of individuals from various units throughout the university. Each of the 12 activities is being evaluated separately and collectively as a part of an overarching analysis of institutional transformation. Social science research studies are being conducted in concert with 6 of the activities.
CLIMATE CHANGE
Co-Chairs - Christine Stanley and Mary Jo Richardson

Workplace climate is a major factor affecting women STEM faculty’s success and efficacy at Texas A&M. In order to address this, the ADVANCE Center is engaged in 5 Climate Change Activities which are designed to improve the work environment by reducing bias. Christine Stanley, Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity, and Mary Jo Richardson, Regents Professor, Department of Oceanography, Co-Chair this effort.

LEAD Program
Activity Leader - Simon Sheather

Activity Summary: The ADVANCE Center is collaborating with the Dean of Faculties and the Office of the Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity to enhance existing diversity training for current and newly appointed Department Heads. The goal of the LEAD Program is to expand training related to implicit bias and provide further support to help Department Heads improve departmental climate for all faculty and meet diversity goals related to women STEM faculty. To that end, the committee is establishing a leadership program for Department Heads that will provide workshops each semester (and possibly during the summer sessions) that focus on issues related to department leadership; training related to implicit bias will be woven into each workshop.

Activity Update: During the reporting period, the committee for this activity and members of the ADVANCE Leadership Team have met and modified the plans to 1) address the concerns reported by the NSF during their 3rd Year Site Visit, and 2) further fine-tune the program. The Workshops will still follow the University of Washington model, but will be further refined as follows:

1. Agendas for the LEAD Workshops will be similar to the draft agenda in Table 1 below for Improving Faculty Recognition (tentatively slated for the next reporting period). Implicit bias content will be woven into each workshop as appropriate for the topic. For example, in a workshop about Faculty Retention, focused time would be spent on how implicit bias impacts the retention of women and minorities.
2. The content of the workshop sessions will utilize presentations, facilitated discussions, case studies, and small group activities to surface issues related to implicit bias.
3. Support materials related to implicit bias will be provided to workshop participants. One example of support materials is the document, Key Research Findings, which includes summaries of key research studies related to implicit bias.
4. The department heads who are selected to plan each workshop will participate in implicit bias training through the ADVANCE Center in order to:
   a. impact academic leaders on a deeper level vis-à-vis implicit bias; and
   b. ensure their planning efforts are aligned with the goals of the LEAD Workshops.
Table 1
Lead Workshop
Draft Agenda – Improving Faculty Recognition

| Introduction | Scope of issue  
| | Differential impact on women in STEM |
| TAMU Data | What do awards look like at TAMU?  
| | What do awards look like in professional societies?  
| | Existing policies and practices |
| Case Study | What would you do?  
| | Small Group Discussion & Report Back |
| Challenges & Strategies | What are the challenges you face and strategies you currently employ for faculty recognition?  
| | Small Group Discussion and Report Back |
| Best Practices | Best Practices for Faculty Recognition  
| | Impact of Implicit Bias on Faculty Awards |
| | Facilitated Discussion |
| | STRIDE Content |
| ADVANCE | Awards Brochure  
| | Workshop Evaluation (including the extent to which participants plan to use the information they learn) |

FASIT Program (Faculty-Staff Interaction)
Activity Leader - Merna Jacobsen

Activity Summary: A positive working relationship between faculty and staff is critical to the success of the University. The ADVANCE Center is working to increase faculty and staff awareness of intentional or unintentional bias toward female faculty by expanding existing training related to gender equity and diversity. The first phase of this activity includes faculty and staff focus groups conducted to inform program design. The second phase will include program development and implementation.

Activity Update: After participants attend a FASIT Workshop, they begin to attend quarterly meetings. These 1.5-2-hour meetings are times to focus on the main components of the workshop curriculum in a more targeted fashion as well as a time to address issues that the FASIT Teams themselves want to address. During the reporting period, the committee planned for and held another quarterly meeting for the FASIT Teams (July 10). The focus of this quarterly meeting was Dealing with Bad Behavior and addressed strategies and tactics for reducing workplace incivility. Implicit bias was surfaced through discussion and case studies. FASIT Teams reviewed case studies and strategized on how to respond if they witnessed such behavior. Case study examples follow:

Case Study 1: An Assistant Professor, new to the department, is working through an issue with a staff member from whom she needs assistance on an urgent matter. A Full Professor, who has been with the department for many years, rudely interrupts and gives that staff member an order to complete a task for him immediately. When giving the staff member the order, he says “try not to screw this up like everything else I ask you to do.” The staff member walks away from the Assistant Professor to attend to the Full Professor’s task.
Case Study 2: A committee comprised of faculty members is discussing which faculty member will be the recipient of research funds to begin a new project. The funds will be given to one of two professors—one of whom is male, the other is female. The discussion has a cordial tone but the nature of the remarks regarding each of the candidates differ. The comments about the male faculty member are limited to his professional career—research agenda, publications, teaching, etc. The comments regarding the female candidate include statements like “I’m not sure she is going to be able to handle additional research given that she has small children” and “I have heard her husband has a very stressful job so this might be a bit much for the two of them.” The male faculty member is referred to as “Doctor” while the female faculty member is referred to by her first name.

During the reporting period, the committee also spent time strategizing on recruiting a new cohort of FASIT Teams, establishing a long-term program timeline, planning for a makeup workshop for those that had missed the original workshop in February, and establishing content for the fall quarterly meeting which will be a more in-depth focus on implicit bias and how it impacts faculty-staff relationships.

Social Science Study Summary: The working title for this study is “Reducing Staff & Student Implicit Biases: Campus Climate Perceptions before and after Diversity Workshops and Training.” ADVANCE Co-Investigator Kathi Miner is leading this analysis of longitudinal Campus Climate Survey data that assesses women STEM faculty’s perceptions of personal and vicarious experiences of disrespect from staff and undergraduate students (see Student Diversity Workshops) before and after diversity workshops and training.

Social Science Study Update: During this time period, the Social Science Studies Team cleaned the 2013 Climate survey data, prepared the data file for analyses (recoding items, creating construct variables), and created a detailed codebook.

Student Diversity Workshops
Activity Leader - CJ Woods

Activity Summary: In order to improve the workplace climate for women STEM faculty, the ADVANCE Center is engaged in an effort to teach students that respecting all faculty is part of the culture of Texas A&M. The Center is working with Fish Camp and other student activities (e.g. New Student Orientation) to address issues of implicit bias, prejudices, and stereotypes of women and minorities.

Activity Update: The ADVANCE Center has been pursuing two interrelated strategies for this activity that were both initiated for the first time during this reporting period:

1) diversity skits at Fish Camp, and

2) a diversity video at New Student Orientation (NSO) in STEM colleges.

This summer, the Program Director and members of the Evaluation Team visited Fish Camp and one New Student Orientation in each STEM college to assess implementation. They reported back to the committee on the findings (August 20) so as to further refine and develop the program. While no major issues with the Fish Camp skits were identified, there was great variety in the way each video was shown at NSO. In one college, there was a thoughtful introduction about why diversity in STEM is important followed by a short but robust discussion.
with students. In another college, the video was played with little introduction or discussion. The committee concluded that more engagement with those showing the video would be necessary. Plans for doing so are underway but this group will not be engaged until next spring as we approach the planning period for next summer’s NSOs.

Now that both strategies have been initiated, we are focusing on ways to further develop the program, deepen the message, and broaden the subject matter so as to maximize the impact on climate for women STEM faculty. We plan to further engage students by:

1. developing and delivering a more formal implicit bias presentation for the Fish Camp Counselor Training (400+- student leaders) where the skit competition is announced;
2. expanding the content of the Fish Camp skits and remaking the NSO video to address issues such as faculty credentials, email etiquette, and other dimensions of identity in addition to gender (e.g. race);
3. incorporating faculty input into future Fish Camp skits and the NSO video by conducting a very brief online survey to identify what student behaviors present the greatest obstacles to faculty success and the frequency with which disrespectful comments toward faculty are experienced or observed;
4. incorporating the Aggie values of Excellence and Leadership into the Fish Camp skits and NSO video as they relate to diversity by addressing Texas A&M’s Vision 2020: Creating a Culture of Excellence imperative: Diversify and Globalize the A&M Community;
5. asking the Fish Camp Director to sit on the committee for this activity as well as to nominate one or two co-directors to sit on the committee so as to ensure continuity in liaising with ADVANCE as Fish Camp Leadership changes;
6. working with Fish Camp leadership to conduct focus groups with the counselors to further understand how our messages are being received among these student leaders;
7. working with associate deans who present the NSO video to standardize the presentation and further encourage dialogue with students about content; and
8. encouraging faculty through newsletters or other publications to enhance the message delivered at Fish Camp and NSO and foster respectful behavior (e.g. make clear how they wish to be addressed, addressing email etiquette etc.).

We also plan to explore other student populations in the future such as the Corp of Cadets and the Greek system.

Of significance, there is anecdotal evidence that this initiative is having an impact. For example, three faculty (two women, one male) who were attending Fish Camp as namesakes this summer sought out the Fish Camp Student Director to share their appreciation for the ADVANCE skits. (Fish Camp is divided into seven sessions and within each session there are six camps. Each camp is named after an individual that has contributed to Texas A&M in a positive way. Being selected as a Fish Camp Namesake is considered an honor.) Further, when the Program Director visited Fish Camp this summer to assess the skits, a female student provided unsolicited comments about her appreciation for the implicit bias presentation that was given during counselor training last spring. Another student, a male veterinary medicine student, had emailed the Program Director after the same training with his ideas for improving the representation of women STEM faculty. Perhaps most telling, during the first week of the semester, there have been faculty reports of students asking women STEM faculty how to address them.
Social Science Study Summary: The Student Diversity Workshops are being conducted in concert with two ADVANCE social science research studies. The first study, currently titled “Reducing Student Implicit Biases: Analysis of Course Evaluations before and after Student Diversity Workshops,” is led by Co-Principal Investigator Stephanie Payne. This study is a content analysis of students’ teaching evaluations and will examine whether or not women STEM faculty receive less disrespectful comments on their teaching evaluations after the student diversity performances. The second study, “Reducing Staff & Student Implicit Biases: Campus Climate Perceptions before and after Diversity Workshops and Training” is led by ADVANCE Co-Investigator Kathi Miner. This study is an analysis of longitudinal Campus Climate Survey data and will assess women STEM faculty’s perceptions of personal and vicarious experiences of disrespect from staff (see Faculty-Staff Interaction) and undergraduate students before and after diversity training. The third study is entitled “Do STEM Women Faculty receive Lower Course Evaluation Ratings? A Comprehensive Meta-Analysis.” This study probes beyond previous meta-analyses of sex differences in quantitative ratings of faculty by students. It focuses on various proposed moderators including STEM status, interaction of STEM status with faculty sex, student sex, interaction between faculty and student sex, year of study, and study design.

Social Science Study Update: For the first study, the Social Science Research Team spent the summer learning how to use some new text analysis software Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) that was recommended and purchased in the spring, in order to automate coding of students’ comments on course evaluations. For the second study, the Social Science Studies Team cleaned the 2013 Climate survey data, prepared the data file for analyses (recoding items, creating construct variables), and created a detailed codebook. For the third study, a detailed coding sheet was developed and over 1200 abstracts were downloaded for the first round of screening to determine which articles were viable for coding.

Merit Pool Incentives
Activity Leader - Christine Stanley

Activity Summary: Christine Stanley, the Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity (VPAPD) and ADVANCE Co-Investigator, and her Council on Climate and Diversity (CCD) annually assess the progress made by each university unit (academic colleges as well as non-academic units) toward reaching diversity goals. The ADVANCE Center is working with Dr. Stanley’s office to leverage this new institutional practice to further the goals of the ADVANCE program (e.g. participant tracking for Departmental Mini-Grants serves both ADVANCE and university diversity reporting requirements).

Activity Update: Due to the current fiscal climate (i.e., no merit raises at Texas A&M), there have been no funds available for an increase in base funds to units based on diversity considerations since 2011. However, from 2011-2013, $1 million in one-time funds were allocated each year, through the Office of the Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity (OVPAPD) to campus units, based on progress in accountability, climate, and equity efforts as outlined in the University Diversity Plan. Further, ADVANCE Co-Investigators Mindy Bergman and Kathi Miner continue to consult with various units through the Diversity Operations Committee (DOC) to assist them in meeting the assessment plan goals for their units. (The DOC is the operational committee formed under the 2009 TAMU Campus Diversity Plan to assist with ongoing planning, implementation, assessment, and evaluation of University and unit progress with respect to accomplishing goals related to accountability, climate, and equity.)
Departmental Mini Grants
Activity Leader – Pending

Activity Summary: The aim of this activity is to support departments in their diversity efforts and to provide an avenue for strategies that promote the success of women STEM faculty at Texas A&M. Mini-grants for innovative projects are being awarded annually to individual departments based on how well the proposed projects support the goals of the ADVANCE program.

Activity Update: Eight proposals, including 1 from a non-STEM department in COALS, were received from 7 departments (see Table 2). Departments requested a total of $56,100 and proposed $17,000 in matching funds. The committee selected 4 STEM proposals for awards totaling $18,500. Matching funds for these proposals equals $4,700. COALS will fund $3,750 for the proposal from Agricultural Economics; the department will provide $1250 in matching funds.

