NDSU FORWARD

🟢 Climate   🟢 Recruitment   🟢 Retention   🟢 Advancement   🟢 Leadership

FORWARD Meeting Agenda –
Friday October 29, 2010, 11:30AM, Peace Garden, MU.

CSWF – Christina
- Childbearing Leave
- Modified Duties

Other Policy Work
- Senate Adhoc committee on Spousal and Partner Hiring
- SROI Revisions

Mid Career Mentoring Program – Charlene
- Promotion to Professor Luncheon Evaluation – **Attachment 1**
- November 18, Leadership Panel/Luncheon

Allies Program – Tom
- October 1 training with dept chairs
- Evaluation **– Attachment 2**
- Upcoming training: November 30 (for Science and Math faculty)

JoAnn Moody Evaluations – **Attachment 3**

Graduate Committee Composition Study –**Attachment 4**

Administrator Survey – **Attachment 5**

Work Life Survey – **Attachment 6**
- Gender differences mini report
- College Reports

Junior Faculty Mentoring Program – Wendy
- Writing seminar
- Mentor social with administrators

Grant Programs
- Reviewers

External Evaluator Visit – November 17-19

EAB Visit - Tuesday November 30

Faculty Recruitment and Hiring – Angela

FORWARD Office – Julie

Other Items?

Next FORWARD Meeting:
November 19 (Peace Garden) 11:30 – 1:00

Promotion to Professor: Perspectives of Department Chairs
October 12th, 2010

Attendance

Forty-eight individuals attended and 34 completed evaluations.

- Thirty-two individuals identified as faculty and two identified as administrators.

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

I feel that my understanding of the process and criteria for promotion to full professor has improved after today's panel

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	3	8.8	8.8
	Agree	24	70.6	79.4
	Strongly Agree	7	20.6	100.0
	Total	34	100.0	

I feel I have acquired new skills and/or information about determining when I am ready to apply for promotion to full professor at NDSU

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	2.9	3.0
	Disagree	7	20.6	24.2
	Agree	18	52.9	78.8
	Strongly Agree	7	20.6	100.0
	Missing Data	1	2.9	
	Total	34	100.0	

I will be able to implement new strategies and knowledge as a result of my participation in this session

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	6	17.6	17.6
	Agree	21	61.8	79.4
	Strongly Agree	7	20.6	100.0
	Total	34	100.0	

I would recommend this panel discussion to others

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	26	76.5	76.5
	Strongly Agree	8	23.5	100.0
	Total	34	100.0	

Rate the overall quality of this session

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Average	15	44.1	44.1
	3.50	2	5.9	50.0
	Above Average	10	29.4	79.4
	Excellent	7	20.6	100.0
	Total	34	100.0	

Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form

1. What questions do you still have after attending this session? Please list any topics related to the promotion process from associate to full professor that you would like to receive additional information about or items that need further clarification.
   - I did not learn anything new, just reinforced information I knew.
   - The importance of being a team player vis a vis scholarship.

- Annual reviews post tenure: do all departments actually do them? 352 yes—practice??
- What are the most common items for promotion that are taken for granted and become stumbling blocks?
- Where will the bar be if and when I go up?
- Should an associate professor serve as department chair or assistant dean if they want to fast track to full professor?
- Sabbaticals—are they encouraged in any disciplines? If so, how do we make that a part of our programs when we prepare to go up.?
- Still not clear about when one is ready. Is there a penalty (although not written) if ail at first attempt at promotion?
- What are the consequences if one is denied promotion? That is, does it "poison the well" for a future application?
- Why become a full professor?
- Is there a minimum number of years a faculty member must spend at associate level before going up either officially or unofficially?
- I would appreciate specific citations for relevant information.
- How do you translate what was said to personal action plan?

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the session you attended today?
   - The criteria for promotion to full professor.
   - Thank you. I thought that the selection of speakers was excellent.
   - Will's comment at the end that you don't have to give up your life. At the session he mentioned many of us come away very depressed ("give up your life - hire help") It is easier, however, for men to maintain that balance?!?!
   - Good to hear what administrators think/have experienced related to evaluation and readiness. Will's comment about the importance of scholarship and that it is hard work gave a nice perspective. Virginia commented on the importance of having people who will be truthful about where you are at – even if it's not positive.
   - Not all standards are the same.
   - Honesty. Honesty about difference among our colleges etc.
   - Hearing different perspectives.
   - In general the information exchange was good.
   - I actually found myself sitting here and thinking strategically about the profile I've built thus far. It allowed me a moment to reflect strategically on how to finish the case in the next few years.
   - Candid answers.
   - Panelists were honest and there was a diversity of disciplines.
   - I liked the panel discussion format and using questions and answers.
   - Diverse panel.

3. How could the session be improved to be more beneficial to you?
   - Perhaps more interaction with faculty.
   - I wish we had an outlet for "coaches" or someone who is not involved in NDSU to evaluate our packages & help us "plan" for the future.
   - Outside NDSU people on the board/panel.
   - Allow more time for questions; perhaps organize one forum with the provost.
   - Include a recently-promoted professor on the panel.
   - Perhaps work tables with our particular deans, chairs and/or college committees.
   - Examples of successful cases—recent ones especially.
   - Given that much of this is discipline-specific, it would have been nice to have more (mine?) disciplines represented.
   - It was cold in the room.

4. Please provide any additional comments you have about today's panel discussion and/or the FORWARD program in general below or on the back of this page.
   - Excellent panel! Very helpful information.
   - I'm glad to know there will be further sessions.
   - Thank you for "tackling" a difficult topic.

Ally Training
October 13th, 2010

Attendance

Twenty-four individuals attended and 11 completed evaluations.

- Two individuals reported being faculty members and 9 reported being administrators.
- Of those who completed an evaluation, 5 reported they were encouraged to attend by the Provost, 2 by a colleague, one by a Dean, and two reported that they encouraged themselves to attend.

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

I will be able to use the information that I learned today in my work at NDSU

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	9.1	9.1
	Agree	8	72.7	81.8
	Strongly Agree	2	18.2	100.0
	Total	11	100.0	

I feel that my knowledge of unconscious gender bias and its impact on our climate at NDSU has increased after today's training

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	18.2	18.2
	Agree	5	45.5	63.6
	Strongly Agree	4	36.4	100.0
	Total	11	100.0	

I will be able to implement new strategies to promote a more equitable climate for woman faculty at NDSU as a result of my participation in this training

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	9.1	10.0
	Agree	8	72.7	90.0
	Strongly Agree	1	9.1	100.0
	Missing Data	1	9.1	
	Total	11	100.0	

The training was clear and well-organized

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	7	63.6	63.6
	Strongly Agree	4	36.4	100.0
	Total	11	100.0	

I would recommend this training to others

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	9.1	9.1
	Agree	5	45.5	54.5
	Strongly Agree	5	45.5	100.0
	Total	11	100.0	

Rate the overall quality

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Average	4	36.4	36.4
	Above Average	7	63.6	100.0
	Total	11	100.0	

<u>Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form</u>
1. What questions do you still have about being an ally for gender equity after attending this training? Please list any areas of the training that you would like to receive additional information about or that need further clarification.
    - Why was this a males only meeting today? Doesn't this totally negate everything that they said today about inclusion?
    - Good as is.
    - Finish the maternity policy. Add 1-2 extra candidates (women) to the list of finalists. Spousal Hire. Clarify for policy. <u>More</u> childcare with free parking for visits, visiting therapists, etc.
    - How do you change an implicit bias?
    - Why does NDSU never bring in high powered women <u>with tenure</u> to non-administrative positions? We will have to wait for a very long time for assistant professors (untenured) to emerge as leaders at the university. Bring in outside women at associate or full.

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the training you attended today?
    - How privilege affects attitudes.
    - Information on male privilege.
    - Individual action list.
    - Carlson was methodical and patient in walking us through the purposes and proposals. Some good material on implicit bias.
    - Hearing the experiences of others.

3. How could this training be improved to be more beneficial to you?
    - More discussion concerning specific actions to address the problem of implicit biases.
    - Good as is.
    - More info on strategies to change implicit bias.
    - We need less training and more action; provide the money to hire more women and allow women to come in as associate and full with tenure.

4. Please provide any additional comments you have about today's training and/or the FORWARD program in general on the back of this page.
    - Upper-upper administration is an old boys club. The only woman is the person tasked with attracting underrepresented groups. Incoming female faculty can see that men run this outfit. Women are in charge at Home Ec and diversity.

Dr. JoAnn Moody
Good and Bad Departmental Practices: Job Searches and Tenure Review Processes
A Workshop for Department Chairs/Heads
September 21st, 2010

Attendance

Thirty-seven individuals attended and 31 completed evaluations.

- Four individuals reported being faculty members and 24 reported being administrators, two reported being "other." One did not report their role at NDSU.

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

I will be able to use the information that I learned today in my work at NDSU

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	9.7	9.7
	Disagree	2	6.5	16.1
	Agree	11	35.5	51.6
	Strongly Agree	15	48.4	100.0
	Total	31	100.0	

I feel I have acquired new skills, information or understanding about good departmental practices related to hiring new faculty

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	9.7	9.7
	Disagree	3	9.7	19.4
	Agree	15	48.4	67.7
	Strongly Agree	10	32.3	100.0
	Total	31	100.0	

I will be able to implement new strategies or knowledge as a result of my participation in this workshop

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	4	12.9	13.3
	Agree	20	64.5	80.0
	Strongly Agree	6	19.4	100.0
	Missing Data	1	3.2	
	Total	31	100.0	

I feel that my knowledge of how to improve the tenure review process has increased after today's workshop

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	6.5	8.0
	Disagree	8	25.8	40.0
	Agree'	9	29.0	76.0
	Strongly Agree	6	19.4	100.0
	Missing Data	6	19.4	
	Total	31	100.0	

I would recommend this workshop to others

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	3.2	3.3
	Disagree	3	9.7	13.3
	Agree	13	41.9	56.7
	Strongly Agree	13	41.9	100.0
	Missing Data	1	3.2	
	Total	31	100.0	

How would you rate the overall quality of this workshop?

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Average	9	29.0	32.1
	3.50	1	3.2	35.7
	Above Average	14	45.2	85.7
	Excellent	4	12.9	100.0
	Missing Data	3	9.7	
	Total	31	100.0	

Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form
1. What questions do you still have after attending this workshop? Please list any areas that you would like to receive additional information about or that need further clarification.
   - Additional mentoring for new chairs.
   - Dealing with dysfunctional senior (tenured) faculty.
   - Other issues chairs might deal with.
   - Chair training, chair support, keep letting chairs talk to each other; not at them.
   - Want to hear from minority faculty about how they succeeded.
   - What makes a good mentor—how to match mentor with person, training for mentors, how is the role figured into workload.
   - Assumptions linked with academic credentials, pedigree annoyance.
   - Needs more work in transferring the context from 'a search process' to the other areas.

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the workshop you attended today?
   - The scenario discussion- brought to light a number of things to avoid.
   - Cognitive errors.
   - Group interaction.
   - Examples of strategies.
   - Discussed realistic scenarios.
   - Hearing how other chairs/heads have handled somewhat similar situations length of time for the meeting was good.
   - Hearing from other chairs.
   - Using the search committee as new faculty mentors is a great idea.
   - Great discussion at our table.
   - Don't be negative with new hire.
   - Meeting other chairs.
   - Checklists very good.
   - Discussions at table.
   - Good examples and discussion/great case "studies."
   - Learning about cognitive errors, learning about problems of 'solo' faculty members.
   - The 2nd half.

3. How could this workshop be improved to be more beneficial to you?
   - More time on the last couple of handouts.
   - Should be given to search committee chairs not only to Department chairs/heads.
   - More of them.
   - Less tiring.
   - Should be done every year!
   - I think it was fine as is.
   - Scenario used was same as for mentors—wish it'd been different.
   - Title said job searches + tenure review, but scenario didn't deal with these issues.
   - Scenario went a little long. Additional materials a little rushed.
   - Talking while we're reading is distracting.
   - Actually we get a bit jaded from so many workshops.
   - Use of a wide range of case studies.
   - Smaller groups- run the workshop- more interactions- more sharing of experiences.
   - Have scenarios with less issues so a deeper discussion could take place.
   - 90 minutes instead of 120, please.
   - Summary compiled.
   - A more focused session on the tenure review process could be added—this was missing!
   - The second half was far more informative than the round-table discussion at the beginning.

4. Please provide any additional comments you have about today's workshop and/or the FORWARD program in general below or on the back of this page.
   - I have been an interim chair/chair for over 10 years so have seen/dealt with nearly every personnel/hiring issue imaginable.
   - Too much covered in time. Not enough detail.
   - Might want to consider some departments are overloaded with women—not men.
   - Good jobs.
   - J. Moody is great!
   - Well done!
   - Please bring more of these to NDSU. Thank you!

Dr. JoAnn Moody
A Workshop for the FORWARD Advocates
September 21st, 2010

<u>Attendance</u>
      Nine individuals attended and eight completed evaluations.

<u>Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form</u>

I will be able to use the information that I learned today in my work at NDSU

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	12.5	12.5
	Disagree	1	12.5	25.0
	Agree	3	37.5	62.5
	Strongly Agree	3	37.5	100.0
	Total	8	100.0	

I feel I have acquired new skills, information or understanding about how to broaden and deepen NDSU's commitment to gender diversity.