The amount awarded by ADVANCE this year is lower than in previous years for two reasons:

1) fewer proposals were received, and more importantly,
2) the nature of the proposals received was not largely focused on initiatives that directly impact department-specific climate challenges, deploy truly innovative strategies, or involve a large portion of the faculty.

The committee for this activity, as well as the ADVANCE Leadership Team, began to address this issue in May when reviewing the proposals. The feedback from the 3rd Year Site Visit that we received from the NSF in June confirmed TAMU ADVANCE’s concerns that we were not receiving proposals that addressed the most challenging climate issues. In order to address this, TAMU ADVANCE aims to change the call and review process for Departmental Mini-grants in the following ways:

1. The ADVANCE Center will hold a workshop for those considering submitting a proposal prior to the next Request for Proposals. (We will also include committee members so as to further educate this group of faculty.) This will allow us to disseminate the literature on climate and gender, share strategies to address climate at the unit level, and provide guidance on what type of initiatives we are looking to fund.
2. We will refine the Request for Proposals to indicate that preference will be given to proposals that:
   a. demonstrate broad departmental participation as evidenced by the targeting of a large fraction of department faculty and specifically address issues of department climate; and
   b. derive from the department’s climate assessment that is tied to the University Diversity Plan (UDP).
3. In order to encourage greater impact, funds will be distributed amongst fewer awardees to support larger-scale endeavors and encourage a more competitive process. Further, the program will be renamed so as not to reflect “small-scale” or “mini” (e.g. ADVANCE Departmental Awards).
4. The Dean of Faculties Office and the Office of the Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity will partner with ADVANCE to co-sponsor innovative proposals that demonstrate a partnership between STEM and non-STEM departments.
5. The committee will provide feedback to departments that receive awards based on the department’s mid-term and annual reports to create a stronger feedback loop.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/College</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Matching Funds</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
<th>Proposal Aims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Agricultural Economics | $3,750           | $1,250         |                | • bring to campus four prominent economists who will serve as role models for faculty  
• speakers chosen based on eminence in profession and shared interests with department’s women faculty |
| Biology                | $10,000          | $5,000         |                | • travel expenses for 10 prominent female scientists to come to campus                                                                           |
| Entomology             | $12,100          | $6,050         |                | • brainstorming” retreat to establish multi-lab collaborations  
• student rotation in the research laboratories of women faculty  
• themed monthly lunches open to the entire departmental faculty  
• purchase textbook for women faculty: *Interdisciplinary Research Teams: The Scientist’s Guide to Building Strong, Productive Teams* |
| Math                   | $4,200           | $2,000         | $4,200         | Continuation grant to further build community among all women faculty separated by rank/geography by holding:  
• two retreats led by a professional facilitator, and  
• five Friday gatherings                                                                                                      |
| Political Science (1)  | $9,600           | $2,700         | $6,900         | Three interrelated strategies:  
• a workshop on building professional networks including developing mentoring relationships  
• a workshop on how to mentor and assist junior scholars’ professional development  
• bring women scholars to campus to build mentoring relationships with the department’s women faculty |
| Political Science (2)  | $7,250           |                |                | • a speaker series with nationally-prominent senior female political scientists                                                                  |
| Psychology             | $5,700           | $3,900         |                | Two interrelated strategies:  
• build greater sense of departmental collegiality through monthly faculty meetings focused on Psychology subfields’ constructs of gender and race  
• outside speaker to address issues raised in monthly meetings                                                                 |
| Sociology              | $3,500           | $3,500         |                | Two interrelated strategies focused on mid-career faculty:  
• a cross-department (social sciences) workshop related to service issues and competing demands led by external speaker who is both a STEM researcher and expert in gender issues  
• supplemental funds for women associate professors to spend an extra day at annual professional association meetings that involve significant service activities |

Note: Colored rows indicate funded proposals. Political Science and Psychology received partial awards. Funds were only provided for one year of activity.
SUCCESS ENHANCEMENT
Co-Chairs – Michael Benedik and Dorothy Shippen

The Success Enhancement component of ADVANCE activities is designed to foster the professional development of women STEM faculty. There are 3 Success Enhancement Activities that have been established to foster the professional development of women STEM faculty. The Dean of Faculties, Michael Benedik, and Dorothy Shippen, Department of Biochemistry & Biophysics, co-chair this effort.

ADVANCE Scholar Program
Activity Leaders - Christine Stanley and Becky Petitt

Activity Summary: The ADVANCE Scholar Program intends to increase likelihood of success of underrepresented women STEM faculty members, particularly women of color, by providing as mentors, eminent scholars in their fields. The ADVANCE Center, in collaboration with the Office of the Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity, has also established a national conference for underrepresented women in STEM, the first of which occurred October 11-12, 2012.

Activity Update: Since our last update, we made a concerted effort to encourage Cohort 1 Scholars to travel to see their Eminent Scholars/Mentors before the end of September 2013. To date, 75% of the Scholars have completed these visits. All reported that their meetings were extremely beneficial, and in several cases, Eminent Scholars/Mentors provided Scholars with opportunities to deliver scholarly presentations to various audiences.

In June, we accepted our third cohort of Scholars. Two identify as Hispanic and one identifies as Black. Two are in targeted STEM departments and one is in a non-STEM department. The cost of the non-STEM scholar’s participation is being covered by the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (COALS). Internal Advocates were assigned to the new Scholars and we are currently in the process of extending invitations to their potential external mentors, whom we hope to have in place no later than September 30.

Now that Cohort 1 has completed their 2 year participation in the program, focused evaluation is underway. The Scholars, Internal Advocates, and External Mentors have all been asked to simultaneously provide qualitative feedback about their experiences and the program’s impact.

Administrative Fellow Program
Activity Leader - José Luis Bermúdez

Activity Summary: This activity provides opportunities for women STEM faculty at the associate or full professor level to serve in developmental assignments in the offices of the Provost, Deans of targeted colleges, Vice President for Research, VP and Associate Provost for Diversity, and the Dean of Faculties. Administrators are selected based on a proposed project, jointly developed by the faculty member with the college or administrative office, and supported jointly by the ADVANCE project and the host office.

Activity Update: A call for Cohort 3 Administrative Fellows was issued in December 2012. Three Position Applications were received and reviewed in January 2013: one from the Office of Undergraduate Studies (OGS), one from the College of Science (COS), and one from the Office of the Vice President for Research (VPR). The committee met and decided to approve the proposals from COS and VPR pending minor revisions which were later made.
The COS submitted and the committee consequently confirmed a candidate for their position: Dr. Ginger Carney. Dr. Carney has been a member of the Biology Department since 2004, and her research focuses on genetic control of courtship behaviors in insects. In her position, she will reinforce an ongoing college-wide commitment to research excellence, not only at traditional faculty and graduate levels but also during the formative undergraduate years, when students are making critical decisions about their futures and forming vital first impressions about higher education as well as the overall research/scholarly knowledge-generation enterprise.

Due to the changes in the VPR’s office (3 people have served in the VPR position in the last year), the candidate for their position is on hold.

Planning for the SEC/Admin Fellows joint programming began during the reporting period. Dr. Benedik has proposed shared programming between the TAMU SEC Fellows and the ADVANCE Administrative Fellows. The ADVANCE Leadership Team sees great potential for this collaboration, especially as it relates to institutionalization, and we are pursuing this opportunity. A lunch is currently being scheduled between the ADVANCE Admin Fellows (both cohorts) and the SEC Fellows to start to build that community and determine shared programming— including participation in the 2015 SEC workshop at A&M. (Future Fellows will be included when they are named.)

Scheduling of the monthly lunch series for the Fellows from both cohorts to meet with campus administrators continued.

Social Science Study Summary: In conjunction with this activity, Mindy Bergman is leading the social science study in which Administrative Fellows and their colleagues are interviewed. The working title of the study is “Advancing Women into Leadership Positions: Effectiveness of the Administrative Fellows Program.” The goal of this study is to develop a thick-description case study of women entering academic leadership and administration for the first time via a part-time, short duration position. The research questions focus on the changing beliefs and expectations of Fellows throughout their first year in administration, the fit of the position into the administrative unit (as part-time, short term administrative positions are relatively unusual at Texas A&M), and the effect on a variety of psychologically healthy workplace outcomes (e.g., work-life balance) and career trajectories as a typical faculty member (e.g., research productivity, student mentoring). All Administrative Fellows will be interviewed at three points during their first year of appointment (beginning, middle, end). Additionally, the sponsor of the position (i.e., the unit head) as well as several peers and support staff will be interviewed at the beginning and end of the first year of each Fellow’s appointment.

Social Science Study Update: Semi-structured interview protocols for both the Fellows and their colleagues probe the efficacy and fit of the position into the host unit (all respondents), components of the psychologically healthy workplace model (especially work-life balance; Fellows), and the effects of joining administration on faculty career trajectories such as maintaining an active research program (all respondents).

To date, the first year and second year cohort interviews are complete for the first year of their respective positions. The Social Science Studies team spent the summer finalizing transcripts for these interviews and getting them all organized and labeled consistently. Additionally, IRB approval was obtained for additional interviews beyond the first year of the administrative fellow experience. Annual interviews for the each cohort will occur beyond the first year (although we
will have to “catch up” on the first year cohort in their now third year, as we did not have approval until after their second year finished). These will occur in January-February 2014.

Success Circles
Activity Leader - Jane Welsh

Activity Summary: The ADVANCE Center is organizing mentoring groups centered on personal and professional interests. This activity functions as a complement to existing one-on-one mentoring (Women’s Faculty Network, the Mexican American Latino Faculty Association and the Black Faculty Alliance) and facilitates the development of social connections among women faculty with the goal of greater satisfaction and well-being.

Activity Update: The Writing Club of women STEM faculty that started in spring 2012 continued to meet weekly during the reporting period. The Writing Club of women STEM faculty that resulted from the College of Agriculture and Life Science’s mini-grant began meeting in December 2012 and continues to meet. The ADVANCE Center is currently scheduling a time for relevant faculty to meet with these groups (e.g. NSF Career Awardees, faculty who have been on NSF review panels, the facilitators of the Stress Free Writing workshops that were previously held etc.)

In addition to the Writing Clubs, efforts to initiate an elder care group based on the New Mom’s group model continue. The Program Director is working with the TAMU Work-Life Committee to plan an event centered on elder care. This panel discussion, which was originally planned for the spring, will take place in the fall. It is hoped that this event will launch an elder care success circle.

RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION
Co-Chairs - Robin Autenrieth and Sarah Bednarz

While the number and diversity of women faculty at Texas A&M University has seen recent gains, a great need still exists to attract and keep women of excellence in the STEM fields. To that end, the ADVANCE Center established 4 activities focused on Recruitment and Retention of women STEM faculty. Robin Autenrieth, Co-PI and Associate Dean of Graduate Studies in the College of Engineering, and Sarah Bednarz, Associate Dean of Geography, are Co-Chairs for this effort.

Roadmap Workshop
Activity Leader - Ben Wu

Activity Summary: Formerly the Workshop for Early Career Academics, this activity is designed for internal (A&M) and external (non-A&M) post-doctoral researchers and Assistant Professors (in the first two years of their position) in STEM fields. The purpose of these annual workshops is to assist departments in the recruitment and retention of women STEM faculty.

Activity Update: The 2013 Roadmap Workshop was held April 8-9. The summer months were spent working with the Evaluation Team to produce an evaluation of the event. See Conducting a Formative Evaluation of the Roadmap Workshop in the Evaluation section below for further information.
Social Science Study Summary: Kathi Miner is conducting a study currently titled “Repairing the Leaky Pipeline: Workshops for Early Career Academics.” This survey study investigates whether workshop attendees report higher levels of self-efficacy for negotiating and, in turn, higher levels of well-being than post-doctoral non-workshop attendees. The sample consists of post-doctoral researchers and Assistant Professors who participated in the workshop. Attendees were also asked to nominate a comparable friend (e.g., female colleague at a similar rank) to also complete the survey; these non-attendees will serve as a comparison group.

Social Science Study Update: All 2012 workshop participants were invited to participate in the first (of three) online surveys at the start of the workshop (April, 2012). Thirty-three participants completed the survey for an 81% response rate. In addition, 12% (n = 4) of survey respondents nominated a colleague to also participate. However, no colleague of workshop attendees agreed to participate even after several recruitment email invitations were sent. We collected wave 2 data from 20 participants from the 2012 cohort (59% response rate from wave 1) and eight participants from the 2013 cohort (44% response rate). In addition, 12 participants (some who were 2012 workshop attendees) supplied the names and contact information of 15 colleagues to serve as control participants; three of these nominees participated in the study (25% response rate). Although we sent several reminder invitation emails to complete the study to workshop participants and their nominees, our response rates were less than ideal. The Social Science Studies Team discussed ways to increase the rate of response for workshop attendees and ways to identify possible comparison group participants. We currently have an IRB application under review to gain approval for these strategies which include monetary incentives for nominees and contacting workshop participants by phone and inviting them to participate.

STRIDE Program (Award and Search Committee Training)
Activity Leader – César Malavé, Industrial and Systems Engineering

Activity Summary: The Dean of Faculties and the ADVANCE Center are working together to expand existing gender bias training for all members of review committees including search committees, committees making decisions on university and college awards, and committees making decisions on tenure and promotion.

Activity Update: The Strategies and Tactics for Recruiting to Improve Diversity and Excellence (STRIDE) Committee - the group of influential faculty that started meeting in August 2012 – continued to meet during the reporting period. They previously finished the facilitated review of the implicit bias literature. The summer months were spent finalizing the presentation, working to schedule presentations for the fall with the College of Liberal Arts and, by request, with the College of Medicine, and identifying a second cohort for the committee.

Social Science Study Summary: One of the six social science studies will be conducted around this activity; the study is currently titled “Improving Selection and Promotion of STEM Women Faculty: Reducing Search and Award Committee Biases.” Mindy Bergman is the lead social science studies team researcher on this study. The basic hypothesis for the social science study is that training will increase knowledge of equal opportunity laws and decrease explicit sex biases substantially as well as decrease implicit sex biases more moderately. The current plan is to use a Solomon 4-group design to compare pre-/post- training attitudes and knowledge regarding implicit sex biases and equal opportunity laws.

Social Science Study Update: Three online surveys were prepared and approved by IRB. The pre-training survey will be administered within a week before training, the post-training survey
will be administered within a week after training, and a follow-up post-training survey will be administered approximately three months after training. Training will begin in the fall.

**ADVANCE Speaker Series**
Activity Leaders - Nancy Amato, Jennifer Welch, and Jodie Lutkenhaus

**Activity Summary:** The ADVANCE Speaker Series has two goals: 1) to bring in one or two senior women scientists and engineers per year who have also been active in gender and diversity issues to speak and 2) to bring in mid-career and senior women scientists and engineers that are nominated by STEM departments for recruiting purposes.

**Activity Update:** Speaker nominations for the spring 2014 ADVANCE Speaker Series were solicited from STEM departments on July 22. Nominations were due August 18. Eight nominations were received from the following departments: Biological & Agricultural Engineering, Biochemistry & Biophysics (2 nominations), Biology, Chemistry, Entomology, Industrial & Systems Engineering, and Mechanical Engineering. The committee will announce the selected speakers during the next reporting period.

ADVANCE continues to promote women STEM speakers (seminar speakers) at the request of departments by highlighting them on our website with pictures, biographical information, and abstracts of their talks and informing the university community about them. Promotions have been conducted for the departments of Biomedical Engineering, Industrial and Systems Engineering (ISEN), and Mechanical Engineering (MEEN). Both ISEN and MEEN have made requests for our assistance for the 2013-14 academic year. While these events are separate from the Speaker Series, it is clear that the departments are seeing value in raising awareness about their female speakers and partnering with ADVANCE to do so; this is important for institutionalization of this effort.

**Faculty Recognition**
Activity Leader - Elena Castell-Perez

**Activity Summary:** This activity is focused on highlighting the success of women STEM faculty. In collaboration with the Dean of Faculties office, the Women’s Faculty Network, the Women Engineering Faculty Interest Group, the Women Administrators Network, and the Vice President of Research, the ADVANCE Center is organizing events to recognize and publicize the achievements of women faculty.

**Activity Update:** Highlighting the successes of women STEM faculty continues on our website (see [advance.tamu.edu](http://advance.tamu.edu)). In addition to the website, ADVANCE continued working with the TAMU Women Former Student Association (WFSN, our women’s alumni group) to organize a small luncheon for the 2013 Eminent Scholar Awardee. Invitees include last year’s awardee, WFSN leadership including Carol Jordan (TAMU ADVANCE EAB Member), and senior women faculty. The luncheon is scheduled for October 16.

Also during the reporting period, the ADVANCE Center continued to work on a newsletter to further highlight the success of women STEM faculty. The content will include recent awards, faculty spotlights, committee news, and in-depth interviews with women STEM faculty. The newsletter will be sent to all faculty and administrators. The first newsletter is targeted for the next reporting period.
EVALUATION

Evaluation Summary: If the ADVANCE program is successful, then at the end of five years, climate and faculty workplace practices at Texas A&M University will be more psychologically healthy than when the ADVANCE program was initiated. To achieve this goal, the project team developed a series of interrelated interventions designed to change the climate, enhance professional success, and improve the recruitment and retention of female faculty.

The Evaluation Team is monitoring each intervention for fidelity to TAMU’s ADVANCE proposal and the mission and goals of the NSF ADVANCE program. Monitoring activities include documenting design and implementation of the interventions, tracking participation, and measuring participant satisfaction (where appropriate). The Evaluation Team is working closely with the Social Science Studies Team to avoid duplication of effort with respect to the interventions that are the focus of social science studies and to use data and findings from the social science studies where appropriate.

The Evaluation Team is also crucially interested in identifying the extent to which TAMU’s suite of interventions is achieving the goal of institutional transformation. Since isolating effects of any single ADVANCE intervention on institutional indicators like climate or retention would be nearly impossible, the Evaluation Team is focusing on a holistic approach that uses departments as the units of analysis. This approach draws on the literature on organizational change, and uses department-level data on faculty climate, faculty recruitment and retention, space allocations, start-up packages, and salaries. In all cases, a difference-in-difference approach is being used to assess whether or not ADVANCE activities can help to explain departmental changes over time. The underlying hypothesis is that departments with greater exposure and/or engagement with ADVANCE will show greater improvements in climate, retention, and recruitment over time.

The difference-in-difference strategy will also be used to examine the link between individual activities and specific items from the climate survey. For example, an intermediate objective of the LEAD program is to improve the skills of STEM department heads; the Evaluation team will use questions regarding unit leadership from the 2009, 2013 and planned 2015 climate surveys to evaluate the extent to which attendance at LEAD workshops is associated with changes in faculty perceptions about department head effectiveness. Evaluation Update: Recent work by the Evaluation Team—headed by Lori Taylor, Jeff Froyd, and Joanna Lahey—has focused on:

- compiling data needed for analysis of institutional transformation,
- monitoring implementation of the Student Diversity Workshops,
- cleaning and compiling the administrative data on space allocations and conducting preliminary analyses of same,
- surveying faculty regarding student-faculty interactions,
- conducting a formative evaluation of the Roadmap Workshop, and
- conducting a preliminary analysis of the 2013 climate survey.

Compiling Data Needed for the Analysis of Institutional Transformation

As part of the analysis of institutional transformation, the Evaluation Team is developing measures indicating the extent to which each TAMU department has engaged with the ADVANCE Program. Not all departments being offered ADVANCE activities are actively participating, and some departments may take up some activities but not take up others. Therefore, it is important to separate two different effects. The first effect is that of the “intent-to-treat”, that is, the effect on everybody who is offered the program intervention, given that some
departments will always choose not to participate (“never takers”) and other departments may participate in similar programs offered through non-ADVANCE initiatives (“always takers”). The second effect is the effect of the “treatment-on-the-treated,” that is, the effect on those departments who are both offered the chance to engage with ADVANCE and who take-up that engagement. This “treatment-on-the-treated” analysis gives information of the direct effect of ADVANCE programs.

In order to measure these separate effects, we first need to know which departments are offered which programs. Using this information, we can create a scale of exposure to ADVANCE. Second, we need to know which departments choose to take-up these programs. Using this second information, we can create a scale of engagement with ADVANCE. Information on exposure gives general information about what the overall impact of ADVANCE is on everybody, including those who do not choose to engage. Information on engagement will tell us what the effects are for those who choose to engage. These data have been collected since the first year of the ADVANCE program and are in the process of being analyzed.

This quarter we worked on our basic measures of engagement. We also collected new data for 2013 and cleaned earlier data. For our preliminary analysis, we are presenting three measures of engagement. We collected information on LEAD, Administrative Fellows, Scholars, Roadmap, Faculty Recognition, FASIT, STRIDE, Minigrants, the Speaker Series, Success Circles, and Student Diversity programs using calendar year data. Our first measure of engagement is our measure of being involved in the design process. This measure looks at the effect of a department having a member engaging in committee design work. We include information on who was on the committees for the LEAD, Administrative Fellows, Scholars, Roadmap, Faculty Recognition, FASIT, Merit Pool, STRIDE, Success Circles, and Student Diversity programs. Our second measure of engagement is a treatment measure. This measure includes information on which departments participated in the aforementioned programs once they came to fruition. A third measure, the total engagement index combines the two.

For the purposes of this report, we are only presenting measures that use indicators of whether or not a department had any participation in a committee or treatment in a year. Future work will also look at the effect of intensity of treatment—how many people from each department were involved with the design or treatment. We are using these indicators in a factor analysis framework to condense participation measures for all the different programs into a single measure of engagement in design, treatment, or total engagement respectively.

For the design measure, we ran a factor analysis on the 2011 data, when committee participation began, and used these results to create a predicted factor variable for all three years. This factor was then correlated with the individual committees. Figure 1 below is a histogram showing the density of each factor. Figure 2 provides a box-plot of the design engagement scores across the three years. Note that 2013 is the calendar year and thus only shows information for half of a year.
For the treatment measure of engagement across departments, we conducted a factor analysis on the 2013 data, when many of the programs were underway, and we used these results to create a predicted factor variable for all three years. This factor represents a weighted average of the membership in the individual committees and summarizes the extent to which a department engages with ADVANCE treatments (as opposed to ADVANCE design). Figure 3 is a histogram showing the distribution of the annual treatment-engagement engagement scores across departments for the two and one-half years of the ADVANCE program. As the figure illustrates, there are a few departments that have been highly engaged with ADVANCE (i.e. have a Treatment Engagement Score above 2) but most have not engaged or have engaged only slightly. Figure 4 provides a box-plot of the Treatment Engagement scores across the three years. Here we see an increase in treatment over time (noting that 2013 is a partial year) indicating that treatment engagement across the university is increasing over time.
We also combined these two measures into a single measure using all years (Figures 5 and 6).

Future work will refine these measures, including intensity of participation as well as any participation. Once we have refined these measures we will use them in the framework discussed above to measure the effects of the ADVANCE program.

**Monitoring the implementation of the Student Diversity Workshops**

The ADVANCE Center has been pursuing two strategies for this activity:

1) Implementing diversity skits at Fish Camp during summer 2013, and
2) Producing a brief diversity video and showing it at New Student Orientation during summer 2013. As previously reported, the video addresses students' differential treatment of male and female professors in terms of how they address them (Dr. vs. Miss/Ms/Mrs.). The plan is to expand the scope of the videos in subsequent years.

The Evaluation Team has been actively monitoring the implementation of the diversity skits and the video presentations. The skits were performed in each of the 7 Fish Camp sessions in summer 2013, resulting in the treatment of approximately 6,000 incoming freshmen. Videos were made of the skits and the Evaluation Team will review the videos as part of a formative evaluation of the experience. The Evaluation Team also plans to conduct a focus group with student leaders who participated as counselors in the 2013 Fish Camp to gather information about strategies for improving and institutionalizing the skit competition.

In addition to the Fish Camp intervention, the diversity video was incorporated into new student orientation this summer. Members of the Evaluation Team attended a session of new student orientation for each of the STEM colleges this summer and documented ways in which the video was used in each session. (Each College conducts multiple orientation sessions, to this represents a sample, not a census. The Colleges were not notified which session the team would observe.)
Evaluation Team representatives attended New Student Conferences as follows:

- July 2nd, 2:00 PM – College of Geosciences, 112 O&M Building
- July 9th-2:00 PM – College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, 115 Kleberg
- July 11th-2:00 PM – College of Liberal Arts, 2300 A&B MSC
- July 16th-1:45 PM – College of Science, 100 Heldenfels Hall
- July 30th -2:00 PM – College of Engineering, Rudder Theater

As a general rule, all of the Colleges used the ADVANCE diversity video. However, the quality of the implementation was inconsistent across Colleges. The College of Science made particularly good use of the video, with the presenter embedding it in an anecdotal story about his own struggle with implicit biases. However, the College of Liberal Arts had technical difficulties in using the video. It accidently started playing early. It was paused, and the presenter continued, prefacing the video with, "Here's a short video on etiquette." The video was not rewound to the beginning, so when it was played, a few important seconds were missing, taking away from the effect of the video. The College of Engineering did not show the video at all in the first session attended by the Evaluation Team, although they did show it in subsequent sessions.

The Evaluation Team prepared a short report on their notes from the new student orientations, and provided that formative analysis to the Student Diversity Committee. (See Appendix A.)

Cleaning and compiling the administrative data on space allocations and conducting preliminary analyses of same

The space allocation analysis will rely on newly developed data on space allocations at TAMU. These data will be the first to link individual records for TAMU faculty with descriptive characteristics of specific offices and laboratories. The baseline analysis will examine the extent to which there are gender differences in the allocation of office or laboratory spaces, conditional on the appropriate demographic characteristics of faculty. Subsequent analysis will examine changes, if any, if the gender pattern of space allocation. Administrative changes at A&M (the facilities department was completely reorganized and partially outsourced) and unfamiliarity with the reporting requirements among the TAMU departments have greatly slowed progress on this part of the analysis. The ADVANCE team has contacted each STEM department on campus to clarify their initial reports and fill in gaps in the baseline data. We continue to work with some STEM departments to address data quality concerns, and consider the analysis below preliminary.