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	12.5	12.5
	Disagree	1	12.5	25.0
	Agree	4	50.0	75.0
	Strongly Agree	2	25.0	100.0
	Total	8	100.0	

I will be able to implement new strategies and knowledge as a result of my participation in this workshop

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	12.5	12.5
	Disagree	1	12.5	25.0
	Agree	2	25.0	50.0
	Strongly Agree	4	50.0	100.0
	Total	8	100.0	

I feel that my knowledge of how to handle lines of resistance has increased after today's workshop.

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	12.5	12.5
	Disagree	1	12.5	25.0
	Agree	4	50.0	75.0
	Strongly Agree	2	25.0	100.0
	Total	8	100.0	

I would recommend this workshop to other male faculty members

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	12.5	12.5
	Disagree	1	12.5	25.0
	Agree	4	50.0	75.0
	Strongly Agree	2	25.0	100.0
	Total	8	100.0	

How would you rate the overall quality of this workshop?

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	1	12.5	12.5
	Average	1	12.5	25.0
	Above Average	6	75.0	100.0
	Total	8	100.0	

Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form
1. What questions do you still have after attending this workshop? Please list any areas that you would like to receive additional information about or that need further clarification.
   - What are our next steps.
   - Continuing discussions of push-back will be useful. Continuing discussions/efforts on writing scenarios.
   - Still need to work on our workshops.
   - How to develop scenarios.
   - I would have liked more time to work on developing scenarios that fit our needs at NDSU.

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the workshop you attended today?
   - Good specific ideas + strategies (and examples) to think about + discuss.
   - Advice on what works and why.
   - Push-back discussion -> specific ideas.
   - A couple of insightful ideas—welcome faculty in the classroom, focusing on non-immigrant minorities.
   - The good & bad practices activity needed more discussion around this type of tool.
   - Dr. Moody was very down to earth and knowledgeable. Discussing lines of resistance was helpful.
   - Some good discussion from participants

3. How could this workshop be improved to be more beneficial to you?
   - More time; it'd be much useful if we'd continue & finish discussing the "typical line."
   - I wish we had spent more time on scenario construction.
   - We should have prepped Dr. Moody more. One suggestion we got from Chesler was to be more pro-active in planning our sessions. We should have focused on one of our core issues—developing good workshops.
   - Less interactions regarding the typical lines of resistance. Incorporate those into best practices.
   - More focus on our unique needs as a group
   - I think Dr. Moody underestimated the experience/knowledge/level of this group.

Dr. JoAnn Moody
Department Climate/Gender Diversity Workshop:
A Workshop for the Department of Biological Sciences
September 21st, 2010

Attendance
>   Fourteen individuals attended and ten completed evaluations.
> - Nine identified as faculty members and one identified as an administrator

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

I will be able to use the information that I learned today in my work at NDSU

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	5	50.0	50.0
	Strongly Agree	5	50.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	

I feel I have acquired new skills, information or understanding about different department cultures.

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	7	70.0	70.0
	Strongly Agree	3	30.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	

I will be able to implement new strategies or knowledge as a result of my participation in this workshop

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	9	90.0	90.0
	Strongly Agree	1	10.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	

I would recommend this workshop to other departments

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	3	30.0	30.0
	Strongly Agree	7	70.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	

How would you rate the overall quality of this workshop?

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Average	3	30.0	30.0
	Above Average	4	40.0	70.0
	Excellent	3	30.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	

Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form
1. What questions do you still have after attending this workshop? Please list any areas that you would like to receive additional information about or that need further clarification.
    - What should we expect from others in our department after our group of female tenure-track hires has grown to greater than critical mass?
    - I am new here. There were many things that were alluded to that I would like to/need to know more about. Hopefully this workshop will help that happen.

- Would like to learn more about the "checklists" for helping new hires and about the training of mentors.
- Checklists should be available to departments as REQUIRED reading.
- How to affect change across campus in other not so 'happy' departments?
- How to get away from SROIS and use better metrics of teaching.
- Mentoring checklist.

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the workshop you attended today?
   - Issues related to developing memos/questions/points to start mentorship or conversations re: progress.
   - Hearing tenured members talk.
   - Dr. Moody made it very evident that we need to do more formal support for new hires. I think that hearing this from an outside expert will be very helpful.
   - Group discussion!
   - Hearing about what goes on in the years leading up to tenure.
   - Nothing particular, just the overall discussion.
   - Develop checklists and formalize mentoring.

3. How could this workshop be improved to be more beneficial to you?
   - Excellent discussion.
   - Can't think of anything in particular, it was great.
   - Perhaps distribute scenarios prior to meeting.

4. Please provide any additional comments you have about today's workshop and/or the FORWARD program in general below or on the back of this page.
   - Thanks!
   - Give this type of program to department of Chemistry/Biochem.
   - Thank you for having our department here!

Dr. JoAnn Moody
A Workshop for Academic Deans
September 21st, 2010

Attendance

      Twelve individuals attended and ten completed evaluations.

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

I will be able to use the information that I learned today in my work at NDSU

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	1	10.0	10.0
	Strongly Agree	9	90.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	

I feel I have acquired new skills, information or understanding about how to retain junior faculty

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	5	50.0	50.0
	Strongly Agree	5	50.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	

I will be able to implement new strategies or knowledge as a result of my participation in this workshop

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	7	70.0	70.0
	Strongly Agree	3	30.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	

I feel that my knowledge of how to handle "lines of resistance" has increased after today's workshop.

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	10.0	11.1
	Agree	3	30.0	44.4
	Strongly Agree	5	50.0	100.0
	Total	9	90.0	
	Missing Data	1	10.0	
	Total	10	100.0	

How would you rate the overall quality of this workshop?

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Average	1	10.0	10.0
	Above Average	4	40.0	50.0
	4.50	1	10.0	60.0
	Excellent	4	40.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	

<u>Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form</u>

1. What questions do you still have after attending this workshop? Please list any areas that you would like to receive additional information about or that need further clarification.
    - Can chairs & search committees receive training on these issues?
    - How do deans know when intervention strategies are needed? How do they get the true information?
    - Specific follow strategies = new ideas.
    - Informal presentation allowed people to be relaxed + open to the information.

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the workshop you attended today?
    - Checklists.
    - Ideas on areas to watch; discussion topics for chairs and faculty.
    - Discussion and examples.
    - Handouts/other references/services.
    - Some specific "tips" (i.e., the checklist).

3. How could this workshop be improved to be more beneficial to you?
    - More time for discussion.
    - Longer time with other case presentations.
    - Should have been longer—allow more discussion.
    - Earlier in the day.
    - More tips! Short lists are important, too.

4. Please provide any additional comments you have about today's workshop and/or the FORWARD program in general below or on the back of this page.
    - Very good.

Dr. JoAnn Moody
Mentoring Students: Good and Bad Practices
September 21st, 2010

Attendance

146 individuals attended and 121 completed evaluations.

- Five individuals reported being staff members, 100 individuals reported being faculty, 9 individuals reported they were administrators, 4 reported they were "other," and 4 did not report their role at NDSU

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

I will be able to use the information that I learned today in my work at NDSU

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	3.3	3.3
	Disagree	13	10.7	14.2
	2.50	1	.8	15.0
	Agree	65	53.3	69.2
	Strongly Agree	37	30.3	100.0
	Missing Data	2	1.6	
Total		122	100.0	

I feel I have acquired new skills, information, or understanding about mentoring students.

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	6	4.9	5.0
	Disagree	17	13.9	19.0
	2.50	1	.8	19.8
	Agree	74	60.7	81.0
	Strongly Agree	23	18.9	100.0
	Missing Data	1	.8	
Total		122	100.0	

I will be able to implement new strategies and knowledge as a result of my participation in this lecture.

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	6	4.9	5.0
	Disagree	18	14.8	20.2
	Agree	73	59.8	81.5
	Strongly Agree	22	18.0	100.0
	Missing Data	3	2.5	
Total		122	100.0	

I would recommend this lecture series to others

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	3.3	3.4
	Disagree	18	14.8	18.8
	Agree	58	47.5	68.4
	Strongly Agree	37	30.3	100.0
	Missing Data	5	4.1	
Total		122	100.0	

Rate the overall quality of this lecture

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	5	4.1	4.4
	Below Average	10	8.2	13.2
	Average	48	39.3	55.3
	Above Average	39	32.0	89.5
	Excellent	12	9.8	100.0
	Missing Data	8	6.6	
Total		122	100.0	

Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form
1. What questions do you still have after attending this lecture? Please list any areas that you would like to receive additional information about or that need further clarification.
   - How can faculty relate stereotype threat to privilege-oppression? How can Ted begin to understand his White, male privilege? Based on discussion, how can a student who experiences racism not take it personally? (Doesn't seem possible).
   - <u>More</u> concrete best practices.
   - How to recognize and play up positive stereotypes.
   - Why international students are not "susceptible to stereotype threat" per the handout?
   - Still unsure how to advise a student with mediocre grades, unimpressive standardized test scores, and uncertain goals.
   - What do you do when a leader on campus makes culturally insensitive remarks that affect and are targeted to students?
   - It would have been nice to have more handouts/solid info about mentoring students.
   - I'm really interested in reducing stereotyped threat about competency. For example, how do you/one make the vulnerable (those being stereotyped) become more comfortable?
   - Difference in mentoring/advising/counseling. I think the student in the example may have some mental health issues not addressed by stereotype threat maybe depression.
   - Positive stereotype of a 'college graduate' aka what should students know and how should they behave. Pulling up the ladder—relate to instructors having higher expectations than the instructor would have endured.
   - It was difficult at first to tie handout one with handout two, but I do understand the connection. Title is a little misleading.
   - It would have been nice to have a shorter discussion with more focus on take-home message and techniques. The problems were already familiar to me, but the solutions tend to be unclear and difficult.
   - The <u>solo</u> phenomenon. How to deal with solo women, minorities, etc.
   - Not enough into on mentoring- especially if your discussion group did not discuss much advising.
   - How do you train the students in your class not to stereotype others.
   - Are booklets available for purchase/distribute?
   - Speaker referenced Claude Steele at end—would have been useful to have more uniform info about this if it was to be an important component.
   - There was really no concrete information about mentoring given.
   - More general strategies for mentoring, particularly mentoring graduate students.
   - Some problems have no solutions. Like racial discrimination in a person's mind. (If there is a solution from human society, we, at this country, should have already known, and eliminated this problem).
   - More information on how to provide <u>efficient</u> guidance for students (→maybe "scenarios" for such meeting?)
   - There is a need for large-scale training on mentoring. The tables with discussion on positive points of the scenario see mentoring in a much different light than the rest of the group seemed. This bias plays out in workloads in departments.
   - Perhaps an NDSU subgroup could discuss/address creating & fostering a more student-friendly (equality, fairness of treatment) campus.
   - A list of good & bad practices with regards to mentoring students.
   - I still want to learn about best practices in mentoring <u>all</u> students, not just minority students.

- Speaker is out of touch with reality that domestic (minority & majority) students are disappearing from graduate schools in science disciplines. Federal agencies recognize this problem.
- The last statement on the summary document about non-native, immigrant students.
- How do I get students to come and seek help?
- Best practices.
- How to mentor students while keeping personal experience bias out of it.
- Some academic presentation with actual learning.
- How do we train students to seek other help when they are treated in this way?
- Would have liked more specific suggestions for how to mentor <u>graduate</u> as well as undergraduate students. Nuts and bolts advice was what I thought we were getting but didn't ☹.
- I'd like those articles on supporting students as they deal with people stereotyping them.
- Is there a "cheatsheet" for advising?
- Very uninformative! Dr. Moody shot from hip and took to session whenever the ball dropped.
- Summary and conclusion of seminar was [illegible]. The info concerning student mentoring was not delivered.

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the lecture you attended today?
   - USELESS- Not very useful.
   - Interactive participation.
   - The active learning exercise about Ted & Dewayne and subsequent discussion.
   - Suggestions for strategies.
   - The summary sheet on "Stereotype threat." This is a concept I was unfamiliar with prior to today.
   - To be more encouraging to students, table discussion was engaging.
   - Chatting with colleagues.
   - Awareness.
   - It was great to hear that my missteps can benefit students.
   - Small group discussion—hearing ideas from the rest of the table that I hadn't thought of.
   - The case study was a decent means of inspiring discussion.
   - Discovering that even "positive stereotypes" have an impact.
   - The solo phenomenon and what goes with it. Also the info about telling stories of failures and determination to inspire students.
   - Discussion with colleagues; understanding power of suggestion.
   - Talking with table-mates about the interaction. And identifying what would work.
   - Heightened awareness of the importance of <u>listening,</u> stepping out of the role of <u>expert</u>—as the mentor and <u>learn</u> from the student.
   - Getting to know more people.
   - Discussion with other members of table.
   - Working with others.
   - Table discussion.
   - Good reinforcement of social and personal factors that affect performance.
   - Table discussion.
   - <u>The first handout</u>. Downhill after that.
   - Learned how to deal with "stereotype threat."
   - The review of stereotype threat.
   - Example. Handouts.
   - Discussion at the table.
   - Chance to talk with others at my table, networking with others.
   - Refresher- initiated self-reflection.
   - The opportunity to work with people at our table to network & learn from each other.
   - Discussion was good.
   - Stereotype threats. Solo phenomenon.
   - Working in groups was a good activity.
   - Group discussion very useful, relevant. Interactiveness nice for after lunch.
   - Scenario.

- Table discussion of scenarios.
- Stereotype threat handout.
- Discussion of advising scenario with other faculty members and information on the best/most valuable role models (those who can disclose failure).
- Discussing scenarios with colleagues at the table allowed me to (re)interpret some assumptions of how faculty-student relationships work.
- I know I'm 40% of Ted.
- Idea of "Stereotype threat" forming.
- Get to know others from other areas in the university.
- Helpful introduction to professor as mentor to undergrads.
- Dr. Moody's evaluation talk after we have read & discussed the example at the table.
- The table mixing was good.
- Good discussion at tables.
- Table discussion.
- Had to leave early but I appreciate the discussion based approach.
- Discussion and opinions from colleagues.
- Some people at my table seemed to learn something new about ethnic/racial stereotyping.
- I think the case study was useful for understanding importance of sensitivity to race and gender.
- Table discussion that allowed exchange of opinions.
- Well-organized for small & large group discussion.
- 1) Group discussions were helpful in hearing about different perspectives of student mentoring. 2) Synopsis from the presenter was helpful too.
- The summary.
- Eye-opening.
- Group work.
- Specific examples.
- To think about how what I am saying sounds to the student.
- Discussion around the table.
- It is practical & beneficial across disciplines, making us sit at assigned tables & meet new people is good.
- Reinforcing that stereotype threat _is_ real. We've heard this from other FORWARD speakers. But it's good to hear again.
- Recognition of complexities.
- I thought it was supposed to be about mentoring grad students.
- Nothing—total waste of time. Lunch was good.
- To see other people, and talk to them.
- Discussion at the table was valuable & insightful.

3. How could the FORWARD lecture series be improved to be more beneficial to you? What recommendations do you have for future lectures?
    - Too much information for the short time we had for the luncheon.
    - Get citations for faculty that can be used to help students overcome inferiorities.
    - It would be great to see programs that implement the advice that our speakers give. FORWARD does it, but more would be good.
    - Bring in grad students or undergrads from programs that have been successful—not just people in charge.
    - A more ambiguous discussion topic without such a clear evaluation.
    - Work directly with the diversity office on these issues—don't assume they know how to be culturally sensitive.
    - Maybe advance reading and information about topic.
    - The elements of choice. Do external standards affect the choices of women into careers. Are we really free to choose??
    - Many staff would be interested in this, but are usually not invited to attend. (Role on campus includes teaching.)

- Since Dr. Moody talked while we were supposed to be reading the handout (in every session!) she forced us to do a dual task, similar to what paragraph 2 talks about.
- A more formal lecture followed by activities would have better.
- Get other speakers like J. Moody who get group to interact & learn together.
- Provide more information about how to address short comings of Ted. Although group activity was good, less time on this would have been better.
- A lecture series or speaker about interdisciplinary collaboration with real opportunities to brain storm look for collaborative partners
- More "take home" points.
- I had trouble hearing and understanding Dr. Moody in the last part of the session.
- These are very valuable and important topics to get across; however this presenter did not provide enough structure for a productive and valuable learning session.
- More introductory remarks from the presenter would have been useful to frame/inform group discussion.
- Perhaps include actual role plays of the scenarios or activities presented (active participation).
- Acoustics of room need improvement.
- I cannot make any suggestions since this is my first FORWARD lecture.
- A luncheon on the mechanics <u>and</u> responsibilities of advising would be beneficial for all.
- Audience participation is useful, but not for the majority of the time—I came here to learn from the speaker who didn't deliver.
- Vary day of week (T/Th vs. MWF) for those of us that teach over noon hour.
- <u>More practical</u> ways of dealing with these very important and very difficult issues.
- More workshops.
- Screen the speaker first.
- Speaker should be screened to make sure that a quality seminar will be delivered.

4. Please provide any additional comments you have about today's lecture and/or the FORWARD program in general below or on the back of this page.
- The document was too "full" of stereotypes—If would have been more useful to have more ambiguous situation.
- Would have liked more faculty accountability in the scenario discussion—racism is a systemic issue that requires reflection and change. This seemed to focus on a person of color and what they need to do different while it is the system with the larger issue/problem.
- At least this did not overlap with most of the others.
- Handout is useful.
- [illegible] reading, better structured speaker.
- Not worth my time.
- Listing athletic performance as the second point as an example of interferences (second handout) –despite the discussion—seems to be an affect (& stereotype). What did she tell us that we should not have known before today?
- More opportunity to learn and meet others.
- It was a little frustrating to be told to check other websites/sources to find the info instead of being given concrete ideas.
- Prefer the presentation format rather than table group work.
- Please don't assign tables again. I don't get to see colleagues that often and I hoped to have some time with them.
- Complete waste of time. Waste of FORWARD money.
- More time was needed to read the 2nd document before meaningful discussion could take place.
- Too much time was allowed for group discussion, thus rushing the end.
- I liked the problem-based approach but would have liked some information from the expert/speaker.
- I lost today 3hours, and learned almost nothing. Lunch should be healthier.
- I couldn't see the speaker as she moved to the far side of the room. Being up on the stage helps to command people's attention.

Dr. JoAnn Moody
A Workshop for New Faculty
September 21st, 2010

Attendance
　　　Thirty-two new faculty members attended and 13 completed evaluations.

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

I will be able to use the information that I learned today in my work at NDSU

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	7.7	7.7
	Agree	8	61.5	69.2
	Strongly Agree	4	30.8	100.0
	Total	13	100.0	

I feel I have acquired new skills, information or understanding about how to increase my own job satisfaction and success

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	15.4	15.4
	Disagree	1	7.7	23.1
	Agree	8	61.5	84.6
	Strongly Agree	2	15.4	100.0
	Total	13	100.0	

I will be able to implement new strategies and knowledge as a result of my participation in this workshop

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	7.7	8.3
	Disagree	2	15.4	25.0
	Agree	6	46.2	75.0
	Strongly Agree	3	23.1	100.0
	Missing Data	1	7.7	
	Total	13	100.0	

I feel that my understanding of "solo phenomenon" stressors has increased after today's workshop.

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	5	38.5	38.5
	Agree	6	46.2	84.6
	Strongly Agree	2	15.4	100.0
	Total	13	100.0	

How would you rate the overall quality of this workshop?

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	7.7	8.3
	Below Average	1	7.7	16.7
	Average	4	30.8	50.0
	Above Average	6	46.2	100.0
	Missing Data	1	7.7	
	Total	13	100.0	

Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form

1. What questions do you still have after attending this workshop? Please list any areas that you would like to receive additional information about or that need further clarification.
   - This didn't address much more than mentoring is good—little info of value otherwise.
   - How is this being delivered to assigned mentors as I didn't see many in the room?
   - What's the true motivation for chairs/mentors help new faculty?

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the workshop you attended today?
   - Solo phenomenon paper.
   - Table discussion.

3. How could this workshop be improved to be more beneficial to you?
   - Hard to have discussion based activities in small university where comments could be easily shared with sources of discontent.
   - A more dynamic facilitator with more info/tips.
   - The idea of SAO was not well defined-- mainly due to time.
   - Be more focused and organized. Not an environment to be open in discussion.

4. Please provide any additional comments you have about today's workshop and/or the FORWARD program in general below or on the back of this page.
   - Part of being successful as a new faculty member is balancing time and spending time and energy on worthwhile topics. Unfortunately, this missed the mark.
   - Needs to be delivered to all faculty.

Dr. JoAnn Moody
A Workshop for Mentors
September 21st, 2010

Attendance
> Twenty individuals attended and 19 completed evaluations.
> - Fourteen attendees identified as faculty and five identified as administrators.

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

I will be able to use the information that I learned today in my work at NDSU

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	11	57.9	57.9
	Strongly Agree	8	42.1	100.0
	Total	19	100.0	

I feel I have acquired new skills, information or understanding about being a mentor

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	4	21.1	21.1
	Agree	11	57.9	78.9
	Strongly Agree	4	21.1	100.0
	Total	19	100.0	

I will be able to implement new strategies and knowledge as a result of my participation in this workshop

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	3	15.8	15.8
	Agree	12	63.2	78.9
	Strongly Agree	4	21.1	100.0
	Total	19	100.0	

I feel that my understanding of how to take pro-active steps to reduce "solo-phenomenon" stressors has increased after today's workshop.

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	3	15.8	17.6
	Agree	11	57.9	82.4
	Strongly Agree	3	15.8	100.0
	Missing Data	2	10.5	
	Total	19	100.0	

How would you rate the overall quality of this workshop?

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Average	10	52.6	52.6
	Above Average	8	42.1	94.7
	Excellent	1	5.3	100.0
	Total	19	100.0	

<u>Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form</u>

1. What questions do you still have after attending this workshop? Please list any areas that you would like to receive additional information about or that need further clarification.
   - Wanted more info for external mentors (vs. chairs).
   - Have clear guidelines on faculty <u>mentoring</u>.
   - More information concerning anticipation and mitigation of faculty conflict.
   - How to connect to other African-American women. Should have recommended to us to contact the diversity officer.

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the workshop you attended today?
   - Scenario was fun, meeting new colleagues.
   - Sharing experiencing.
   - Discussion.
   - Listening to discussions.
   - More participants are needed. Solutions are not presented. We heard problems no solutions.
   - Real discussion.
   - The discussion.
   - Discussion with other faculty.
   - Hearing other viewpoints, experience.
   - Practical exercise.
   - Peers giving answers.
   - Different views.

3. How could this workshop be improved to be more beneficial to you?
   - She came late, left early and allowed too much time to discuss scenario, I felt cheated.
   - More case studies.
   - More thought-provoking case studies.
   - Longer time—say ½ day.
   - More time & additional session with additional topics.
   - More problem-oriented, scenario opening.
   - Use a P.A. system.
   - Condense time or faster paced conversation.
   - More & different scenarios- more time.
   - Too much time before reporting. There was too little time in the big group to discuss.
   - What can you do with 30-40 min?

4. Please provide any additional comments you have about today's workshop and/or the FORWARD program in general below or on the back of this page.
   - Great!

Dr. JoAnn Moody
PTE Processes: Rising Above Cognitive Errors
A Workshop for Department and College PTE Members
September 21st, 2010

<u>Attendance</u>

Twenty-three individuals attended and 21 completed evaluations.

- Eighteen individuals reported being faculty members and two reported being administrators. Two did not report their role at NDSU.

<u>Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form</u>

I will be able to use the information that I learned today in my work at NDSU

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	9.1	9.5
	Agree	13	59.1	71.4
	Strongly Agree	6	27.3	100.0
	Missing Data	1	4.5	
	Total	22	100.0	

I feel I have acquired new skills, information or understanding about cognitive errors that can occur during the PTE process

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	4	18.2	19.0
	Agree	10	45.5	66.7
	Strongly Agree	7	31.8	100.0
	Missing Data	1	4.5	
	Total	22	100.0	

I will be able to implement new strategies or knowledge as a result of my participation in this workshop

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	5	22.7	23.8
	Agree	11	50.0	76.2
	Strongly Agree	5	22.7	100.0
	Missing Data	1	4.5	
	Total	22	100.0	

I feel that my knowledge of how to improve the tenure review process has increased after today's workshop

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	4	18.2	20.0
	Agree'	12	54.5	80.0
	Strongly Agree	4	18.2	100.0
	Missing Data	2	9.1	
	Total	22	100.0	

I would recommend this workshop to others

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	3	13.6	14.3
	Agree	9	40.9	57.1
	Strongly Agree	9	40.9	100.0
	Missing Data	1	4.5	
	Total	22	100.0	

Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form
1. What questions do you still have after attending this workshop? Please list any areas that you would like to receive additional information about or that need further clarification.
   - I had considerable experience on PTE committees but the review was helpful.
   - More focused workshops for faculty eligible for PTE committees.

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the workshop you attended today?
   - Discussion.
   - A validation of my own + my committee's work. Additional knowledge of other departments/college practices.
   - Examples of strategies.
   - Discussion.
   - Excellent discussion and sharing of ideas.
   - Issues that arose from the case study scenario.
   - Bruce Maylath's idea for norming sessions in preparation for PTE committees.
   - Interesting case history and discussion (thought I found Professor A to be a caricature—I've never encountered a PTE committee member remotely like this!)

3. How could this workshop be improved to be more beneficial to you?
   - Ok as is.
   - Specifically focusing on NDSU policy.
   - Seems to be a bit too random.
   - Smaller discussion groups.

4. Please provide any additional comments you have about today's workshop and/or the FORWARD program in general below or on the back of this page.
   - I liked the suggestion or a "norming session" for PTE committees.

Dr. JoAnn Moody
Tricks of the Trade: Saving Time and Sanity --- A Workshop for Women Faculty
September 21st, 2010

Attendance

Forty-seven individuals attended and 41 completed evaluations
- Thirty-nine people identified themselves as faculty, one individual identified as an administrator and one individual identified as staff.