Table 3 presents results from regression analysis of the total square footage controlled by a faculty member, conditioned on sex, and departmental affiliation. As you can see in the first column of the table, our initial pass of the data, controlling only for department and using all of the types of space given to us, women have, on average, 248 square feet fewer than men do, and this result is significant at the 10% level.
Table 3: Preliminary Analysis of Space Allocation, All Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling for rank</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>Professors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>only</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-247.7*</td>
<td>-1.542</td>
<td>-220.9</td>
<td>-56.25</td>
<td>-91.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(147.7)</td>
<td>(191.3)</td>
<td>(331.9)</td>
<td>(270.3)</td>
<td>(387.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>362.9</td>
<td>(2,273)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>553.8</td>
<td>(2,271)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>(2,265)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/VP</td>
<td>-2,147</td>
<td>(2,431)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Indicators?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>0.470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One possible reason for this difference could be that as time goes on, there are more women entering academia, so rank correlates with gender. Because people of higher rank are likely to have more space, gender could be picking up the effect of rank. In column (2) we control for rank, specifically that of assistant, associate, and full professor. All non-tenure-track professors are dropped out of the regression in columns (2)-(5). Controlling for rank, there is no difference in space allocation between tenured and tenure-track men and women at Texas A&M University. Drilling down into these results, columns (3)-(5) look at assistants, associates, and full professors respectively. Among assistant professors, we see that women, on average, have 221 less square feet than men; however, this difference is not significant. Associate professors and full professors show a smaller difference, and again, these differences are not significant.

Table 4 presents results from a parallel analysis looking only at the space allocation differences in office space and laboratory space. Here our results vary dramatically, showing that women have both less square feet and more square feet. None of these results are statistically significant.
Table 4: Preliminary Analysis of Space Allocation, Office and Laboratory Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1) Baseline</th>
<th>(2) Baseline Controlling for rank</th>
<th>(3) Assistant Professors Only</th>
<th>(4) Associate Professors Only</th>
<th>(5) Full Professors Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-102.0</td>
<td>75.96 (84.73)</td>
<td>-112.5 (125.5)</td>
<td>-5.146 (126.2)</td>
<td>216.7 (250.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>949.0 (1,368)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>1,039 (1,367)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1,182 (1,365)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/VP</td>
<td>151 (1,270)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Indicators?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>1,052 (231)</td>
<td>290 (629)</td>
<td>522 (419)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.453 (0.659)</td>
<td>0.629 (0.419)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We caution that the results shown are only a first pass. The data still need to be further cleaned of identification errors; at this point, 61 mis-transcriptions have been found and corrected. Transcription errors would tend to introduce random measurement error, which would bias our results towards a finding of no relationship. Additionally, we need to make decisions about space allocation that may potentially affect our results. For example, some departments share lab space and some do not. Some departments assign faculty support to specific individual identifiers and some do not. Barn and field space may need to be treated differently than wet or dry lab space. To the extent that these differences differ by department and departments vary in gender composition, we may be biasing our results in one direction or another.

The complete analysis will also examine the extent to which differences in the quality of allocated space can be attributed to the sex of the STEM faculty member. However, because faculty space is clustered by department—meaning that faculty from any given department tend to be housed in a single building—we are unlikely to detect any differences in space quality not also apparent in the allocation of space quantity.

**Surveying faculty regarding student-faculty interactions**

In collaboration with the Social Science Studies Team and the ADVANCE Leadership Team, the ADVANCE Evaluation Team developed and administered a brief survey seeking faculty feedback regarding student interactions with faculty members (see Appendix B). The purpose of this Faculty-Student Interaction Survey was two-fold; first, to provide a baseline for the evaluation of our Student Diversity Activity interventions and second to suggest additional areas of concern or types of micro-aggression that could be addressed when the scope of the student diversity intervention is expanded for summer 2014. The survey was in the field from August 19th through 26th. Nearly 400 faculty members responded to the survey, which would represent
Conducting a formative evaluation of the Roadmap Workshop

The second Roadmap for a Successful Academic Career Workshop was held April 8 and 9, 2013. As with the previous workshop in spring 2012, the Evaluation Team conducted a formative evaluation of the activity. To facilitate comparisons, the Evaluation Team administered the same survey instrument as was used to conduct the formative evaluation of the first Roadmap Workshop in 2012, and conducted a similar analysis of the data (see Appendices C and D.)

As was the case with 2012 Workshop, all of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that:

- The Workshop content was useful and relevant
- The presentation of material was clear and understandable
- Presenters were well informed on the topics covered
- The Workshop materials were useful

Furthermore, unlike in 2012, all of the respondents in 2013 said that “yes” they would recommend the workshop to a friend. On the other hand, one respondent was neutral with respect to two questions with which all respondents in 2012 agreed

- Presentations were interesting and enjoyable
- Overall I was satisfied with the workshop

Respondents also provided substantial, open-ended feedback on the workshop. Those responses have been de-identified and provided to the Roadmap Workshop Committee as part of the evaluation report.

Analyzing the Climate Survey

The team is currently working to analyze the faculty campus climate survey administered in spring 2013. The survey has been completed and the data are currently being cleaned by the Social Science Studies and Evaluation teams. To date, the Social Science Studies Team has prepared an analysis of the response rate (see Appendix E) and the Evaluation Team has prepared an analysis of faculty responses to key questions regarding job satisfaction and turnover (see Appendix F). During the next reporting period, the Evaluation Team will examine the extent to which changes in departmental climate can be attributed to engagement with ADVANCE.
New Student Orientation Diversity Video
2013 Formative Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sessions Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2\textsuperscript{nd} -- 2:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 9\textsuperscript{th} -- 2:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 11\textsuperscript{th} -- 2:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 16\textsuperscript{th} -- 1:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 30\textsuperscript{th} -- 2:00 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

July 2: College of Geosciences

- The program started at 2:00pm in room 112 of the O&M Building
- There were approximately 20-22 students attending and approximately 13 parents attending
  - Students were asked to sit in the first three rows but some seem to have stayed in the back with their parents so it was hard to get a count
  - These were transfer students from other colleges, not incoming freshmen
- Of the students attending, about 12 of them were male and about 9 of them were female
- The video was shown 30 minutes into the program
- It was prefaced with a speech from the presenter about how A&M is a community of respect. The presenter stated that they were going to show a video about a problem on campus and teach the proper etiquette.
- After the video, the presenter immediately asked “What is my first name?” and prompted the students to reply “Doctor.”
- She then told a personal story about just that morning when a person on the phone insisted on calling her “Mrs.” instead of “Dr.”
- She stated that addressing all professors by “Dr.” is a mark of respect and that it is very important to do
Students did not give any verbal feedback
  • No questions asked specifically to them
• It was difficult to tell how well the video was received for multiple reasons.
  • The group was quiet overall and did not talk much throughout the entire presentation
  • There were no follow up questions asked directly to the students
  • The presenter quickly moved on to the next part of the presentation after debriefing the video

July 9: College of Agriculture

• The program started at 2:00pm in Room 115 of Kleberg
• There were approximately 75 students and 83 parents attending the program.
  • The students were scattered throughout the large room and surrounded by their parents and siblings so it was difficult to get an exact count.
  • Almost all students were accompanied by at least one of their parents.
• Of the students attending, about 23 of them were male, and about 52 of them were female
• The video was shown 15 minutes into the program
• The video was prefaced with a speech about how some of the freshmen attending the presentation today may go into research and how they must know the proper way to address their professors regardless. The presenter stated that this is not high school anymore and that there is a way to properly address all professors that is expected. He then stated that the ADVANCE center made a video to help students learn about this.
• After the video, the presenter immediately stated that this is food for thought that students must keep in mind. He stated that the university has more female than male students so this is very important. He also told the audience that the College has many female professors and he named a few that attended the presentation today. He said that this is very important to keep in mind as they go into their first semester.
• The presenter referred to female faculty as “ladies”.
• Students did not give any verbal feedback
  • No questions asked specifically to them before or after the presentation
• The video seemed well received overall
  • Students laughed at the humorous points of the video
  • The audience was very attentive
• It was still difficult to get much more about how the video was received because the students did not give any direct feedback

July 11: College of Liberal Arts

• The program started at 2:00pm in Rooms 2300 A&B in the MSC.
• There were approximately 88 students and 93 parents attending the program.
The students were scattered throughout the large room and surrounded by their parents and siblings so it was difficult to get an exact count.

Almost all students were accompanied by at least one of their parents.

Of the students attending, about 26 of them were male, and about 52 of them were female.

The video was shown 30 minutes into the program.

When slides were changed in the presentation, the video accidentally began playing too early. It was paused, and the presenter continued, prefacing the video with, “Here’s a short video on etiquette.” The video was not rewound to the beginning, so when it was played, a few important seconds were missing, taking away from the effect of the video.

The introduction of the video was skipped, leaving out the portion with the A&M logo displayed and the War Hymn.

After the video finished, the presenter made the point that, “male, female, young, or old, it’s a sign of respect” and moved on.

Students did not give any verbal feedback

• No questions asked specifically to them before or after the presentation.

The video seemed well received overall

• Students laughed at the humorous points of the video

• It was still difficult to get much more about how the video was received because the students did not give any direct feedback.

July 16: College of Science

The program started at 2:00pm in room 100 of Heldenfels.

There were approximately 105 students and 96 parents attending the program.

• The students were scattered throughout the large room and surrounded by their parents and siblings so it was difficult to get an exact count.

• Almost all students were accompanied by at least one of their parents.

Of the students attending, about 53 of them were male and 52 of them were female.

The video was the first thing that was shown in the program, immediately at 2:00pm. The video was prefaced with “We are going to watch a video with an important take away lesson.” The professor presenting was featured in the video and made a joke about “a very famous actor” that was appearing in the video.

After the video, the presenter asked what the point of the video was, besides his acting debut. He took an answer from a volunteer.

He then asked “What did young lady in the video make a mistake in doing?” and he took another volunteer to answer.

He went on to say that referring to female professors as Ms. or Mrs. is almost a reflex action but that we need to work hard to change that reflex because it diminishes women and their PhD by doing so.

He also stated that he has to think about it because he was born in the south and that he was always taught to call women “ma’am.”
• He summed up the presentation by giving a rule for students to follow: When in doubt, address all of your professors as doctors. If they are not, then they will instruct you to address them otherwise. Don’t make the mistake of diminishing women faculty who have the same degrees.

• The presenter then asked the big question: Why does this matter? He stated that this is a huge deal in science especially because the college does not have as many women. They then transitioned to the rest of the program by stating that this is a preview of one of the many things to be aware of as they start their education.

• The video was well received
  • The students were attentive before, during, and after the clip.
  • Volunteers answered all of the questions asked.
  • The students laughed at the professor’s jokes about his acting career

• This was the first presentation in which the students were allowed to give direct feedback.

• The professor continued to allude to the video in different parts of his presentation.
  • He was talking to the Life Sciences students and stated that they had many more women and that the rule would still be just as important.

**July 30: College of Engineering**

• The program started at 2:00pm in Rudder Theater.

• There were approximately 180 students and 193 parents attending the program.
  • The students were scattered throughout the large room and surrounded by their parents and siblings so it was difficult to get an exact count.
  • Almost all students were accompanied by at least one of their parents.

• Of the students attending, about 131 of them were male, and about 49 of them were female

• The video was not shown during the program
  • We attended the presentation from beginning to end to ensure that we did not miss it

• The name of the speaker was different than the name on the first slide of the PowerPoint presentation, so it may have been a different person than the usual speaker
APPENDIX B
Faculty-Student Interaction Survey

1. In courses where enrollment is predominantly freshmen, how many disrespectful comments did you receive from or observe by students toward faculty members in fall semester 2012 and spring semester 2013?

2. In courses where enrollment is predominantly sophomores, juniors, or seniors, how many disrespectful comments did you receive from or observe by students toward faculty members in fall semester 2012 and spring semester 2013?

3. In courses where enrollment is predominantly graduate students, how many disrespectful comments did you receive from or observe by students toward faculty members in fall semester 2012 and spring semester 2013?

4. How often have you observed or been told about students treating faculty disrespectfully based on their identity (gender, race, ethnicity, national origin, etc.) in fall semester 2012 and spring semester 2013?

5. What are your three pet peeves regarding student behaviors toward faculty members? (If "use of technology in the classroom", such as texting, games, cell-phones, facebook, etc. is a problem, please list that as a single pet peeve.)

6. What is your UIN?
**Roadmap Workshop - April 8-9, 2013**  
**Formative Evaluation**

### To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please check one box per row</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Workshop content was useful and relevant</td>
<td>14/17</td>
<td>3/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Presentation of material was clear and understandable</td>
<td>13/17</td>
<td>4/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Presenters were well informed on the topics covered</td>
<td>12/17</td>
<td>4/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Presentations were interesting and enjoyable</td>
<td>13/17</td>
<td>3/17</td>
<td>1/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Workshop materials were useful</td>
<td>10/17</td>
<td>7/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Overall I was satisfied with the workshop</td>
<td>12/17</td>
<td>4/17</td>
<td>1/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** There were no significant differences between post-docs and assistant professors in their response to the above questions.