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

I will be able to use the information that I learned today in my work at NDSU

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	2.4	2.5
	Agree	26	63.4	67.5
	Strongly Agree	13	31.7	100.0
	Missing Data	1	2.4	
	Total	41	100.0	

I feel I have acquired new skills, information or understanding about successfully managing my academic career as a woman

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	4.9	4.9
	Disagree	2	4.9	9.8
	2.50	1	2.4	12.2
	Agree	31	75.6	87.8
	Strongly Agree	5	12.2	100.0
	Total	41	100.0	

I will be able to implement new strategies and knowledge as a result of my participation in this workshop

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	4.9	4.9
	Disagree	3	7.3	12.2
	Agree	23	56.1	68.3
	Strongly Agree	13	31.7	100.0
	Total	41	100.0	

This was a positive networking experience with other women faculty

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	2.4	2.5
	Agree	9	22.0	25.0
	Strongly Agree	30	73.2	100.0
	Missing Data	1	2.4	
	Total	41	100.0	

I would recommend this workshop to others

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	2.4	2.4
	Disagree	2	4.9	7.3
	2.50	1	2.4	9.8
	Agree	17	41.5	51.2
	Strongly Agree	20	48.8	100.0
	Total	41	100.0	

How would you rate the overall quality of this workshop?

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	2.4	2.6
	Below Average	1	2.4	5.3
	Average	14	34.1	42.1
	Above Average	18	43.9	89.5
	Excellent	4	9.8	100.0
	Missing Data	3	7.3	
	Total	41	100.0	

Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form
1. What questions do you still have after attending this workshop? Please list any areas that you would like to receive additional information about or that need further clarification.
   - Don't forget the email about time management course. Thanks.
   - How to work with spouse on their duties for family.
   - General time management skills.
   - Maybe look at actual scenarios to evaluate re: rising above cognitive errors.
   - Time management.
   - The handout didn't seem to match this topic. It seemed like a handout for the afternoon.
   - Concrete strategies for time management (like important vs. urgent).
   - Perspective of speaker, her experience from other institutions, summary of our discussion were not delivered at all. Her advices.

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the workshop you attended today?
   - Interaction with other female faculty; interesting ideas/elements.
   - The opportunity to network with other faculty from diverse departments.
   - Seeing I wasn't alone.
   - Networking reinforcing ideas.
   - Talking to faculty at multiple levels of development in their careers.
   - Be where you are. Don't feel guilty about what others have to do.
   - Discussion with other faculty.
   - Advice from other faculty about self wellness.
   - Dr. Moody's comments and the handout.
   - Connecting with other women faculty.
   - Opportunity to hear tips and insights from other female faculty.
   - Sharing tricks of the trade—very helpful for early career faculty like myself.
   - Work life balance is a problem all the way around.
   - Sharing/discussions in groups.
   - Discussion with others; collaboration brain storming.
   - Taking time to visit with other colleagues.
   - The large amount of interaction with others.
   - It was social.
   - Thinking about how to reduce workload in balance with home—need more of this (to maximize energy and time for work). Being reminded that others feel these challenges too.
   - Discussing with others.
   - Good discussion—hearing from other women on campus.
   - I'm not alone with tenure problems.
   - Tips & chance to talk with others.
   - Brainstorming with table-mates.
   - Tricks of the trade and how to achieve work/life balance.
   - Networking/talking with other faculty members, learning from their experience.

- Nothing, I only enjoyed meeting other people from other departments. However, the issues we discussed today have been discussed numerous times at NDSU, it was like treading water. (At WiR & Forward meetings and seminars).

3. How could this workshop be improved to be more beneficial to you?
   - More concrete suggestions, tips for integrating ideas to change department/college climate rather than just as an individual.
   - Longer—more lecture/discussion beyond group discussion.
   - Beyond small groups—not much new info.
   - More interaction with the presenter although overall it was good.
   - Less small group interaction.
   - Wish we would have heard more from Dr. Moody. Small group discussions were interesting but similar to conversations at other workshops/gatherings.
   - I was looking for more ideas & tips from the speaker—less of the "self help" round table discussions.
   - A bit more structured would help.
   - Ask that participants to not sit with people from their same department or college so more discussion occurs.
   - Condense – we are busy, want the biggest payoff for our time.
   - More leadership from the facilitator. I believe that I could have had this discussion within the department/college without the facilitator.
   - I'm beginning to think JoAnn Moody was a lot of $ for running discussions that many faculty here could have done. Her visit was a catalyst but little meat.
   - Time management. Balance discussion and info she was conveying.
   - Also, get us to write down 1 thing we will do differently based on these discussions.
   - Mix up groups to avoid department groupings.
   - I would have enjoyed or needed more on the research about the "solo."
   - Take less time for group discussion.
   - Wish it was less of us and more of her.
   - Would have liked a tip sheet directly relevant to the workshop topic.
   - More time and list of resources.
   - Nuts & bolts.
   - Start on time 10:10, end on time 11:25.
   - More information from presenter (relative to group discussion time).
   - Speaker should have a structured presentation with power point to provide summary & conclusions of seminar and to provide "take home message."

4. Please provide any additional comments you have about today's workshop and/or the FORWARD program in general below or on the back of this page.
   - Today there was a lot of discussion at our table about mothering & faculty work. It would be nice if there were an opportunity to meet casually as a group to talk about mothering and faculty.
   - I like the selection of speakers that come into NDSU.
   - Thank you!
   - Hiring stuff at the end wasn't relevant to this workshop.
   - Good review. Nothing new.
   - Speaker should be "screened" to make sure she will deliver quality seminar.
   - On Tuesday, September 20, I attended a seminar entitled "Women faculty- Tricks of the Trade: Saving Time and Sanity" at 10am, and a pedagogical luncheon at noon. Both seminars/workshops were much below my expectations. In fact, these seminars were the worst I have ever attended. I expected that Dr. Moody will share with an audience her expertise, experience, perspective and her knowledge, which did not happen. I expected that I would learn how faculty at other universities is dealing with some common problems. I did not gain any additional knowledge, any advices, and any new information.

     It seemed to me that Dr. Moody came to NDSU unprepared. Seminars/workshops which are based on group discussion (as on Tuesday) should be followed up by the speaker's presentation which should summarize the discussion, present leader's point of view, knowledge and expertise, and provide a "take

home message." Unfortunately, Dr. Moody did not summarize any discussion, but rather reiterated what was said by other people. Power Point presentations (can be short) in such workshops/seminars are very helpful since it helps to memorize some facts, and the most important points of the discussion. Dr. Moody said that she does not do these presentations, which in my opinion is a mistake. Power Point presentations engage an audience much better than speech alone on the subject of the seminar.

At the first seminar (Women Faculty- Tricks of the Trade: Saving Time and Sanity), I expected that she would share with an audience information on how to manage time, how to be more effective, and more satisfied at work based on her experience. Again, she did not deliver this information. Instead, she let all women faculty discuss issues which have been discussed for several years among this group at WISMET/WiR, FORWARD and other meetings. It was like treading water, and repeating a discussion, without presenting any solutions to any problems.

At the pedagogical luncheon, she was not able to summarize the group discussion in organized and structured manner. She did not provide real examples of student's mentoring based on her expertise, and she did not present any new knowledge.

Consequently, I lost 3 hours of my time which I could have used in a more efficient manner.

I talked to 5 of my colleagues (3 assistant, 1 associate and 1 full professor) who attended one or two seminars by Dr. Moody, to get their opinion. It appeared that all of them shared in 80-100% my opinion presented above about these seminars.

I suggest, that in the future, organizers of such event(s) should screen invited speaker(s) more carefully, by requesting a detailed synopsis of seminar(s) to be presented and getting reviews of his/her seminar(s) from other institutions. I also suggest focusing on new areas, but not on the areas discussed at seminars in previous years.

However, I enjoyed meeting my colleagues from other departments, and discussing some issues with them.

Graduate Committee Composition Review
October 2010
DRAFT

Sample
The sample is comprised of 693 plans of study filed between Fall 2006 and Spring 2010. Data were collected regarding gender of the student, chair (and co-chair if applicable), and committee members, rank of chair (and co-chair if applicable) and committee members, and STEM or Non-STEM status were taken from the plans of study. This sample consists of 212 doctoral students, 111 male (52.4%), and 101 female (47.6%). A total of 481 master's students filed a plan of study including 274 males (57%) and 206 females (43%).

Descriptive Results

Committee Composition: Gender
On graduate committees with four or less faculty members, 268 (38.1%) of committees were comprised entirely of men. Only 12 (1.7%) were comprised entirely of women committees. Similarly, 219 (31.6%) of committees had only one woman, while 66 (9.5%) had only one man. One hundred and one committees (14.6%) were equally divided between male and female committee members.

Among 425 STEM committees, 47.1% or 200 committees were populated entirely by men. No STEM committees had all-female composition. Fourteen committees (3.3%) had one man and 158 committees (37.2%) only one woman. Only 40 committees (9.4%) had equal gender distribution.

Within the 268 Non-STEM committees, 65 committees (24%) were comprised entirely of men, while only 12 committees (4.5%) were populated only by women. Sixty committees (22.4%) had equal gender distribution with two women and two men. Committees with one woman and three men made up 22.8 % or 61 committees compared to the 52 committees (19.4%) with one man.

Committee Chair Composition: Gender
Women account for only 15.6% or 33 of doctoral chairs and 121 or 25.3% of master's committee chairs. There does not appear to be a connection between the gender of the chair and the gender of the student as male and female students are nearly equally represented (43.1% female in master's level and 47.6% female in doctoral level) at both the master's and doctoral level studies. Furthermore, while few women faculty are chairing thesis and dissertation committees at least one woman faculty member is on over half of all thesis/dissertation committees (n = 397, 87.3%).

In Non-STEM committees, roughly two-thirds (66.4%) of committee chairs were male, while 33.6% were female. In STEM committees, males were the committee chair 84.9 % of the time while 64 committees (15.1%) were chaired by women.

Committee Chair Composition: Rank
Of 693 committee chairs, 236 (34.1%) were assistant professors. Associate professors made up 27.3% or 189 chairs. Full professors represented 36.9% or 256 chairs. Two (0.3%) were faculty from outside of NDSU and nine (1.3%) were lecturers or instructors.

Of 268 Non-STEM committees chairs, 78 or 29.1% were assistant professors and 92 (34.3%) were associate professors. Ninety-four (35.1%) were full professors. One (0.4%) was a faculty member from outside of NDSU and three (1.1%) were lecturers.

Among the 425 STEM committee chairs, 158 or 37.2% were assistant professors, 97 (22.8%) were assistant professors and 162 or 38.1% were full professors. One (0.2%) was a faculty member from outside NDSU and six (1.4%) were lecturers or instructors.

Graduate Appointee Composition: Gender
Of the 425 STEM graduate appointees, 108 or 25.4% were women and 317 or 74.6% were men. Of the 253 Non-STEM graduate appointees, 106 or 41.7% were women and 147 or 57.9% were men.

Comparative Results

Table 1. STEM Committee Chairs by Gender & Rank (n= 440 STEM committee chairs)**

	Number of STEM Committee Chairs	Percentage of STEM Chairs Serving	Total Number of STEM Faculty	Percentage of Total STEM Faculty	Difference between % of Chairs and Total STEM Faculty
Women Chairs or Co-Chairs	**69**	**15.7**	**66**	**20.6**	**-4.9**
Instructor/Lecturer	0	0	0	0.0	0
Assistant Professor	35	7.9	49	15.3	-7.4
Associate Professor	12	2.7	10	3.1	-0.4
Full Professor	22	5.0	7	2.2	2.8
Employed Outside of NDSU	0	0	---	---	--
Men Chairs or Co-Chairs	**371**	**84.3**	**255**	**79.4**	**4.9**
Instructor/Lecturer	7	1.6	1	0.3	1.3
Assistant Professor	130	29.5	89	27.7	1.8
Associate Professor	86	19.5	69	21.5	-2.0
Full Professor	146	33.2	96	29.9	3.30
Employed Outside of NDSU	1	0.2	---	---	--

**includes 15 committees which included co-chairs. Both chairs are represented in this table.

Table 1 shows STEM women faculty are serving as committee chairs at a rate lower than their percentage of total STEM faculty except at the full professor rank where they are serving at a higher rate. STEM men faculty are serving at a rate higher than their percentage of the total STEM faculty except at the associate professor rank where they are serving at a lower rate.

Table 2. Non- STEM Committee Chairs by Gender & Rank (n= 273 Non-STEM committee chairs)**

	Number of Non-STEM Committee Chairs	Percentage of Non-STEM Chairs Serving	Total Number of Non-STEM Faculty	Percentage of Total Non-STEM Faculty	Difference between % of Chairs and Total Non-STEM Faculty
Women Chairs or Co-Chairs	**92**	**33.7**	**94**	**41.6**	**-7.9**
Instructor/Lecturer	1	0.4	4	1.8	-1.4
Assistant Professor	34	12.4	60	26.5	-14.1
Associate Professor	47	17.2	26	11.5	5.7
Full Professor	10	3.7	4	1.8	1.9
Employed Outside of NDSU	0	0			--
Men Chairs or Co-Chairs	**181**	**66.4**	**132**	**58.4**	**8.0**
Instructor/Lecturer	2	0.7	2	0.9	-0.2
Assistant Professor	46	16.8	44	19.5	-2.7
Associate Professor	46	16.8	45	19.9	-3.1
Full Professor	86	31.5	41	18.1	13.4
Employed Outside of NDSU	1	0.4			--

**includes 5 committees which included co-chairs. Both chairs are represented in this table.

Table 2 shows Non-STEM women faculty are serving as committee chairs at a rate higher than their percentage of total Non-STEM faculty except at the assistant professor rank where they are serving at a lower rate. Non- STEM men faculty are serving at a rate lower than their percentage of the total Non-STEM faculty except at the full professor rank where they are serving at a higher rate.

Table 3. STEM Graduate Appointees by Gender & Rank (n= 425 STEM graduate appointees)

	Number of STEM Graduate Appointees	*Percentage of STEM Graduate Appointees*	*Total Number of STEM Faculty*	*Percentage of Total STEM Faculty*	*Difference between % of Appointees and Total STEM Faculty*
Women Graduate Appointees	**108**	**25.4**	**66**	**20.6**	**4.8**
Instructor/Lecturer	0	0	0	0.0	0
Assistant Professor	57	13.4	49	15.3	-1.9
Associate Professor	19	4.5	10	3.1	2.4
Full Professor	31	7.3	7	2.2	5.1
Employed Outside of NDSU	1	0.2	---	---	--
Men Graduate Appointees	**317**	**74.6**	**255**	**79.4**	**-4.8**
Instructor/Lecturer	5	1.2	1	0.3	0.9
Assistant Professor	134	31.5	89	27.7	3.8
Associate Professor	99	23.3	69	21.5	1.8
Full Professor	77	18.1	96	29.9	-11.8
Employed Outside of NDSU	2	0.5	---	---	--

Table 3 shows STEM women faculty are serving as graduate appointees at rate higher than their percentage of total STEM faculty except for at the assistant professor rank where they are serving at a lower rate. STEM men faculty are serving at a rate higher than their percentage of the total STEM faculty except at the full professor rank where they are serving at a lower rate.

Table 4. Non-STEM Graduate Appointees by Gender & Rank (n= 253 Non-STEM graduate appointees)

	Number of Non-STEM Graduate Appointees	*Percentage of Non-STEM Graduate Appointees*	*Total Number of Non-STEM Faculty*	*Percentage of Total Non-STEM Faculty*	*Difference between % of Appointees and Total Non-STEM Faculty*
Women Graduate Appointees	**106**	**41.7**	**94**	**41.6**	**0.1**
Instructor/Lecturer	0	0	4	1.8	-1.8
Assistant Professor	51	20.2	60	26.5	-6.3
Associate Professor	37	14.6	26	11.5	3.1
Full Professor	12	4.7	4	1.8	2.9
Employed Outside of NDSU	6	2.4	---	---	--
Men Graduate Appointees	**147**	**57.9**	**132**	**58.4**	**-0.5**
Instructor/Lecturer	1	0.4	2	0.9	-0.5
Assistant Professor	27	10.7	44	19.5	-8.8
Associate Professor	40	15.8	45	19.9	-4.1
Full Professor	74	29.2	41	18.1	11.1
Employed Outside of NDSU	4	0.4	---	---	--

Table 4 shows Non-STEM women faculty are serving as graduate appointees at rate higher than their percentage of total Non-STEM faculty except at the assistant professor rank where they are serving at a lower rate. Non-STEM men faculty are serving at a rate lower than their percentage of the total Non-STEM faculty except at the full professor rank where they are serving at a higher rate.

Table 5. STEM Committee Members (not chair or graduate appointee) by Gender and Rank
(n= 880 STEM committee members)

	Number of STEM Committee Members	Percentage of STEM Committee Members	Total Number of STEM Faculty	Percentage of Total STEM Faculty	Difference between % of Committee Members and Total STEM Faculty
Women Committee Members	**120**	**13.6**	**66**	**20.6**	**-7.0**
Instructor/Lecturer	2	0.2	0	0.0	0.2
Assistant Professor	80	9.1	49	15.3	-6.2
Associate Professor	21	2.4	10	3.1	-0.7
Full Professor	15	1.7	7	2.2	-0.5
Employed Outside of NDSU	1	0.1	---	---	--
Men Committee Members	**760**	**86.4**	**255**	**79.4**	**7.0**
Instructor/Lecturer	28	31.8	1	0.3	31.5
Assistant Professor	262	29.8	89	27.7	-2.1
Associate Professor	177	20.1	69	21.5	-1.4
Full Professor	265	30.1	96	29.9	0.2
Employed Outside of NDSU	26	2.9	---	---	--

Table 5 shows STEM women faculty are serving as committee members at rate lower than their percentage of total STEM faculty. STEM men faculty are serving at a rate higher than their percentage of the total STEM faculty except at the full professor rank where they are at a rate about equal to their percentage of the total STEM faculty.

Table 6. Non- STEM Committee Members (not chair or graduate appointee) by Gender and Rank
(n= 560 Non-STEM committee members)

	Number of Non-STEM Committee Members	Percentage of Non-STEM Committee Members	Total Number of Non-STEM Faculty	Percentage of Total Non-STEM Faculty	Difference between % of Committee Members and Total Non-STEM Faculty
Women Committee Members	**211**	**37.7**	**94**	**41.6**	**-3.9**
Instructor/Lecturer	9	1.6	4	1.8	-0.2
Assistant Professor	99	17.7	60	26.5	-8.8
Associate Professor	62	11.1	26	11.5	-0.4
Full Professor	23	4.1	4	1.8	2.3
Employed Outside of NDSU	18	3.2	---	---	--
Men Committee Members	**349**	**62.3**	**132**	**58.4**	**3.9**
Instructor/Lecturer	11	2.0	2	0.9	1.1
Assistant Professor	86	15.4	44	19.5	-4.1
Associate Professor	100	17.9	45	19.9	-2.0
Full Professor	131	23.4	41	18.1	-5.3
Employed Outside of NDSU	17	3.0	---	---	--

Table 6 shows Non-STEM women faculty are serving as committee members at rate lower than their percentage of total Non-STEM faculty except at the full professor rank where they are serving at a higher rate. Non- STEM men faculty are serving at a rate lower than their percentage of the total STEM faculty.

Appendices for Graduate Committee Composition Report

Gender of Committee Members

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	All Men	265	38.2	40.0
	One Woman	219	31.6	73.1
	Equal Gender Distribution	100	14.4	88.2
	One Man	66	9.5	98.2
	All Women	12	1.7	100.0
	Missing Data	31	4.5	
Total		693	100.0	

What is the gender of the Non-STEM committee chair?

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	178	66.4	66.4
	Female	90	33.6	100.0
	Total	268	100.0	

What is the faculty rank of the Non-STEM chair/advisor?

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Assistant	78	29.1	29.1
	Associate	92	34.3	63.4
	Full Professor	94	35.1	98.5
	Outside of NDSU	1	.4	98.9
	Lecturer/Instructor	3	1.1	100.0
	Total	268	100.0	

What is the gender of the STEM committee chair?

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	361	84.9	84.9
	Female	64	15.1	100.0
	Total	425	100.0	

What is the faculty rank of the STEM chair/advisor?

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Assistant	158	37.2	37.2
	Associate	97	22.8	60.0
	Full Professor	162	38.1	98.1
	Outside of NDSU	1	.2	98.4
	Lecturer/Instructor	6	1.4	99.8
	Missing Data	1	.2	100.0
	Total	425	100.0	

NDSU Administrative Survey – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Dana M. Britton, Ph.D., October 2010

The NDSU administrative survey was presented to department heads, deans, and other administrators from February 18, 2010 to March 24, 2010. The items focus largely on administrators' perceptions of gender equity on campus and in their units and attitudes about strategies for change.

Demographics

75 administrators received the survey; 42 (56%) responded (Table one). The sample profile is as follows:

1. Sex and race: 25 respondents (60%) are men, eleven (26%) are women, six (14%) chose not to answer. 33 (79%) of respondents are white; nine (21%) chose other categories or did not respond.
2. Experience: 25 respondents (60%) have been at NDSU eleven years or more, eleven (26%) for four to ten years, the remainder (three, or 7%) for three years or fewer (three respondents did not answer).
3. Position: The majority of respondents (27, or 64%) are department heads, five (12%) are Deans, five (12%) are assistant/associate Deans or heads. Five (12%) are in other positions or did not answer.
4. College: Sixteen respondents (38%) indicated an appointment in one of the three STEM colleges. The remaining thirteen (31%) indicated appointments in non-STEM colleges.   One indicated another appointment and twelve (29%) did not answer this item. This likely reflects confidentiality concerns.

Further analysis of response rates appears in table two.

NDSU Climate

A number of items on the survey tap issues of NDSU campus climate. The first is a set of paired items that ask, for example, whether service expectations are reasonable for faculty who are men, followed by a parallel item asking whether they are reasonable for women. Responses (as throughout) range from one to five, with five indicating strong agreement. There are fifteen of these pairs (Table three). Administrators are in almost respects more positive about the campus climate for men than for women. Statistical tests indicate significant differences in administrators' perceptions for ten of fifteen pairs.

Eight additional items tap general perceptions of gender equity in campus climate, e.g., equity in allocation of resources to men and women faculty (Table four). Means indicate moderate levels of agreement with all of these items. Tests of mean differences between men and women administrators reveal that women are significantly more negative about gender equity on the NDSU campus – there are significant mean differences across six of these eight items, and in all instances women perceive less equity than men.   There are no significant differences between STEM and non-STEM administrators.

The final set of items asks administrators to choose reasons men and women are most likely to leave the university (Table ten). The top five reasons are the same, but there are six (of sixteen) significant differences, including the findings that administrators believe women are less likely to leave because they receive a competing offer and more likely to leave because they are frustrated with informal systems at NDSU.

<u>Unit climate</u>
Items in this part of the survey tap two basic dimensions, gender equity in hiring/retention/leadership and department climate for work/family balance. On the first dimension (table four), administrators generally believe they have tried to recruit women and that their unit climates are supportive for women. They are less positive about their units' actual plans to retain and mentor women and help them advance to leadership positions, however. There are significant differences between men and women administrators in several areas – in general, men are more positive about their unit climates in this regard than are women. There are no differences between administrators in STEM and non-STEM colleges.

The items that tap work/family balance show that administrators generally believe their units have policies to support efforts to balance work and family (Tables five and six). Even so, most indicate some level of agreement that it is often difficult for faculty to deal with family responsibilities. There are many significant differences between men and women administrators, with women consistently perceiving a less positive climate and more difficulties for faculty in dealing with family responsibilities. There are no significant differences between STEM and non-STEM administrators on these items.

<u>Policy</u>
There are two sets of policy-oriented items in the survey, the first taps attitudes about NDSU policies aimed at increasing gender equity (e.g., child care or stop the clock policies - table seven); the second taps attitudes about ADVANCE FORWARD initiatives. The analysis here reveals a very consistent pattern: there is broad consensus that such NDSU policies are valuable. Similarly, respondents view ADVANCE FORWARD initiatives as valuable. There are NO significant differences on any of these items between the levels of agreement for men and women administrators, or for STEM versus non-STEM faculty.

<u>Conclusions and implications</u>
Taking all of the university and climate items together reveals a pattern of marginally positive responses (i.e., mean values of agreement above three on a five point scale), to items assessing whether the climate is gender equitable for men and women faculty. There is far less agreement that units have concrete policies in place to retain, promote, and advance women into leadership positions, however, which suggests that this is an area in need of attention. There is also relatively strong agreement on the need for institutional transformation to create gender equality (X̄ = 3.71 for this item).

For almost all climate items, women administrators are significantly less positive than men. Interestingly, there are no differences between STEM and non-STEM administrators on any of these dimensions. This argues strongly for efforts to address the university and campus climate that target all colleges, rather than STEM units. The fact that women administrators are more likely to perceive problems than men administrators also argues quite strongly for including men as central players in efforts to document inequity and create change.

One of the most positive findings from the survey is the broad consensus about policies aimed at increasing gender equity. All administrators (men/women, STEM/non-STEM) believe these policies are valuable. This suggests that policy initiatives to address gender equity, particularly in the areas of work/family balance, should elicit widespread support among administrators.

NDSU Administrative survey – DRAFT REPORT
Dana M. Britton, Ph.D., 17 October 2010

The NDSU administrative survey consists of fifteen items – many with sub-items – that were presented to department heads, deans, and other administrators from February 18, 2010 to March 24, 2010. The items focus largely on administrators' perceptions of gender inequality on campus and in units; and specific questions query perceptions of campus climate, community climate, department and university practices, and strategies for change.

1. Response rate and demographics

75 administrators received the survey; 42 ultimately responded, for a response rate of 56%. 25 of these respondents (60%), were men, eleven (26%) were women, six (14%) chose not to answer this question. 33 (79%) of respondents are white, six (14%) chose "other" or preferred not to answer. One respondent indicated that she/he is biracial, and two chose "Asian or Pacific Islander." The remaining demographic characteristics are listed in table one.

The majority of respondents are department heads (27, or 64%), and have been at NDSU for eleven or more years (25, or 60%). The modal category of experience in administration is three years or less (18, or 43%), and have a 51 to 75 percent administrative appointment (20, or 48%). Sixteen respondents (38%) come from the three STEM colleges (Agriculture, Food Systems, and Natural Resources, Engineering and Architecture, and Science and Math), thirteen (31%) come from non-STEM colleges, thirteen (31%) of respondents chose "other" or preferred not to answer. Missing data for all of these questions ranges from 2% (How long in current administrative position?) to 29% (College of Appointment). This likely indicates concerns about confidentiality, which would not be unusual given the nature of the survey and the small sample size. In the analyses that follow, missing data will be excluded. As it is very likely that these missing data are likely not distributed equally across categories of interest, any comparison across these categories (particularly for items with large numbers missing – such as college) should be viewed with some caution. These concerns are tempered somewhat by the fact that exploratory tests do not reveal significant mean differences on climate items between those who provided data for "college of appointment" and those who did not, however.