### What did you find most helpful about this workshop?

- “Academic dossiers”+ teaching + power writing
- Broad range of topics covering full spectrum of areas required for tenure track positions. Writing seminar. Emphasis on work/life balance and mentors.
- NSF funding section and power writing
- Receiving the tenure statements from within my college. I found practical advice and tips more useful then the conceptual. Also, anytime I could get specific info about how it typically works in my area of research. I also found the writing session to be the most impactful.
• P&T. Pat Hurley. Networking with other women. Specific information about my dossier, nut & bolts, e.g. annotating on your CV what your contribution is on a manuscript. I wish I had known that last week, when I turned in my materials. Specific info from Pat Hurley regarding service.

• Information on NSF funding, power writing and communication my science, and College of Ag expectations for P&T.

• All presentations I attended have been very helpful. Always good to refresh and update on the policies of tenure and promotion.

• Hearing from and meeting very passionate researchers and learning from their personal example: e.g. Karan Watson, Pat Hurley, Mark Zoran, Farida Sohrabji, Tiffani Williams, Power writing was superb.

• Power writing, communicating your science.

• Work-life balance, research, tenure process and priorities.

• Insights of the speakers are most helpful to me. Especially, speakers at the administration position help me a lot in understanding the big pictures about being a new faculty member.

• Power writing segment, also the segment on expectations for P&T by Dave Reed was excellent (also provided metrics for hiring asst. Profs).

• An overview all the necessary hirings in academics.

• Power writing, communicating your science, academic dossiers, success stories.

• Being aware of what to be aware of for the future (since I’m a postdoc now) was very useful. The panels of people giving advice based on what they did were extra useful (research I, work-life balance).

• One work-life panel was very refreshing to see women who can balance career/ family. Writing session was helpful.

• As a postdoc, I enjoyed the chance to learn the ins and outs of the tenure track and funding to prepare myself for when I attain a tenure-track position.

What did you find least helpful?

• Work-life balance section seemed narrow and didn’t give me much of a “take away.”

• NSF funding was too brief, rushed. Website session wasn’t hands-on enough.

• I found the “funding strategies” session least useful. I can’t tell you what “strategies” were offered.

• Web presence “elevator talk”

• Presentation on teaching was a bit unorganized and too general.

• Session on communication could have been 30 minutes instead of 1 hour. NSF funding with Cheryl Page was a bit dry.

• NSF, funding strategies

• Teaching and mentoring sessions are very helpful but can be a bit shorter.

• The workshop has a large percentage of sessions about tenure and promotion, which is very important to assistant professors. However, if the workshop is also designed for non-tenure or research positions, this part of information is not very helpful to those people.
• As a post doc, I wished that there would have been a salary/start up negotiation workshop.
• All of the sessions were very helpful. I cannot think about which one was least.
• Communicating your science could have been more relevant by sticking with stuff that we would realistically use, like professional websites. Who is going to tweet about their research? The funding talks were good to tell me what to be aware of, but they were tedious and probably could have been done better.
• The funding strategies were very hard to follow and not very helpful.
• Work life balance since I am a single woman and halve already found a nice balance between my lab work life and my personal life. I’m sure it was helpful to others but not me.

Are there additional topics that should be addressed at future workshops?
• My impression before the workshop was that we would hear about the job application process, which is significant to me as a postdoc, but the workshop really focused on assistant prof. positions. Adding a sessions on finding and getting a job would be great
• Brief preview of life after tenure (both positive or negative outcome of case). How to find collaborators.
• Make good presentation in conference and invited talks
• How to give a great presentation
• When discussing mentoring, I wish there had been more explicit discussion about the fact that there are A LOT of “anti-mentors.” In fact, there are probably more anti-mentors than true mentors. Getting rid of anti-mentors and not letting them bring you down would have been good.
• Hold a longer “power” writing workshop with more tools for becoming a successful writer.
• How to be a “boss” to techs, grads, students etc.
• Networking and collaboration.
• Section about postdocs.
• I am a postdoc. So through out the workshop, I could not stop myself from thinking can anyone tell me how to get assistant professor position before understanding tenure processes. I wish you have session more helpful for postdoc.
• It would be nice to have a session where postdocs and asst. profs are separate to address specific issues on taking the next step to getting faculty positions.
• Tips or steps to find a tenure-track position including the interview and application process. Any A&M faculty that were at primarily undergrad intuitions that could address this alternate academic career? How similar are the two tracks?

How else could this workshop be improved?
• Some of the sessions seemed highly repetitive. I think better defining sessions and giving that info to speakers (on their own and other sessions) may improve this. i.e. “midterm review” section redundant to “academic dossiers” section.
• Actively working on some activities in small groups with expert feedback. (e.g. Website, CV, grant research goals.)
• Everything is great.
• I would love to have more small-group discussions around the grant process. Small enough that people could share their ideas and get feedback no matter where they are in the process.
• We should sit in a horseshoe. It seemed last year that there was more interaction in the form of lunches, meetings with faculty etc. I would have liked that. The wine/ hors d'oeuvres room was too large to facilitate interaction. I should have gone to Abuelos. I wish there had been a norm where in presenters you’re your own dept. should leave the room. I wanted to ask when you know its time to leave a school/ dept, but not in front of Gevianne Alexander.
• Have each presenter prepare a handout with an outline of topics that they will each cover.
• Some speakers were tremendously inspiring, others ok. Regardless of specific topic, the tremendously inspiring researchers invariably had tremendously useful information and advice. Keep these and increase their numbers in future workshops.
• Really good workshop
• Not to be a pessimistic it would be helpful for the presenters talking about acquiring research funding to directly address some of the huge hurdles facing grant seekers.
• Some presentations were not very audible. Maybe microphone would make it louder.
• I think NIH and NSF should be nonparallel session.
• Splitting into postdoc and early faculty when needed, or at least address important issues for each group. Many topics seemed more geared at softer sciences, which was less helpful for me specifically.
• A lot of info was very repetitive and there was a lot of overlap. If that could be ironed out I would feel less burnt out. List titles of guest speakers on agenda because some speakers don’t mention their dept. / position.
• Would have been nice to attend both the NISE and NSF discussions or join them together in a more broad aspect. Alternative sessions for those not at TAMU or not is asst. prof positions for the P&T expectations session. Some of the panels (particularly about P&T) were repetitive. Could be streamlined or more specific topics each session (CV, external letters, statement) maybe in shorter sessions.

Would you recommend this workshop to a colleague?

• All 17 respondents answered “yes”

Why?
• It is unique, timely, and very informative to new female scientists.
• Extremely focused with important information to share. Speakers are extremely experienced and knowledgeable.
• Inspiring, empowering and gives lots of useful strategies and information.
• Could learn a lot, meet many people.
## How knowledgeable are you about the following regarding an academic position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please check one box per row</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Getting Letters of support for Tenure</td>
<td>2/17</td>
<td>7/17</td>
<td>6/17</td>
<td>1/17</td>
<td>1/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Getting Mentors</td>
<td>4/17</td>
<td>9/17</td>
<td>2/17</td>
<td>2/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Course Design</td>
<td>6/17</td>
<td>2/17</td>
<td>7/17</td>
<td>3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Teaching Graduate Courses</td>
<td>6/17</td>
<td>8/17</td>
<td>2/17</td>
<td>2/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Integrating Teaching &amp; Research</td>
<td>2/17</td>
<td>6/17</td>
<td>8/17</td>
<td>1/17</td>
<td>1/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Creating a Teaching Portfolio</td>
<td>5/17</td>
<td>6/17</td>
<td>3/17</td>
<td>2/17</td>
<td>1/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Grant Writing and Development</td>
<td>1/17</td>
<td>4/17</td>
<td>8/17</td>
<td>3/17</td>
<td>2/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Productive Writing Strategies</td>
<td>4/17</td>
<td>4/17</td>
<td>7/17</td>
<td>2/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Mentoring Graduate Students</td>
<td>4/17</td>
<td>7/17</td>
<td>1/17</td>
<td>3/17</td>
<td>2/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Service Activities</td>
<td>1/17</td>
<td>6/17</td>
<td>7/17</td>
<td>1/17</td>
<td>2/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There were no statistically reliable differences between post-docs and assistant professors in their response to the above questions. However, seven of the nine post-docs (and four of the eight assistant professors) indicated that they knew nothing or only a little about mentoring graduate students.
Do you have any additional comments?

- Attendees seemed to lack diversity in area of interest. It may be more interesting for group conversation to increase this for diversity.
- Would raise my settings for #7 based on this workshop
- No. Everything is wonderful
- I was not able to attend all the sessions, but enjoyed the sessions I was able to attend.
- I think I am in the strange position of being in my second year on my tenure clock but my fourth year working as faculty. So the most helpful workshops were about p&t, and concrete information about the dossier. Secondarily, I enjoyed meeting other women in the same position as me. But the discussion about teaching/mentoring, these are topics that have occupied my thinking for the past four years, and I have pretty clear ideas about my own approach/philosophy.
- Thank you very much for allowing me to participate in this wonderful workshop. Please keep having similar events to help prepare new female faculty for their new responsibilities on the job. I recommend you write the presenters position, dept, and contact info underneath their names on the agenda.
- Thank you for the tremendous organization, wonderful workshop, and caring for all of us.
- I found the workshop to be very useful.
- It would be nice to have activities fall between 8 and 5 to accommodate for those with child care arrangements. More sessions that are more interactive with participants. The teaching session was great to hear participants share their experiences. We were mentoring each other.
- The schedule was a nice pace. It was good to hear from various people throughout the university (especially in admin. positions) to increase network. Good to interact with people in similar career stages and those that have taken the next step.

What is your current employment status?

☐ Postdoctoral Associate/Researcher 9 /17
☐ Assistant Professor 8 /17

Are you a Texas A&M employee?

☐ Yes 14/17
☐ No 3/17
The Roadmap for a Successful Academic Career Workshop is designed for internal (A&M) and external (non-A&M) post-doctoral researchers and beginning assistant professors in STEM fields. The purpose of these annual workshops is to assist departments in the recruitment and retention of women STEM faculty.

The first Roadmap Workshop took place March 26-28, 2012. Forty-six people applied, all were accepted, and 41 attended. Table 1 describes the attendees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution:</th>
<th>30 TAMU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 TAMU System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 External</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank:</th>
<th>19 Assistant Professors (3 external, 2 system)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 Postdoctoral Researchers (6 external)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College:</th>
<th>Liberal Arts = 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geosciences = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering = 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture = 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity:</th>
<th>Caucasian = 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American/Black = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 or more = 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the end of the Workshop, participants were asked to complete a short survey regarding their satisfaction with the experience. This report presents a formative analysis of those survey responses. The intent of this report is to provide the Roadmap Activity Committee with...
participant feedback that could prove useful when designing the Workshop for spring 2013.

Summary of Findings

Thirty-eight of the 41 attendees completed the survey, and all agreed or strongly agreed that:

1. The Workshop content was useful and relevant
2. The presentation of material was clear and understandable
3. Presenters were well informed on the topics covered
4. Presentations were interesting and enjoyable
5. The Workshop materials were useful, and
6. Overall I was satisfied with the workshop.

As one respondent indicated “This workshop demystified the tenure track application process. I am leaving more confident about pursuing this path, and even if things don't work out, I know I will be just fine.”

There were no systematic differences between post-doctoral researchers and beginning assistant professors with respect to their responses to the above statements. However, internal participants were more likely than external participants to strongly agree that “overall, I was satisfied with the workshop.” Only one of the 10 external respondents strongly agreed with this statement. (The rest agreed, but not strongly). Nearly all (36/38) of the respondents would recommend the Roadmap workshop to a colleague. The one respondent who indicated that she would not recommend the workshop stated “it is extremely useful for women who are already hired here, but again it’s very specific to TAMU…If you don't work here, it is not as helpful.”

When asked what they found most helpful about the Workshop, many respondents cited the opportunity for networking and the discussions about mentoring. When asked what they found least helpful or what they would cut if the Workshop needed to be shorter, many respondents cited the sessions on teaching and negotiations.

There is evidence that some of the departmental meetings were not as effective as they could have been. For example, one respondent noted “The afternoon session with my department was not very well organized. I would have liked to know more in advance that I had to give a talk.” Another noted “the departmental activities were not very interesting and they [sic] not taking us for dinner and others department did, showed not very much interest.” On the other hand, other respondents identified the departmental meetings as one of the strengths of the Workshop.
**Detailed Survey Responses**

This section details the responses to individual survey items. Identifying information (such as any reference to meetings with specific departments) has been suppressed.