Women administrators are not distributed evenly across these categories – they are significantly less likely (as assessed by a chi-square test) to be chairs (nineteen men are chairs, versus five women – four women are associate chairs, versus one man, four men are Deans, but no women), to have less experience in their administrative appointments (82% of women have three years or fewer of experience, compared to 36% of men), and to have part time appointments (82% of women administrators have a 50% time or less appointment, compared to 38% of men). Though a chi-square test is not significant (likely due to sample size) for the distribution across colleges, it is worth noting that 63% of women administrators who indicated a college of appointment (N=5) in the sample are in non-STEM colleges, versus 38% (N=8) men. Chi-square tests of differences between STEM and non-STEM administrators on the academic position, experience, and percentage of appointment variables indicate no significant differences – this indicates that these dimensions do no vary significantly across these groups of colleges.

Table 1: Demographics

WHAT POSITION DO YOU HOLD?		
Department Head/Chair	27	64%
Associate/Assistant Department Head/Chair or Associate/Assistant Dean	5	12%
Academic Dean	5	12%
Program coordinator	1	2%
Missing/Prefer not to answer	4	10%
HOW LONG AT NDSU?		
3 years or less	3	7%
4 to 10 years	11	26%
11 or more years	25	60%
Missing/Prefer not to answer	3	7%
HOW LONG IN CURRENT ADMIN POSITION?		
3 years or less	18	43%
4 to 10 years	15	36%
11 or more years	8	19%
Missing	1	2%
PERCENT OF APPOINTMENT ADMINISTRATIVE?		
25 percent or less	6	14%
26 to 50 percent	14	33%
51 to 75 percent	20	48%
Missing	2	5%
COLLEGE OF APPOINTMENT?		
Agriculture, Food Systems, and Natural Resources	8	19%
Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences	7	17%
Business	2	5%
Engineering and Architecture	3	7%
Pharmacy, Nursing. and Allied Sciences	4	10%
Science and Mathematics	5	12%
Human Development and Education	0	0%
Academic Affairs/Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies	1	2%
Prefer not to answer	12	29%

Response rates within categories are difficult to calculate due to the presence of missing data. 56 men administrators received the survey, 25 of those who respondents indicated that they are male, for a response rate of 45%. Nineteen women administrators received the survey; eleven respondents indicated that they are female, for a response rate of 58%. Six respondents did not answer this item. Response rates for by college should be interpreted with even more caution, as twelve respondents – 16% of the entire original sample of 75 (and 29% of the final sample of 42 respondents) – did not answer this item. Table two reports the response rates for each college that can be determined on the basis of the responses of those who identified their college of appointment.

Table 2: Response rates by college

Agriculture, Food Systems, and Natural Resources	47%
Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences	58%
Business	50%
Engineering & Architecture	30%
Human Development & Education	0%
Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Sciences	57%
Science & Mathematics	38%
Graduate & Interdisciplinary Studies/Acad Affairs	14%

2. Overall NDSU community (items one and two)

Items one and two assess respondents' attitudes about the climate at NDSU as a whole. The question that leads into both of these sets of items is the same: "With respect to the overall NDSU community, please indicate your level of agreement with each item on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree." There are two types of items in these sections. Most items are direct comparisons between respondents' attitudes about the climate for men faculty versus women faculty, e.g., "Service expectations after tenure are reasonable for faculty who are women," followed by an item that replaces the word "women" with "men." The second type of item directly assesses perceptions of climate, e.g., "Search committees at NDSU receive sufficient resources for gathering a gender diverse candidate pool." I will report results for these types of items in turn.

The pattern of means for these items, reported in table three, is instructive. All items with a mean value of 4.0 or higher refer to men – administrators perceive that men faculty members are encouraged to provide suggestions on how to improve the workflow in their units (X = 4.18), that they feel a part of the local community (X = 4.11), and that annual evaluations help them to advance their careers (X = 4.03). None of the top three ranked items for women faculty reach this level of agreement. The top ranked item for women taps administrators' perceptions that women faculty respect individual and cultural differences (X = 3.92), that annual evaluations help them advance their careers (X = 3.83), and that they feel a part of the local community (X = 3.82). It is worth noting that the top ranked items for men faculty and women faculty capture very different characteristics – men faculty exercise power by providing suggestions to improve workflow (a quality that is likely ranked to advancement and pay), women faculty are sensitive to individual and cultural differences (a trait arguably less likely to be rewarded). Conversely, administrators' responses rank the "improving workflow" item number five for women faculty (X = 3.65), and the "sensitivity to individual and cultural differences" number 13 (of fifteen) for men faculty (X = 3.23).

Table 3: Paired items for climate with tests of significance	Mean	N	Sig.
Pair 1 Service expectations after tenure are reasonable for women faculty.	3.03	39	0.04
Service expectations after tenure are reasonable for men faculty.	3.54		
Pair 2 Women faculty are disadvantaged by the existing tenure process.	2.32	38	0.04
Men faculty are disadvantaged by the existing tenure process.	1.82		
Pair 3 The promotion process from associate to full professor status is fair for NDSU faculty who are women.	3.55	38	NS
The promotion process from associate to full professor status is fair for NDSU faculty who are men.	3.53		
Pair 4 Women faculty are disadvantaged by the existing promotion process.	2.13	38	NS
Men faculty are disadvantaged by the existing promotion process.	1.95		
Pair 5 Women faculty at NDSU respect individual and cultural differences.	3.92	38	0.00
Men faculty at NDSU respect individual and cultural differences.	3.21		
Pair 6 Faculty who are women at NDSU are empowered to resolve problems.	3.26	39	0.01
Faculty who are men at NDSU are empowered to resolve problems.	3.82		
Pair 7 Formal grievance processes are effective for faculty who are women.	3.29	31	0.10
Formal grievance processes are effective for faculty who are men.	3.68		
Pair 8 Informal grievance processes effectively address concerns of faculty who are women.	3.16	32	0.01
Informal grievance processes effectively address concerns of faculty who are men.	3.72		
Pair 9 Faculty at NDSU who are women are encouraged to provide suggestions on how to improve the work flow in their unit.	3.63	38	0.01
Faculty at NDSU who are men are encouraged to provide suggestions on how to improve the work in their unit.	4.18		
Pair 10 Women faculty feel a part of the NDSU community.	3.62	34	0.01
Men faculty feel a part of the NDSU community.	4.15		
Pair 11 Women faculty at NDSU feel a part of the Fargo/Moorhead community.	3.81	31	0.11
Men faculty at NDSU feel a part of the Fargo/Moorhead community	4.00		
Pair 12 Communication between administrators women faculty is effective.	3.34	38	0.00
Communication between administrators and men faculty is effective.	3.95		
Pair 13 The networking opportunities for faculty who are women are helpful.	3.80	35	NS
The networking opportunities for faculty who are men are helpful	3.86		
Pair 14 The mentoring opportunities for faculty who are men are helpful.	3.62	37	NS
The mentoring opportunities for faculty who are women are helpful.	3.81		
Pair 15 Annual evaluations of women faculty help them advance their careers.	3.90	40	NS
Annual evaluations of men faculty help them advance their careers.	4.03		

The appropriate statistical test for differences in paired items is a "paired samples T-Test." This is a test that assesses whether answers across a pair of items differ for the same respondent; in this case the test measures whether the respondent feels that a the concept tapped by an item differs for men and women faculty in the NDSU community as a whole. Results of this analysis appear in Table three.

Of the fifteen possible pairs of items, there are significant differences for ten pairs, all of which indicate that respondents believe the climate is more difficult for women faculty. These items capture a perception that service expectations after tenure are less reasonable for women faculty, that women are disadvantaged by the existing tenure process, that women are more likely to demonstrate respect for individual and cultural differences, that they are less likely to be empowered to solve problems, that formal and informal grievance processes are less effective for women, that they are less likely to be asked for suggestions on how to improve the work flow in their units, feel less a part of the Fargo/Moorehead community, and have less effective communication with administrators. Given that this test taps difference WITHIN the same respondent (which minimizes variation), this is a very significant pattern of results. Items for which differences are not significant include two on promotion to full, two on mentoring/networking, and one on annual evaluations.

There are eight additional items in these two sections that tap administrators' perceptions of the NDSU climate as a whole for men and women faculty. For comparisons of these items across groups of faculty, independent samples t-tests are appropriate. Results for these items and comparisons across men and women and STEM and non-STEM administrators appear in table four. The first column of results indicates the sample mean, the second is the value obtained when subtracting one group's mean from the other (e.g., the mean for men administrators minus the mean for women administrators). A positive value indicates that the reference group's mean (men administrators or STEM administrators) is higher than the comparison group (women administrators or non-STEM administrators). A bold value indicates this difference is statistically significant (p<0.05).

Table 4. NDSU Climate comparisons	Sample Mean	Men v. Women	STEM v. Non-STEM
Academic Administrators at NDSU are equally accessible to faculty who are men and faculty who are women.	3.79	**1.36**	0.45
NDSU has an equitable process for nominating faculty who are men and faculty who are women for awards.	3.61	**2.05**	0.85
Policies are applied equitably to faculty who are men and faculty who are women.	3.62	**1.85**	0.19
Search committees at NDSU receive sufficient resources for gathering a gender diverse faculty candidate pool.	3.10	0.34	-0.73
Resources are allocated equitably to faculty who are women and faculty who are men.	3.23	**1.71**	0.55
There is a need for institutional transformation at NDSU to create more gender equality.	3.71	**-1.32**	-0.35
Faculty at NDSU (men and women) have a shared sense of mission for the university.	3.50	0.74	-0.56
On the department level, NDSU has a transparent process for allocating resources to men and women faculty	3.29	**1.85**	0.12

Sample means for all of these items indicate a marginal to moderate level of agreement – all are in the 3.1 to 3.8 range. The highest levels of agreement are for the items assessing whether administrators are equally accessible to men and women (X = 3.79), and – significantly – in the perception that there is a need for institutional transformation to create more gender equity at NDSU (X = 3.71). The lowest level

of mean agreement is with the item tapping whether search committees receive sufficient resources for gathering a gender diverse faculty pool (X = 3.10).

There are significant differences on six of the eight items for men adminstrators versus women administrators, however, and in all cases women's attitudes about climate are significantly more negative than men's. The largest mean difference is for the item that taps attitudes about nominations for awards – men administrators (X $_{men}$ = 4.38) are significantly more likely than women administrators (X $_{women}$ = 2.33) to believe that NDSU has an equitable process for nominating men and women faculty for awards. Men administrators are also significantly more likely than women administrators to believe that policies are applied equitably to men and women faculty, that NDSU has a transparent process for allocating resources to men and women faculty, that resources are allocated equally to men and women faculty, and that academic administrators are equally accessible to men and women faculty. Importantly, men administrators (X $_{men}$ = 3.28) are significantly *less* likely than women administrators (X $_{women}$ = 4.60) to believe that institutional transformation to achieve gender equity is necessary at NDSU. There are no significant differences in mean values for STEM verus non-STEM administators on any of these items. This means that the differences between men administrators and women administrators are NOT due to the fact that men are more likely to be in STEM colleges (and women in non-STEM colleges). This pattern of difference illustrates a significantly different (and more pessimistic) view of the NDSU gender climate among women administrators.

3. Unit climate – recruitment, retention, promotion and leadership (item four)

Item four taps respondent attitudes on recruitment, retention, promotion and leadership within their units. The statement that leads into these items is: "With respect to campus climate, recruitment, retention, promotion and leadership, please rate your level of agreement with the following statements relating to faculty in your UNIT, on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree."

The pattern of means in response to these questions, reported in table five, is illuminating. The highest mean value is for recruitment – administrators generally believe their units have tried to recruit women faculty (item two), and that climates in their units are supportive for women (item three), largely due to successful efforts to enhance that climate (item four). However, respondents also believe that their units would benefit from more women in application pools (item one) and in leadership positions (item five). Administrators are far less positive about their units' efforts to retain and promote women, however; the means for all of these items are among the lowest of any in the table. This perhaps suggests that efforts around hiring have been perceived as successful, but that more resources should be concentrated on retention, promotion and leadership for women.

Table 5. Unit climate comparisons

	Sample Mean	Men minus Women	STEM minus non-STEM
My unit would benefit from more candidates who are women in applicant pools.	3.71	**1.52**	0.94
My unit has actively tried to recruit faculty who are women.	4.45	0.38	0.58
The climate for faculty who are women in my unit is supportive.	4.29	0.79	0.38
My unit has taken steps to enhance the climate for faculty who are women.	4.21	0.54	0.17
My unit would benefit from more faculty who are women in leadership positions (e.g., program coordinators, PTE or search committee chairs, department heads/chairs).	3.85	0.55	0.42
My unit has developed a specific plan to move faculty who are women into leadership positions.	2.36	0.44	-0.43
My unit has developed a specific plan to retain faculty who are women.	2.73	**0.95**	-0.62
My faculty unit has developed a specific plan to mentor faculty who are women.	3.10	**1.29**	-0.21
My unit has developed a specific plan to promote faculty who are women.	2.78	0.50	-0.25
I would do more for faculty who are women in my unit, but there would be negative reactions from the faculty who are men in my unit.	1.65	-0.43	-0.10

There are three significant differences between men and women administrators on these items – men administrators (X_{men} = 4.16) are more likely than women (X_{women} = 2.64) to believe their units would benefit from more women in applicant pools, and men administrators are more likely to say their units have specific plans to retain (X_{men} = 3.04, X_{women} = 2.09) and mentor (X_{men} = 3.56, X_{women} = 2.27) faculty who are women. The result in the first case is probably due to the fact that men are more likely to be in more heavily male-dominated units. The meaning of results for the latter two items are unclear – either men administrators are more likely to be in units with mentoring or retention plans, or they are more likely to *believe* their units have such plans. Given the results to this point, the latter explanation seems more plausible – a review of policy would help to adjudicate this. There are no significant differences for STEM versus non-STEM administrators. As with the issues on NDSU climate, this suggests that issues around recruitment, retention and promotion of women exist campus-wide, rather than in particular colleges.

4. Work/family lives of faculty in unit (item 6)

This section of the instrument consists of several combination items assessing work/life balance issues in units. The statement leading into this section is: "Statements with respect to the personal lives of faculty in your UNIT: FIRST, please indicate your level of agreement with each statement on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree. THEN, please indicate whether you perceive a difference on each statement for NDSU faculty who are women compared to faculty who are men." This is a somewhat unusual item structure. The first part of the questions – level of agreement – is standard, and higher values indicate higher levels of agreement. The second part is more difficult to assess. The response options for this piece of the question are "yes," "no" and "don't know." As the question asks

only whether a respondent perceives difference, rather than whether such things are harder for men versus women, theoretically a perception of difference could go in either direction. Table six lists the sample means for the items, as well as the distribution of responses to the "difference" item for each question.

Table 6. Unit climate for work and family		Different for Men versus Women? (%)		
	Sample Mean	Yes	No	Don't Know
It is difficult for faculty in my unit to adjust their work schedules to care for children or other family members.	2.53	44%	28%	28%
It is difficult for faculty in my unit to attend meetings held early in the morning or late in the afternoon due to family obligations.	3.29	60%	22%	19%
My unit has supportive policies for faculty with a new baby/child.	4.05	65%	22%	14%
My unit has supportive policies for faculty with dependent care responsibilities.	3.89	63%	14%	23%
My unit is supportive of new faculty hires who need to utilize spousal/partner hiring.	4.14	65%	15%	21%
Faculty in my unit who have children are considered by their peers to be less committed to their careers.	1.76	59%	21%	21%
Pace and pressure in my unit have a negative influence on the personal lives of faculty.	3.00	62%	15%	24%

Sample means range from a low of 1.76, indicating a very low level of agreement, for the item assessing whether faculty who have children are perceived as less committed, to a highs of 4.14 and 4.05 for the items asking whether administrators believe their units support spousal/partner hiring and have supportive policies for faculty with new children. For six of the seven items, more than 50% of respondents indicate that men and women differ along these dimensions. It is reasonable to assume, given women's status as primary caregivers, that these responses indicate administrators believe women have more difficulty balancing work and family. It is worth noting the high numbers of "don't know" responses, which range from 14% to 28% of respondents.

Table 7 compares differences in mean values for levels of agreement for these items for men and women and STEM versus non-STEM administrators. There are very clear differences in these items between men and women administrators; for five of the seven items women administrators describe the work/family climate for faculty as more difficult than men. Women administrators are more significantly more likely than men administrators to agree that faculty have difficulty in balancing their work and family lives; specifically, that it is difficult for faculty to adjust work schedules to care for children or family (X_{men} = 2.09, X_{women} = 3.50) and to attend late/early meetings (X_{men} = 2.95, X_{women} = 4.30), and to agree that faculty who have children are considered by their peers to be less committed to their careers. This latter difference is especially dramatic; the mean for men administrators on this item is 1.18, the lowest for any of these seven items; the mean for women administrators is 3.11. If, as above, we assume that men administrators are more likely than women to be in heavily male-dominated departments, this difference may indicate what other literature suggests – that men faculty who have children are often taken *more*

seriously, but women faculty who have children are perceived as *less* committed to their jobs. It may also simply be that men administrators are less sensitive to these issues, on the whole, than women administrators, who are more likely to have been primary caregivers themselves. Women administrators also perceive a less positive climate than men regarding dependent care (X $_{men}$ = 4.18, X $_{women}$ = 3.25) and spousal hiring (X $_{men}$ = 4.39, X $_{women}$ = 3.29) in their units. There are no significant differences between STEM and non-STEM administrators, again indicating that these differences in perceptions are campus-wide, rather than concentrated in STEM units.

Table 7. Unit work/family climate comparisons	Sample Mean	Men minus Women	STEM minus non-STEM
It is difficult for faculty in my unit to adjust their work schedules to care for children or other family members.	2.53	**-1.40**	-0.37
It is difficult for faculty in my unit to attend meetings held early in the morning or late in the afternoon due to family obligations.	3.29	**-1.35**	-0.45
My unit has supportive policies for faulty with a new baby/child.	4.05	0.87	0.25
My unit has supportive policies for faculty with dependent care responsibilities.	3.89	**0.93**	0.43
My unit is supportive of new faculty hires who need to utilize spousal/partner hiring.	4.14	**1.11**	0.07
Faculty in my unit who have children are considered by their peers to be less committed to their careers.	1.76	**-1.93**	-0.39
Pace and pressure in my unit have a negative influence on the personal lives of faculty.	3.00	-0.94	-0.19

Tests of the differences in the proportions of administrators who say "yes" to the difference items (e.g., in the proportion of administrators who believe that there is a difference between men and women in the difficulty they face in adjusting work schedules to care for children or other family member) largely follow this pattern, with larger numbers of women administrators perceiving differences between men and women. The largest such difference is again on the item assessing whether faculty who have children are perceived to be less committed by their peers: 77% of women administrators perceive that there is a difference in this regard between men and women faculty versus only 25% of men. There are no significant differences in perceptions of difference between STEM and non-STEM administrators.

5. NDSU programs for campus climate, recruitment, retention, promotion and leadership (item seven)

This section of the instrument consists of a set of policy items respondents are asked to rate in terms of their value. The statement leading into this section of the instrument is: "Existing NDSU Programs for campus climate, recruitment, retention, promotion and leadership as they relate to faculty in your UNIT: please rate your perception of the value of each program to your UNIT on a scale from 1 to 5, were 1=not at all valuable and 5=very valuable. " Though respondents could answer that they had not heard of a

particular program, this occurred for only two respondents in total; these responses were coded as missing data. Table 8 presents the distribution of these items and differences in mean values on these policy items for men and women administrators and STEM versus non-STEM administrators.

As these responses indicate, respondents perceived all of these programs as moderately valuable, with a low of 3.17 on a five point scale for online sexual harassment training, and mean values greater than four for on campus child care (X = 4.50), extension of the tenure clock (X = 4.40), and spousal/partner hiring (X = 4.22).

Table 8 reports Table 8. NDSU Policy comparisons

	Sample Mean	Men minus Women	STEM minus non-STEM
Extension of the tenure clock	4.40	-0.32	0.14
Spousal/partner hiring	4.22	0.22	0.23
Required training for search committee chairs.	3.56	0.06	0.37
On-line training for search committee chairs.	3.33	-0.02	0.68
Required on-line sexual harassment training	3.17	-0.34	0.75
On campus child care services	4.50	0.38	0.48
Advance FORWARD Programs	3.57	-0.01	0.63

There are no significant differences between men and women administrators in their views of the value of these NDSU policies – this is the first set of items on the survey for which this is the case. Nor are these significant differences between STEM and non-STEM administrators. From an administrative point of view this is good news; it suggests broad consensus about the value of policies aimed at assisting faculty with work/life balance.

6.   ADVANCE FORWARD Programs (item eight)

This section lists several ADVANCE FORWARD initiatives and asks respondents to rate their value. The statement leading into this section of the instrument is: "Please rate your perception of the value to your UNIT of each of the following existing NDSU Advance FORWARD programs for campus climate, recruitment, retention, promotion, and leadership as they relate to faculty, on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1=not at all valuable and 5=very valuable."

Respondents were also offered the option of choosing a response indicating they had not heard of a particular program. These numbers were generally low, but ranged across programs: Allies/Advocates Program: 10%, Course release program: 17%, LEAP grant: 14%, Climate research grant: 21%, Travel grants: 0%, Leadership development grants: 10%, Junior faculty cohort mentoring program: 7%, FORWARD lecture series, 0%. Further analysis indicates that almost all of the respondents who indicated they had "never heard" of a particular program are in non-STEM colleges, with the exception of one STEM

respondent each for the course release, LEAP grant, and junior faculty cohort mentoring programs, three STEM respondents for the Climate research grants, two for the Leadership development grants. These respondents are excluded for the purposes of the following comparisons. The reader should keep in mind, however, that more non-STEM than STEM respondents have been excluded for this reason. Combined with the fact that twelve of the original 42 respondents chose not to list their colleges, this means that the comparison population for non-STEM respondents for some items is quite small (in one case, as few as six non-STEM respondents). Table nine reports the mean difference comparisons for men and women and STEM versus non-STEM administrators.

Table 9. ADVANCE FORWARD Policy comparisons

	Sample Mean	Men minus Women	STEM minus non-STEM
Allies/advocates program	3.32	0.37	-0.48
Course release program	3.71	-0.04	1.27
Leap grant program	3.81	0.2	1.26
Climate research grant	3.54	-0.47	0.67
Travel grants	4.47	0.17	0.55
Leadership development grants	4.09	0.08	0.48
Junior faculty cohort mentoring program	3.87	0.18	**0.90**
FORWARD Lecture Series	3.40	-0.25	0.75

On the whole, respondents rate all of these programs at moderately to highly valuable. The lowest rating is for the Allies/Advocates Program (X = 3.32), the highest is for travel grants (X = 4.47); leadership development grants are also perceived as highly valuable (X = 4.09). As for the previous policy items, there are no significant differences between men and women administrators. Again, this suggests broad consensus about the value of policies aimed at creating institutional transformation. For the reasons discussed above, the STEM/non-STEM comparisons are less useful, though there is one significant difference – STEM respondents (mean value = 4.50) perceive junior faculty cohort mentoring programs as more valuable than non-STEM respondents (mean value = 3.60). Again, the relative lack of differences suggests a fairly high level of consensus about policies across groups of administrators.

7. Decisions to leave (item nine)

The final set of items on the instrument assesses the most important reasons respondents believe men and women faculty leave their units. This is a series of items for which respondents were asked to choose the top five reasons they believe men and women leave. The statement leading into these questions is: "Of the following factors, please check the FIVE you believe most contribute to the decision to leave your unit by faculty who are WOMEN and by faculty who are MEN." The top five reasons for each are exactly the same – receiving another offer (#1 for both men and women), the weather (#2 for women, #3 for men), failing to meet expectations for research (#3 for women, #2 for men), a desire to relocate to be closer to family (#4 for both), and a lack of spousal accommodation (#5 for both).

Table 10. Paired items for faculty turnover reasons, with tests of significance

		Mean	N	Sig.
Pair 1	Women: Unable to meet expectations for teaching	0.14	42	0.04
	Men: Unable to meet expectations for teaching	0.24		
Pair 2	Women: Unable to meet expectations for research	0.40	42	0.01
	Men: Unable to meet expectations for research	0.57		
Pair 3	Women: Not having enough resources to conduct research	0.29	42	NS
	Men: Not having enough resources to conduct research	0.31		
Pair 4	Women: Too many service obligations	0.29	42	0.00
	Men: Too many service obligations	0.00		
Pair 5	Women: Receiving an offer for another job	0.57	42	0.01
	Men: Receiving an offer for another job	0.79		
Pair 6	Women: Conflict within the unit	0.19	42	NS
	Men: Conflict within the unit	0.24		
Pair 7	Women: Not compatible with direction of unit	0.12	42	NS
	Men: Not compatible with direction of unit	0.17		
Pair 8	Women: Subtle or overt discrimination	0.05	42	NS
	Men: Subtle or overt discrimination	0.02		
Pair 9	Women: Subtle or overt harassment	0.05	42	NS
	Men: Subtle or overt harassment	0.02		
Pair 10	Women: Frustration with informal systems at NDSU (e.g., cliques, unwritten rules)	0.19	42	0.02
	Men: Frustration with informal systems at NDSU (e.g., cliques, unwritten rules)	0.07		
Pair 11	Women: A partner/spouse with an academic career not being accommodated at NDSU	0.36	42	NS
	Men: A partner/spouse with an academic career not being accommodated at NDSU	0.33		
Pair 12	Women: Lack of supportive family leave policy/options	0.12	42	NS
	Men: Lack of supportive family leave policy/options	0.07		
Pair 13	Women: Need/desire to live closer to family	0.40	42	NS
	Men: Need/desire to live closer to family	0.40		
Pair 14	Women: Not liking the weather	0.43	42	NS
	Men: Not liking the weather	0.45		
Pair 15	Women: Not liking the community	0.19	42	0.04
	Men: Not liking the community	0.29		
Pair 16	Women: Negative Perception of NDSU's prestige as an institution	0.02	42	NS
	Men: Negative Perception of NDSU's prestige as an institution	0.10		

As the same respondent was asked to choose from an identical set of reasons for women and men faculty, the appropriate statistical test is again a paired samples test. This test taps differences between two items within the same respondent. As these were simple yes/no choices, the means for these items

should be read as the proportion of respondents who chose a particular option. Table ten presents the results of this analysis.