**To What Extent Do You Agree or Disagree with the Following Statements?**

- **Workshop content was useful and relevant**
  
- **Presentation of material was clear and understandable**
Presenters were well informed on the topics covered

Presentations were interesting and enjoyable

Workshop materials were useful
Table 2
Exploring Differences in Response Between Internal and External Respondents, and between Assistant Professors and Post-Doctoral Researchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>External Respondents</th>
<th>Internal Respondents</th>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
<th>Post-Doctoral Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop content was useful and relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of material was clear and understandable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenters were well informed on the topics covered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations were interesting and enjoyable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop materials were useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall I was satisfied with the workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you recommend this workshop to a colleague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Shading indicates a paired response that was significantly different at the 5 percent level.
External respondents offered the following responses when asked what they found most helpful about the Workshop

- A good overview on everything needed to be a successful woman in academia. Very important people with lots of experience.
- Ability to network with new women faculty and post docs from a variety of STEM fields
- I found the networking with other junior female faculty and with the people in my discipline at A&M must helpful. I also enjoyed advice on research strategies and writing strategies.
- Information on tenure process and teaching resources for new faculty. Tenure process - annual reviews, importance of teaching, research, and service.
- It was nice dose of reality about tenure-track positions, and the various specific requirements for each college.
- Meeting other women in my position. Hearing tips and best practices about research, teaching & service. Learning about the system at Texas A&M. I really enjoyed the teaching workshop and visiting my department. That was a wonderful opportunity.
- Meeting with the dean of the College. (Got a much clearer picture of the tenuring process)
- Substantively detailed information regarding tenure requirements helped to demystify the process and recommendations for how to be strategic was useful and appreciated. Also, this workshop felt extremely supportive and encouraging and helped me to feel more confident about succeeding in academia.
- Breakout sessions: especially loved the writing workshop & "promotion & tenure expectations" session from 8)30-9:15 (breakout session) Teaching, especially Jean & Ben. Dept visit (Tuesday afternoon)
- Talk with department personnel. Meeting other academic women in sciences

Internal respondents offered the following responses when asked what they found most helpful about the Workshop

- College Discussions on P&T
- College Specific time. Panels of different colleges/levels
- Helped me to better know how the tenure process happens, what to look out for having good dossiers
- I found people's personal stories very useful for normalizing experience. I found the individual department meetings the absolute MOST useful. Knowing what the voting members think about our packets and what is required.
- Individual meeting with department members. It gave me a chance to get more candid feedback compared to what gets communicated in the annual review letter. Also,
meetings with (censored) on specifics of the P&T process. Most point by point information about what is involved in the processing packet.

- Learn information about success in academic career that is not published. Experiences shared by senior professors. Meet female colleagues in similar condition like me. Very well prepared talks.
- It was extremely useful and appreciated. I really took something from all sessions.
- Meeting colleagues for networking. Dr. Reed’s P&T discussion. Dr. Shippen’s lab management discussion
- Meeting with department members, discussion of specific tips or tactics for teaching, research, & service
- Meetings at the department were very useful. I was not much aware about tenure process before, so I also got a lot of new information about it during sessions. I especially liked practical tips that were given by presenters.
- Networking, the writing breakout, time with the departments, information about finding agents mentoring in your lab (was good even though it’s not what I wanted to see)
- Q and A sessions with invited speakers
- Q&A sessions with panelists. Conversations with other women on diff (illegible).
- Research component was most useful because they gave bulleted point + examples for how they succeeded.
- See how newly promoted professor going through this process. Lab Management. Teaching. Tenure Promotion Process
- Simply explaining the tenure and promotion process and dossier and what is expected in research, teaching, and service by a tenure-track professor. Information on service, mentors, mentoring.
- The most helpful things were concrete tips and advice about things that I could do right now. For example, Pat & Barb’s tip that we should make an appointment w/our writing. Or Antonio’s advice A/B how to work up to being on a journal editorial board. Also perspectives when people shared their perspective as a senior person or admin, that was helpful because we could see processes from a different side.
- The part about service work, since I didn't know much about it. Also the other sessions each had useful tips. Mentoring was good too.
- The process was explained in a way to make sure everybody that they can be successful.
- The session(s) on tenure and promotion on first day
- The talks about mentoring, promotion, and tenure- successful stories of tenured-track faculty- meeting with department and college developing collaboration; overall, very satisfied with conference program. Panel discussion kept the information balanced among colleges.
The talks on mentoring and research expectations.

The teaching sessions were great, both because the moderators and because of the contribution of workshop attendees. I liked the information presented in the tenure and promotion package session (especially examples of how to write statements). Also liked the panel discussion w/Joanne Lipton, Courtney Schumacher, Michelle Taylor-Robinson, Bob Webb, and Tifanni Williams. Very good examples to choose

The time in the department to talk about my research, teaching and service statements with senior faculty

The Workshop was very well organized, and it was great to interact with workshop participants and presenters. I like that it covered all these areas of research, teaching and service.

To have relaxed speakers with a sense of humor and a "normal" perspective of life (i.e. appreciation for balanced life, importance of family, outside activities, etc.)

Whenever a facilitator gave specific, actionable advice (i.e., Antonio’s recommendation on how to get on an Ed Board). Hearing the tips/tricks my ADVANCE workshop colleagues had. A reasonable # of breaks & great snacks. Thanks ADVANCE for remembering that we are human beings!

External respondents offered the following responses when asked what they found least helpful about the Workshop

Not addressing enough the kind of issues we might face by being a woman. Too many topics but none of them were discussed with enough depth. So, I would have added one day with a workshop about for example writing either papers or grants.

Maybe find a way to limit to spent on personal stories from participants to balance with experts

Work life balance session, and the irony that this was presented while people wanted to be home with children was not lost on conference attendees.

Sessions on service. Could be much shorter - i.e., 20 minutes. I think the main thing I took away from this session was the types of committees that are useful vs. time sucks. I also was a little disappointed by the teaching session I would have liked more info about direct applicability and tips on time saving

The teaching panel could have been more structured. I would have rather have them walk us through a typical course prop day. (e.g. sample syllabus, sample coursework... large vs. small classes, undergrad vs. grad). The Q/A session was good but we did not get all the info necessary.

For those of us from out of town, or without a job (post-doc), or tenure track at TAMU it wasn’t applicable or helpful because many of the serviced and rules were/are
unavailable at our current situation. Maybe a breakout session of the different professional stages so we can discuss those issues.

- I am in (censored) so some of the more hard science info (lab work management) etc. was not very relevant to me. But it was interesting to hear
- Negotiating mini session - it seemed too rushed and too general
- I am not at a tier 1 research university so more info about d2 or regional/ lib arts colleges would be helpful

Internal respondents offered the following responses when asked what they found least helpful about the Workshop

- The teaching panel
- The break-out sessions on Monday afternoon (Research II) The topics were really helpful great topics but the time for each session was really short. If separate session on these topics can be held, it will be great/useful
- Everything was useful. The teaching section could have focused a little more on the dossiers and what info is needed there.
- The work life balance section/talk, not because it wasn't important or a well given & thoughtful presentation but because the content identified that it's a problem but didn't offer suggestions/potential solutions. I would've appreciated a more candid discussion of the difficulties of balancing the responsibilities of young faculty professionally (i.e. pursuit of tenure) versus their personal life. I think people are afraid of showing that vulnerability.
- I previously took a teaching portfolio seminar and I didn't find the teaching section so useful I think developing a teaching portfolio course, you more time will be needed.
- Session on individual college meetings and general mentoring session was much more helpful. Service section seemed to be very exhaustively discussed. Keep Dr. Auntrieth though. Excellent presenter!
- Discussion of mentoring, advice to find a mentor. I would like to be able to attend power writings and negotiating 101. Power writing was extremely useful-extend.
- The section about negotiations was the least helpful. And I would prefer more sessions on research and less on teaching, thought teaching sessions were also interesting. It just looked like there was not enough time for research topics.
- Meeting with the women in xxx department. - it was depressing and they need to rock the boat
- Negotiation talk. It was too theoretical
- Service component could have been better organized. I would have liked to see more specific examples. I think the same applies for the first part of teaching. It would have been great to hear more ex
• Looking for grants. I wish the speaker has more time to talk about this. He only has 20 minutes
• The negotiating session. I know that women either do not or poorly negotiate their first position so I would like more strategies or information a/b why women struggle with negotiation and how to improve.
• Negotiation
• The presentation for teaching from CTE. This information was too much and too general.
• Project Management Session was a no-show
• All the sessions I have attended have been helpful and allowed me to keep in check with the tenure-track process.
• Service section and departmental
• The break-out session (research ii) was not useful for me. NSF funding was too general and rushed. Mentoring - good, but I need less help in this area). Negotiating 101, VERY POOR, way too theoretical. I wanted it to be much more applied towards negotiation an assistant prof. position.
• I think some of the sessions could have used a little more time; however, this is extremely difficult!! There is so much information that we want to cover and extending the workshop longer would have been difficult. Therefore, this is quite a wordy way to say there was nothing I found least helpful!
• Dr. Taylor-Robinson's discussion of service during the discussion on research. Kevin Cosgriff-Hernandez's breakout session on Negotiating. Dr. Alexander's breakout session on mentors - she'd never had a mentor & I'm not sure she's ever acted as one. She was not very supportive of ideas brought up by my successful peers.

External respondents offered the following responses when asked “if it were necessary to shorten the workshop, which sessions would you cut and why?”

• Teaching was discussed vaguely. I would not eliminate anything, I would add instead. They tried to cover too much in a few days.
• less on service-most if the advice seemed to suggest that this should be time limited
• General sessions; please do shorten the workshop (7:15-7:30 is too long)
• Service Session. Mentoring Session - mentoring is clearly important but as a scholar of mentoring I think it’d be more helpful to give a presentation w/ evidence based advice (there's TONS of research out there, some specific to women & academia) versus a discussion with anecdotes.
• One session on mentoring could have been sufficient. Service session could be half an hour.
• The mentoring session was a bit redundant; many of us have mentors that led us to the program, so emphasis on the portfolios and nitty-gritty is helpful.
• I would shorten some panels, but not cut any. Also there was a lot of overlays for panels, shortening would be ok
• Shorten some of the presentations and convert to "panel" type discussions. Mentoring sessions could be shortened and scope broadened (for example it was never mentioned that we are diverse people, so the type of mentor that we need will be equally diverse in approach to being successful)
• Teaching panel discussion was somewhat unfocused and dominated by a few individuals with concerns and questions that were not broadly applicable. Better would be to have people submit questions on note cards & look for themes and or address questions raised by multiple participants
• Less on specific research- take care of this in mentors?

Internal respondents offered the following responses when asked “if it were necessary to shorten the workshop, which sessions would you cut and why?”

• Don't Cut :)
• All the sessions were integral
• Teaching. I learned a lot from other places such as reading a book or following trending blogs
• The teaching presentation—part 1—see comments above.
• Shorten teaching discussion or perhaps break into individual groups (i.e. small classes, large classes) Delete the college mentoring session
• Shorten teaching philosophy. For me personally, I had this elsewhere (course in grad school)/ The ability to ask questions was much more useful.
• Negotiations- it was too vague, without practical tips and examples. I would also make "service" section shorter or just include it in some other section.
• Shorten the teaching section
• I would cut service to 30 min, and expand on a full session on grant writing (i.e. panel sessions), and expand on writing session. Grant & writing sessions were too short :(
• Teaching. I learned a lot from other places such as reading a book or following trending blogs
• I think that teaching is very important, especially highlighting the teaching resources available at A&M and elsewhere and briefly describing backwards design. But I think this session could be shortened with fewer very specific questions from participants.
• Visiting the department
• I would have shortened the teaching - not because it’s not important but because I needed the least amount of input. Classroom management can be its own conference.
• Even though it was a long program during weekdays, the length of the sessions was adequate.
• I wouldn't shorten anything. In fact I would suggest extending the program longer. Some of the 20 minute break out sessions (i.e. day 1) were too short and I wanted to attend concurrent sessions but actually missed some of this useful information.
• None
• Academic dossiers seemed a little redundant w/promotion and tenure expectations. Maybe combine?
• I cannot think of anything at this point
• The Teaching Session by the Center for Teaching Excellence. I felt like discussion from our peers was more supportive and helpful. CTE seemed to be telling us what we were doing wrong (assuming we hadn't already applied their strategies). I think this is less their intention & more driven by time constraints.

External respondents offered the following responses when asked “if it were possible to lengthen the workshop, what additional sessions would you like to see?”
• Making one of the sessions more in-depth. Some topics that I would have done longer are getting grants, writing workshop, better examples on teaching, I think the teaching session needed to be more interactive in terms of specific examples. The panel needed to take the lead.
• More on how to make yourself competitive in grant getting. More concrete strategies on how to network
• More breakouts; how to mentor grad students; how to chair a diss. Committee
• I think the writing, grant, & lab management sessions could have been longer. I would have liked more info on how to mentor grad students& the external reviewer for tenure
• Maybe have some special breakout sessions for postdocs separate from faculty. Also possibly group local candidates so they can interact w/ one another.
• A breakout session for postdocs, one for non-TAMU faculty, and TAMU faculty on tenure process. Each have very different needs and different experiences thus far.
• Break away sessions for post docs on the job market. I would also like to be able to talk about how to prepare my teaching philosophy etc. to market myself. More diversity in info for people not at Texas A&M
• I think the writing, grant, & lab management sessions could have been longer. I would have liked more info on how to mentor grad students& the external reviewer for tenure
• More discipline specific breakouts for teaching - Teaching portfolios - examples? More on publishing
Internal respondents offered the following responses when asked “if it were possible to lengthen the workshop, what additional sessions would you like to see?”

- Having faculty look at your vitae and give suggestions OR have a session on how to format a dossier
- I would really like if each of the sessions on promotions and tenure expectations, adding session on what to negotiate when u accept a faculty position
- Writing skills will be something I would like to see more of
- Power writing, negotiating, work life balance. I would like a frank discussion of having a family (perhaps confidential) - what that means for your ability to get work done, timing (if possible) etc. More on grant writing, finding funding (perhaps by college)
- I would like to see more sessions about funding, publishing and the last section about promotion and tenure expectations should be longer. It was not enough time for presenter to say all she wanted, and she was very helpful and it is a pity that couple of presenters didn’t do their presentations on the last day.
- If it were lengthened,, please don’t have it in the middle of the semester (or at finals)
- longer breaks
- The work life balance talk needs to be presented as part of the day, because this role conflict influences efforts in research, teaching and service. Also how to integrate life role's not just balance
- Power writing!
- Grant Writing & identify grant
- Could we see actual PowerPoint or print outs of successful and unsuccessful 3yr reviews & tenure packets (this can be made confidential). Maybe also look at CVs and their structure, point out deficiencies in these examples.
- Dual academic careers. Grant writing- more detail on writing, not just funding sources whole section on backward course design w/ specific examples of conceptual teaching/learning.
- How to recruit good students
- Tenure and promotion sessions
- The section on writing would have been nice if it was lengthened (Power Writing). The section on friendly would have been long
- A session on interviewing may be useful? Meeting with faculty is active practice, but getting feedback on our performance would be great
- A session on dealing with difficult life circumstances that impede work; how to bootstrap research career after prolonged absence (due to maternal leave or illness or death in family, etc.)
- Same # of sessions, but spread over more time, giving more breaks. POWER writing should be a plenary session. Barbara & Pat are amazing & everyone should hear what they have to say!

**How knowledgeable are you about the following regarding an academic position?**

There were five possible responses to this panel of questions: extremely knowledgeable; very knowledgeable; knowledgeable; a little knowledgeable; and not at all knowledgeable.

### Getting Letters of Support for Tenure

- **Not at all knowledgeable**: 13%
- **A little knowledgeable**: 45%
- **Knowledgeable**: 29%
- **Very knowledgeable**: 13%

---
Teaching Undergraduate Courses

- Knowledgeable: 42%
- Very: 26%
- Extremely: 16%
- A little: 16%
- Not at all: 3%

Integrating Teaching & Research

- Knowledgeable: 42%
- Extremely: 8%
- Very: 8%
- A little: 39%
- Not at all: 3%
Creating a Teaching Portfolio

- Knowledgeable: 42% (8% Very)
- A little: 37%
- Not at all: 8%

Grant Writing and Development

- Knowledgeable: 26%
- A little: 50%
- Very: 8%
- Extremely: 8%
There were no statistically significant differences between internal and external attendees in response to this panel of questions. The only statistically significant difference between post-doctoral researchers and assistant professors was that assistant professors reported systematically more knowledge than post-doctoral researchers about teaching undergraduates. On average, assistant professors reported more knowledge about teaching undergraduates than about any other topic, whereas post-doctoral researchers reported more knowledge about getting mentors.
How Knowledgeable Are You about the Following Regarding an Academic Position

- Service Activities
- Balancing Work and Non-Work
- Mentoring Graduate Students
- Project management
- Publishing
- Productive Writing Strategies
- Grant Writing and Development
- Creating a Teaching Portfolio
- Integrating Teaching & Research
- Teaching Undergraduate Courses
- Teaching Graduate Courses
- Course Design
- Getting Mentors
- Networking
- Getting Letters of Support for Tenure

All Respondents

- Not at all
- A little
- Knowledgeable
- Very
- Extremely
Other Comments

- Note: On the schedule - make the pickup times from the hotel clear. Also, if the morning schedule (breakfast) were in the same location each day, it would be useful.
- I’m not sure if I would recommend this workshop to a colleague --it depends a lot on the colleague. I think the usefulness of this workshop might vary depending on the needs & knowledge of the person.
- It is extremely useful for women who are already hired here, but again its very specific to TAMU that if you don't work here it not as helpful.
- Very informative and got invaluable information about do's and don'ts for 3rd year review.
- Perhaps add a small session specifically for postdocs. i.e. mock interviews, the faculty position application process, etc.
- This workshop demystified the tenure track application process. I am leaving more confident about pursuing this path, and even if things don't work out, I know I will be just fine.
- Excellent networking opportunities. Very detailed information about tenure and promotion process, building an academic career. Every young faculty should attend and obtain information about it. Very complete program.
- Informative, Inspiring, Encouraging, Seeing successful role models.
- More opportunities to continue relationships began at the workshop- contact list and perhaps the creation of a listserv, linkedin group, etc.
- In my conversations with many of the attendees I realized that it is common for women to feel that they are not liked in their departments, will not be promoted, have damaged self-esteem, and want to leave the academic profession. We need part of the workshop to acknowledge that we are tired and confused, over extended but we are still trying to succeed.
- I would like a section that addresses challenges and strategies to becoming an effective independent researcher as a women and/or minority in STEM fields. For example, how to recruit grad. students, have your research respected while in development (so before you have the publications to prove you are smart and relevant) how to avoid being marginalized in your department and only noticed when diversity and low status tasks need to be done.
- 1) The breakout sessions were most useful to me because they were what I needed to know. The biggest weakness of the workshop was that so much of the content was not relevant to me or repetitive. The breakout sessions never felt that way because they were either tailored to me (i.e. Wed 8:30-9:15 session) or I chose because I wanted to learn more about it (i.e. NIH grants or writing workshop). 2) This was a great chance to stop & think about what it takes to get tenure, to think about long term research
planning, and to get some very valuable tips. 3) Send us emails with important logistical info. It takes too much time to check into e-learning & I didn't even realize there were emails there until late Sunday evening (I was wondering why I wasn't getting any info. so I went looking).

- It may be beneficial for post-docs and new faculty to split up at some pt. so that post-docs can learn about how to apply for a faculty (e.g. how to prepare your teaching and research statement) & new faculty can learn about how to set up their lab (how to make the most of the start-up costs)

- I think it would be a good thing to focus on either keeping it an internal program, or if maintaining an external component include external panel members from other institutions to broaden the perspectives and add context to all ALL of academia and women.

I was so happy to be included and really appreciated the variety of experts who came and the time they gave us. I know these tips will help me for year to come but I would have liked more attention to my needs as a post doc since I am in a position where I need to secure a job. So a session w/teaching philosophy review would be great. o would also have really liked an ice breaker activity at the beginning where we go around and introduce ourselves to everyone. That way we could get a feel for the larger group and their interest and positions. I tried to talk to everyone individually but I missed a lot of people.

- Thank you so much for this opportunity. I am so glad that I attended

- Adding a session on how to just survive as a female (saying "no" to an evening event b/c of family issues)

- Great workshop. Thanks

- I consider this workshop provided me with the opportunity to meet smart and brave women, share experiences. The departmental activities were not very interesting and they not taking us for dinner and others department did, showed not very much interest

- I really enjoyed it and got a lot out of it!

- I am very thankful to all presenters and organizers out to the opportunity to participate in workshop. It is not only useful in terms of getting information about tenure process but also in building new contacts, experience exchange and developing network connections.

- Staying at the Hilton was difficult (not near any stores, and the Hilton didn't have toiletries that might be needed) Stay at a "business" hotel. This has been useful and I appreciate being included, but being at a non R-1 school I felt a little out of place. I did receive a LOT of useful information

- The afternoon session with my department was not very well organized. I would have like to know more in advance that I had to give a talk
• Please see my response to 6a. (I enjoy the conference & would highly recommend this workshop). I think A&M needs to start a listserv for postdocs because I was unfamiliar with all the resources until this workshop and planning committee. BTW, Chris and Linda are amazing individuals and I'M so grateful they allowed me to participate in this experience.
• Thank you so much for giving me this opportunity to hear all the wonderful presentations & discuss with my peers.
• Keep up with the good work! I was very fortunate to have the opportunity to attend this workshop. If possible, offer this workshop during the weekend in order to increase attendance for the in-town faculty and post-doc to all sessions.
• I think this was an excellent overview of the lecture and promotion process. It was an inspiring experience and clarified what to expect in the tenure process.
• Thank you so much for your time, hard work, and dedication to this event!! It was very informative and organized. We never had any questions on what was next. Thanks again
• Facilitators who were fantastic that I hope you will invite again: Courtney Schumacher, Tiffani Williams (!), Barbara Gastel & Pat Goodson, Robin Autenrith, Maria Escobar-Lemmon, Sherry Yennello
• In general, the workshop was somewhat depressing to me as I feel it was mostly trying to teach us how to play by the unwritten rules of a game that tends to disadvantage women. I wish we could actually change the culture and informality and subjectivity of academia!
2013 Faculty Climate Survey: Respondent Demographics

**Overall**
Of the 2,689 faculty members in spring 2013 invited to participate in the Dean of Faculties Faculty Climate survey, 1,222 provided usable responses to the survey (45% response rate). In comparison, there were about 742 usable responses to the 2009 survey from 3,133 faculty members (24% response rate). Participants for both surveys included tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty from the TAMU main campus (non-HSC), Galveston, and Qatar. Note that calculated response rates are minima because some individuals did not choose to answer all questions. For example, the 17 respondents who did not indicate gender could have been male, female or transgendered, so there were at least 789 males, at least 412 females and at least 4 transgendered respondents. Percentiles add to more than 100% due to rounding.

**Demographic Breakdowns**

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Responses (% of 1,222)</th>
<th>Total Faculty (% of 2,689)</th>
<th>Response Rate within Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>789 (66%)</td>
<td>1830 (68%)</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>412 (34%)</td>
<td>859 (32%)</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>4 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>? (?%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>17 (1%)</td>
<td>20 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Responses (% of 1222)</th>
<th>Total Faculty (% of 2,689)</th>
<th>Response Rate within Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>21 (2%)</td>
<td>78 (3%)</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>55 (5%)</td>
<td>355 (13%)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>4 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>9 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a or Hispanic</td>
<td>50 (4%)</td>
<td>159 (6%)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern/Arabic</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>? (?%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial*</td>
<td>23 (2%)</td>
<td>5 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>707 (58%)</td>
<td>2063 (77%)</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>361 (30%)</td>
<td>20 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents who marked two races were classified as multiracial.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title*</th>
<th>Total Responses (% of 1,222)</th>
<th>Total Faculty (% of 2,689)</th>
<th>Response Rate within Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>423 (35%)</td>
<td>961 (36%)</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>289 (24%)</td>
<td>639 (24%)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>186 (15%)</td>
<td>488 (18%)</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non tenure track</td>
<td>277 (23%)</td>
<td>597 (22%)</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., Program Manager)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (0.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>41 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*177 respondents indicated that they are currently in an administrative role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Total Responses (% of 1,222)</th>
<th>Total Faculty (% of 2,689)</th>
<th>Response Rate within Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>711 (58%)</td>
<td>1400 (52%)</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure track</td>
<td>187 (15%)</td>
<td>381 (14%)</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non tenure track</td>
<td>277 (23%)</td>
<td>908 (34%)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>41 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Total Responses (% of 1,222)</th>
<th>Total Faculty (% of 2,689)</th>
<th>Response Rate within Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Leadership/Admin.</td>
<td>4 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>131 (5%)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture / Life Sciences</td>
<td>190 (16%)</td>
<td>330 (12%)</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>46 (4%)</td>
<td>110 (4%)</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush Gov’t Public Service</td>
<td>17 (1%)</td>
<td>51 (2%)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mays Business</td>
<td>57 (5%)</td>
<td>161 (6%)</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>80 (7%)</td>
<td>208 (8%)</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Look Engineering</td>
<td>183 (15%)</td>
<td>420 (16%)</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>42 (3%)</td>
<td>97 (4%)</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>230 (19%)</td>
<td>439 (16%)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>122 (10%)</td>
<td>340 (13%)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Med / Biomed</td>
<td>63 (5%)</td>
<td>235 (9%)</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M Galveston+</td>
<td>75 (6%)</td>
<td>16 (5%)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>55 (5%)</td>
<td>72 (3%)</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M Qatar</td>
<td>16 (1%)</td>
<td>78 (3%)</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>42 (3%)</td>
<td>1(&lt;1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Dean of Faculties records, there are 144 faculty in Galveston; however, the bulk e-mail with the survey link was only sent to 16 of these faculty. The survey link was not linked to individual responders and was included President Loftin’s “Campus news and updates” e-mail dated February 27, 2013.
2013 Campus Climate Survey: Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions

Executive Summary
The 2013 Campus Climate survey was conducted from February 19th through March 19th, 2013. The survey was designed to accomplish multiple goals, but its primary purposes were (a) to monitor the extent to which faculty members are satisfied with their working environment; (b) enhance our understanding of the climate, both departmental and institutional, in which faculty work; and (c) to evaluate the changes over time, if any, in the climate within departments, within colleges, and across the University. Differences in satisfaction and climate with respect to gender, race/ethnicity, rank, and college have been analyzed. The purpose of this section of the report is to present results obtained from the portion of the survey that focused on satisfaction and turnover intentions.

A total of 1,222 of 2,689 faculty responded to the 2013 climate survey. This 44% response rate was sharply higher than the 24% response rate for the 2009 survey (742 of 3,133) or the 30% response rate for the 2006 survey (820 of 2,718). The pattern of responses to the 2013 climate survey was generally representative, but there are two areas of possible concern. First, non-tenure-track faculty members appear to be under-represented in the survey responses. The response rates for tenured and tenure track faculty each exceeded 50%, whereas the response rate for non-tenure-track faculty was no higher than 35%. Second, there appears to have been an unusually low response rate for Asian faculty members. Only 5% of the respondents identified themselves as Asian, even though 13% of the faculty members are identified as Asian in Texas A&M’s administrative records. Although it is possible that Asian faculty were systematically less likely than other faculty groups to identify their race/ethnicity and not systematically less likely to respond to the survey, the calculated response rate for Asian faculty members was only 15%. No other EEOC group had a calculated response rate below 27%. More detail about response rates by gender, race and ethnicity, title, tenure status, and college can be found in the section of the report on respondent demographics.

The following are key points that were extracted from the analysis of responses to the satisfaction section of the survey:

- General satisfaction is weaker than it was in 2009, when it was characterized as moderate.
- Female faculty members report systematically lower levels of job satisfaction than do male faculty members. This pattern persists even after controlling for differences in rank and college.
- Despite the differences in job satisfaction, there are no systematic differences in turnover intentions between male and female faculty.
- Satisfaction has generally declined for non-Hispanic white faculty, while is has remained unchanged for non-white faculty.
- As a general rule, satisfaction has declined more for tenured faculty than for other faculty ranks.
- There are statistically significant differences in satisfaction within colleges between male and female faculty members once differences in faculty rank are taken into account. In all such cases, female faculty report lower satisfaction than male faculty.
Indicators of General Satisfaction

The figures below show responses to the five indicated items that address job satisfaction, colleague recommendations and turnover intentions. Taken together, these five items can be interpreted as an indicator of general satisfaction with working at Texas A&M.

As the figures illustrate, the share of survey respondents reporting low levels of satisfaction increased between the 2009 and 2013 surveys. On four of the five indicators, satisfaction was significantly lower in 2013 than it was in 2009.\textsuperscript{1} Satisfaction was also lower on the fifth question “I often think about quitting this job,” but the difference between surveys was only statistically significant at the 10-percent level.

\textsuperscript{1} Statistical significance was determined using ordered probit regression and a 5-percent standard for significance.
I often think about quitting this job

- **Strongly disagree**
- **Disagree**
- **Neither agree nor disagree**
- **Agree**
- **Strongly Agree**

I am actively looking for another job

- **Strongly disagree**
- **Disagree**
- **Neither agree nor disagree**
- **Agree**
- **Strongly Agree**

I will probably look for a new job during the next year

- **Strongly disagree**
- **Disagree**
- **Neither agree nor disagree**
- **Agree**
- **Strongly Agree**
Detailed Scales from the Satisfaction Portion of the Survey

Further insight can be gleaned by exploiting additional questions about satisfaction from the survey. Given the large number of possible questions, however, it is not especially fruitful to examine responses to individual questions. Instead, responses to individual questions can be clustered into a set of satisfaction scales, and those scales can be used for further analysis.

Table 1 shows the items used in various satisfaction and turnover intention scales constructed from the survey. To facilitate comparisons across time, these scales were constructing using only questions that were asked on both the 2009 and the 2013 surveys. A scale score was calculated as the mean of the items in the scale. Items were reverse coded as needed to make all items on the same scale in the same direction (i.e., all high scores indicating more positive feeling/experience or all high scores indicating more negative feeling/experience). Missing items were ignored; a scale score was calculated for any respondent who answered at least one item on the scale. All of the scales were validated using factor analysis and found to reasonably summarize the responses to the component questions. Note that the wording on the Productivity Perception indicators differs somewhat between 2009 and 2013, and there was a wider range of possible responses to those questions in 2013. Therefore, comparisons with 2009 were not possible for this scale. Similarly, the response options differed for the Feeling Valued indicators, so comparisons are also not possible for that scale.

Table 1. Description of the Items Used in the 2009 and 2013 Campus Climate Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Faculty Satisfaction</td>
<td>All things considered, I am satisfied with my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague Recommendation</td>
<td>I would recommend employment at Texas A&amp;M to a colleague.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>I often think about quitting this job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am actively looking for another job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will probably look for a new job during the next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>I always find new and interesting aspects in my work. [reverse-coded]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can stand the pressure of my work well (reverse coded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lately, I tend to think less during my work and just execute it mechanically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During my work, I often feel emotionally drained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes I feel really disgusted with my work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After work, I usually feel worn out and weary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Satisfaction</td>
<td>Opportunity to collaborate with other faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of social interaction with members of my unit/department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of funding for my research or creative efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current salary in comparison to the salaries of my TAMU colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to attract students to work with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of intellectual stimulation in my day-to-day contacts with faculty colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing to theoretical developments in my discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance between professional and personal life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree to which community and/or state service is recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree to which my professional developments have been recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Valued</td>
<td>Being valued as a teacher by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being valued as a mentor by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being valued as an advisor by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being valued for my teaching by members of my unit/department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being valued for my research, scholarship, or creativity by members of my unit/department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being valued for my social and/or cultural identity membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being valued for my disciplinary expertise and/or contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity Perceptions</td>
<td>How would YOU rate your overall level of productivity compared to researchers at your rank in your area/discipline at other Tier 1 Research universities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do you think your colleagues in your department view your productivity compared to researchers at your rank in your area/discipline at other Tier 1 Research universities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>In most ways my life is close to my ideal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The conditions of my life are excellent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am satisfied with my life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of the Scales**

Table 2 provides a summary of the averages of the responses on the different scales for 2013. There are also comparisons by gender, race/ethnicity, title, and tenure status. Because White was by far the largest race/ethnicity category, in addition to tabulating by race/ethnicity, there is also a comparison between White and the rest of the categories for race and ethnicity, as this might show general trends of difference in experience between respondents in the largest group versus those in minority groups. Shading indicates that significant differences were detected among the demographic groups.

Following the table, the remaining sections of the report graphically present scale averages for 2009 and 2013, with comparisons by sex, race and ethnicity, title, and tenure status. Throughout the analysis of the scales, statistical significance was determined using OLS regression and a 5-percent standard.
Table 2. Summary of Average Response across the Scales, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Faculty Satisfaction</th>
<th>Colleague Recommendations</th>
<th>Turnover Intentions</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Career Satisfaction</th>
<th>Feeling Valued</th>
<th>Productivity Perceptions</th>
<th>Life Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenure track</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non tenure track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure track</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shading indicates that differences within the category are statistically significant at the 5 percent level.
Overall Faculty Satisfaction
All things considered, I am satisfied with my job (average score).

- On average, overall faculty satisfaction is significantly lower in 2013 than in 2009. It is lower for both male and female faculty.
- Satisfaction remains significantly lower for female faculty than for male faculty.
- Average satisfaction has increased for African American and multiracial faculty, on average, but those groups had unusually low satisfaction in 2009 and the number of faculty surveyed is low in both years, so the change is not statistically reliable.
- Average satisfaction has declined significantly for non-Hispanic white faculty
- In 2013, there is no significant difference among racial/ethnic groups on this indicator.
- Satisfaction is significantly lower for tenured associate professors and full professors than for assistant professors and non-tenured faculty
- The decline in satisfaction is attributable to tenured faculty and administrators. Satisfaction remains essentially unchanged for tenure-track assistant professors and non-tenured, non-administrative faculty.
Colleague Recommendation
I would recommend employment at Texas A&M to a colleague (average score)

- On average, the share of faculty who would recommend TAMU to a friend is significantly lower in 2013 than in 2009. It is lower for both male and female faculty.
- There is no significant difference between male and female faculty on this indicator in 2013.
- There is no statistically reliable difference among racial/ethnic groups on this indicator in 2013.
- The average score for this indicator has declined significantly for White faculty.
- This indicator has fallen significantly for all faculty ranks except non-tenured, non-administrative faculty.
- Tenured faculty members are significantly less likely than other faculty types to report that they would recommend employment at Texas A&M to a colleague.
- On average, turnover intentions are significantly higher in 2013 than in 2009. They are significantly higher in 2013 for male faculty, but not for female faculty.
- There is no significant difference between male and female faculty on this indicator in 2013.
- In 2013, turnover intentions are significantly higher for African-American faculty than for other racial/ethnic groups.
- Turnover intentions have generally increased, but the change is not statistically significant for any specific racial/ethnic group.
- Turnover intentions are highest among assistant and associate professors.
- The only groups where turnover intentions are significantly higher are tenured associate and full professors.
The scale measuring Faculty Burnout did not change significantly between 2009 and 2013, for either male or female faculty.

On average, female faculty scored significantly higher on the Burnout scale than did male faculty in 2013.

There are no statistically reliable differences across racial/ethnic groups with respect to this indicator.

Faculty Burnout has fallen for non-white faculty, while it remains unchanged for non-Hispanic white faculty.

Non-tenured non-administrative faculty members report the lowest incidence of Burnout, whereas tenured associate professors report the highest incidence. Differences between those two groups are statistically significant.

The Faculty Burnout scale is significantly lower for non-tenure-track, non-administrators in 2013 than in 2009. However, there has been considerable volatility within this group since 2009, and the difference may largely reflect the changing composition of non-tenure-track faculty.
On average, Career Satisfaction is lower in 2013 than in 2009. It is significantly lower for both male and female faculty.

In 2013, female faculty report significantly lower levels of Career Satisfaction than do male faculty, on average.

Differences in this indicator, although relatively modest, are statistically significant across racial/ethnic groups.

Career Satisfaction has fallen significantly for Asian and non-Hispanic white faculty. Changes for other racial/ethnic groups are not statistically reliable.

Administrators have significantly higher Career Satisfaction than other faculty in 2013.

Career Satisfaction has declined for all ranks, but the change is only significant for administrators and tenured faculty.
Due to changes in the survey responses that were designed to make this indicator more reliable going forward, it is not possible to make reliable comparisons between the responses on the 2009 and 2013 surveys.

In 2013, female faculty report significantly lower levels of Feeling Valued than do male faculty, on average.

There are no systematic differences by race/ethnic group with respect to this indicator.

Administrators are more likely to report that they feel valued than other ranks.
Productivity Perceptions
Average of the items shown in Table 1

- Due to changes in the survey questions and response options that were designed to make this indicator more reliable going forward, it is not possible to make reliable comparisons between the responses on the 2009 and 2013 surveys.
- In 2013, female faculty report significantly lower levels of Productivity Perceptions than do male faculty, on average.
- There are no systematic differences by race/ethnic group with respect to this indicator.
- Tenure-track assistant and tenured associate professors report the lowest levels of perceived productivity.
### Life Satisfaction

Average of the items shown in Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race unknown</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenured</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure track</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- On average, the Life Satisfaction scale is lower in 2013 than in 2009. It is significantly lower for male faculty, but not for female faculty.
- In 2013, female faculty report significantly lower levels of Life Satisfaction than do male faculty, on average.
- There are no systematic differences by race/ethnic group with respect to this indicator.
- Life Satisfaction has fallen significantly for non-Hispanic white faculty. Changes over time for other racial/ethnic groups are not statistically significant.
- Tenured associate professors report the lowest levels of Life Satisfaction among the faculty ranks.
- Life Satisfaction has declined more for tenured faculty than for other faculty ranks.
### Table 3. Summary of Average Response across the Scales, by College, STEM and Sex, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Overall Faculty Satisfaction</th>
<th>Colleague Recommend.</th>
<th>Turnover Intentions</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bush School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COALS (non-STEM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COALS (STEM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Architecture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Education &amp; Human Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Geosciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Liberal Arts (non-STEM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Liberal Arts (STEM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Veterinary Medicine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dwight Look College of Engineering</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mays Business School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texas A&amp;M University – Galveston</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texas A&amp;M University – Qatar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Career Satisfaction</th>
<th>Feeling Valued</th>
<th>Productivity Perceptions</th>
<th>Life Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush School</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COALS (non-STEM)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COALS (STEM)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Architecture</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Geosciences</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts (non-STEM)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts (STEM)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Look College of Engineering</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mays Business School</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University – Galveston</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University – Qatar</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Shading indicates significant differences by sex within the College, after controlling for differences in faculty rank.

- As Table 3 illustrates, there are statistically significant differences in satisfaction within college between male and female faculty members once differences in faculty rank are taken into account.
- In all such cases, female faculty report lower satisfaction than male faculty.
- Note that differences by sex for Texas A&M University – Qatar could not be reported because there was only one female respondent from that College.