Tests of six of these sixteen pairs achieve statistical significance. Specifically, respondents perceive that men are more likely than women to leave because they are unable to meet expectations for teaching, because they are unable to meet expectations for research, because they have received another job offer, and because they do not like the community. Respondents perceive that women are more likely than men to leave because of heavy service obligations and frustration with informal systems (cliques, unwritten rules) at NDSU. There are no significant differences in perceptions across the other ten item pairs.

8. Conclusions and implications

Taking all of the university and climate items together reveals a pattern of marginally positive responses (i.e., mean values of agreement above three on a five point scale), to items assessing whether administrators believe the climate is gender equitable for men and women faculty. There is also relatively strong agreement on the need for institutional transformation to create gender equality (X = 3.71 for this item), however.

There is far less agreement that units have concrete policies in place to retain, promote, and advance women into leadership positions, however. This suggests that while administrators feel that they have made efforts to recruit women and improve the climate in their units, they have far less in place in the way of concrete plans to retain, promote, and advance women faculty into leadership positions. This strongly implies that this is an area in need of attention. Unit heads would perhaps benefit from the distribution of best practices to help them develop their own policies, and/or the establishment of broadly-based programs to help accomplish these aims, such as the ADVANCE initiatives.

For almost all climate items, women administrators are significantly less positive than men. Women administrators perceive less gender equity on campus and in their units, and significantly more conflict, especially for women faculty, in balancing work and family obligations. Interestingly, there are no differences between STEM and non-STEM administrators on any of these dimensions. This argues strongly for efforts to address the university and campus climate that target all colleges, rather than STEM units. The fact that women administrators are more likely to perceive problems than men also argues quite strongly for including men as central players in efforts to document inequities and create change.

One of the most positive findings from the survey is the broad consensus about policies aimed at increasing gender equity. All administrators (men/women, STEM/non-STEM) believe these policies are valuable. This is particularly true for policies – like stopping the tenure clock and child care – aimed at helping faculty balance work and family. Administrators also agree that the ADVANCE FORWARD initiatives (such as small grants and mentoring programs) are valuable. This suggests that policy initiatives to address gender equity, particularly in the areas of work/family balance, should elicit widespread support among administrators.

2008 NDSU FORWARD Faculty Work/Life Balance
Survey Results of Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty:
Significant findings related to GENDER

Prepared September 2010

Introduction

The faculty work/life survey is part of the Advance FORWARD project at North Dakota State University (NDSU). This survey collected baseline data on a variety of topics important to faculty: the hiring process at NDSU, the tenure process at NDSU, professional activities, satisfaction with NDSU, NDSU programs and resources, balancing personal and professional life, women faculty at NDSU, and demographics.

The full report presenting detailed survey results, entitled *Faculty Work/Life Balance: Results of the 2008 NDSU FORWARD Survey*, is available on the NDSU FORWARD website at http://www.ndsu.edu/forward/. This mini-report summarizes differences found to be statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level based on respondents' gender.

Survey data were collected mid-December 2008 through early February 2009 via a web survey. Of the 224 tenured or tenure-track faculty who responded to the survey, 49 percent (109 respondents) were male, 41 percent were female (91 respondents), and 11 percent did not identify their gender (24 respondents). According to data from NDSU's Office of Institutional Research and Analysis, 74 percent of the 488 tenured and tenure track faculty at NDSU in fall 2008 were men and 26 percent were women.

Significant results based on respondent's gender

➢ Women were more likely to feel that their department has not identified ways to actively recruit women, not identified ways to enhance the climate for women, or not taken steps to enhance the climate for women at all. They were less likely to think that their department has actively recruited women faculty or made an effort to promote women into leadership positions. They were more likely to think that their department has too few women faculty in leadership positions and that their department has not identified ways to move women into leadership positions.

➢ Overall, and among women in non-STEM designated colleges, women were more likely than men to express uncertainty about taking on formal leadership positions at NDSU. Overall, and among women in STEM designated colleges, women were more likely to say there were barriers preventing them from doing so (many of which were gender-related barriers).

➢ Women were more likely to have been hired as an Assistant Professor (and less likely to have been hired as an Associate Professor or full Professor) than men. Women were less likely to have been at NDSU more than 5 years and were less likely to be tenured at the time of the survey. These characteristics likely contribute to less participation in certain professional activities among women compared to men, such as being less likely to have served on or chaired a promotion committee in their department, chaired other types of committees, held (or hold) an administrative role in their department or college, or held a role as principal investigator on an educational grant in the past. Overall, and among women in STEM designated colleges, women were less likely to have held a position as chair of a major committee in a professional organization or association outside NDSU or held a position as editor of a journal.

➢ Number of years at NDSU and tenure status are clearly prominent factors in faculty's achievements and professional activities; however, it is still important to discuss the element of gender. Specifically, these three dynamics interrelate (i.e., gender, tenure status, and length of time at NDSU) and contribute to an overall environment at NDSU in which there are too few women serving in key leadership positions and too few women who can serve as mentors to junior faculty.

➢ At the time of the survey, women spent slightly more time on service activities than men and less time on administrative duties. They wanted to see a somewhat larger decrease in the amount of time they spend on teaching and a slightly larger decrease in time spent on service than the decreases men wanted to see.

➢ Women were more likely than men to say they did or will experience the tenure or promotion process to Associate Professor at NDSU, and among these respondents, women were less likely to have tenure or an indefinite appointment already and less likely to feel (or have felt) supported in their advancement to tenure/promotion. Women were more likely to have reset the tenure clock.

➢ Women were more likely than men to say that they do not have colleagues on campus who do similar research, that they feel their research is not considered mainstream, and that they feel isolated in the department. Overall, and among women in non-STEM designated colleges, women were more likely to feel that their colleagues do not value their research and were less likely to feel that they "fit" in their department. They were also less likely to have collaborated in the past with colleagues in their department.

➢ Women were more likely to not feel like full and equal participants in problem-solving and decision-making in their primary department/unit. They were also more likely to say that department meetings do not allow for all faculty to share their views and that they feel excluded from an informal network in their department.

➢ Overall, and among women in STEM designated colleges, women were less likely than men to strongly agree that they are treated with respect by staff. Overall, and among women in non-STEM designated colleges, women were less likely than men to strongly agree that they are treated with respect by colleagues and more likely to say that they encounter unwritten rules concerning how they are expected to interact with colleagues.

➢ Women were more likely to say that the pedagogical luncheons/workshops program is very valuable. They were more likely to have heard of WISMET and the Advance FORWARD programs, more likely to say the programs are very valuable, and more likely to have used the programs. They were also more likely to have used the new faculty orientation, the Gear Up for Grants, and the faculty mentoring programs, but less likely to have used the workshops for search committees program.

➢ Women were less satisfied than men with the way in which they balance their professional and personal life and agreed more that they have seriously considered leaving NDSU in order to achieve better balance between work and personal life. Women agreed more than men that they often have to forego professional activities such as sabbaticals or conferences because of personal responsibilities.

➢ Women were more likely than men at NDSU to be single. They were less likely to have cared for dependent children, currently or in the past. However, among respondents who have had or currently have children, women were more likely to currently use or need childcare. Among these respondents who need childcare, women were much more likely to have said that finding childcare when they are away at conferences/special events and finding extended hour childcare when they must work evenings/nights/weekends are childcare issues.

➢ Among respondents who were not single, women were more likely to have spouses who work (and prefer to work) full-time, and more likely to have spouses that work at NDSU. They were more likely to have said they have seriously considered leaving NDSU to enhance their spouse/partner's career and leaving Fargo/Moorhead to enhance both their careers.

➢ Women were less likely to have rated their overall health at the time of the survey as excellent, less likely to feel well-rested at least sometimes, and less likely to feel physically fit quite often. They were more likely to say they feel fatigued, stressed, nervous, depressed, and short-tempered quite often.

➢ Women were less likely to be in STEM designated colleges, less likely to be tenured at the time of the survey, less likely to have been at NDSU more than 5 years, and less likely to be in a college that had a "low" proportion of women.

➢ Women were more influenced by salary and benefits in their decision to accept a position at NDSU than men. They were more likely to hesitate to accept a position at NDSU because of opportunities for their spouse/partner and climate for women.

Highlights of the 2008 NDSU FORWARD Work/Life Survey Results of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty:
College of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Natural Resources

Prepared September 2010

Introduction

The faculty work/life survey is part of the Advance FORWARD project at NDSU. This survey collected baseline data on a variety of topics important to faculty: the hiring process at NDSU, the tenure process at NDSU, professional activities, satisfaction with NDSU, NDSU programs and resources, balancing personal and professional life, women faculty at NDSU, and demographics. Survey data were collected mid-December 2008 through early February 2009 via a web survey, with NDSU IRB approval. Of the 224 tenured or tenure track faculty who responded to the survey, 50 indicated that the College of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Natural Resources (AFSNR) was the primary college to which they were assigned. The full report presenting detailed survey results, entitled *Faculty Work/Life Balance: Results of the 2008 NDSU FORWARD Survey*, is available on the NDSU FORWARD website at http://www.ndsu.edu/forward/. This mini-report presents highlights of the survey results for the College of AFSNR – overall and by gender. When differences in responses based on gender were found to be statistically significant at the p< .05 level, they are marked with an *.

Overview

Women tenured and tenure track faculty in the College of AFSNR were significantly less likely than men faculty to have tenure. Other statistically significant differences include that women, on average, agreed much more than men that they receive/received feedback on their progress toward tenure and promotion; however, they agreed much less than men that they are/were satisfied with the overall tenure and promotion process. Among faculty who indicated they are interested in (or are unsure about) taking on formal leadership positions at NDSU, a much higher proportion of women indicated that there are barriers preventing them from taking on such positions. Gender issues were among the barriers cited. Women, on average, agreed less than their male colleagues that they are treated with respect by staff. Women agreed much more than men that they encounter unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with colleagues. Women were much more in agreement than men that their department is supportive of family leave and that their department has a supportive policy for faculty who have a new baby.

Highlights for the *College of AFSNR*

Characteristics of Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty in the College of AFSNR
- 50 tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of AFSNR responded to the survey; 36% (n=18) of respondents were women, 62% (n=31) were men, and 2% (n=1) did not identify her or his gender.

- 44% of women and 36% of men faculty said they currently have children ages 18 or younger (40% overall). However, 47% of women compared to 77% of men said they have cared for or currently care for dependent children (64% overall).

- 28% of women (N=5) and 26% of men (N=8) said they have provided care for an aging parent or relative in the past three years (26% overall).

- 89% of women and 77% of men were of a majority status, i.e., self-identified as "white, not of Hispanic origin" (80% overall).

*Differences in responses based on gender statistically significant at p < .05

Women Faculty at NDSU
- Among tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of AFSNR who gave an answer regarding statements about recruitment of, climate for, and leadership opportunities for women faculty in their primary department/unit, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women agreed somewhat less than men that the climate for women in their department is good (mean = 3.29 for women, 3.45 for men, 3.40 overall).
  - Women agreed less than men that there are too few women faculty in their department (mean = 2.33 for women, 2.76 for men, 2.60 overall).
  - Women agreed less than men that their department has actively recruited women faculty (mean = 2.77 for women, 3.07 for men, 3.00 overall).
  - Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether their department has too few women faculty in leadership positions (mean = 2.81 for women, 2.82 for men, 2.78 overall).
  - Women agreed much less than men that that their department has made an effort to promote women into leadership positions (mean = 2.45 for women, 3.06 for men, 2.83 overall).
  - Women agreed somewhat more than men that their department has identified ways to enhance the climate for women (mean = 2.77 for women, 2.65 for men, 2.70 overall).
  - Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether their department has taken steps to enhance the climate for women (mean = 2.71 for women, 2.75 for men, 2.74 overall).

Hiring and Tenure Process
- 28% of women and 39% of men faculty were recruited to apply for a position at NDSU (32% overall).

- 24% of women had tenure compared to 81% of men, regardless of where they went through the process (60% overall)*.

- The three most common factors in faculty members' decision to accept a position at NDSU were research opportunities (61% of women, 45% of men, 50% overall); colleagues in the department/unit/lab (39% of women, 36% of men, 36% overall); and geographic location (33% of women, 36% of men, 34% overall).

- The three most common factors that caused faculty members to hesitate about accepting a position at NDSU were geographic location (44% of women, 52% of men, 50% overall); salary and benefits (28% of women, 45% of men, 38% overall); and support for research (33% of women, 13% of men, 22% overall).

- Among faculty who did (or will) experience the tenure process at NDSU, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women agreed much less than men that they are/were satisfied with the overall tenure and promotion process (mean = 2.54 for women, 3.24 for men, 3.03 overall)*.
  - Women agreed much more than men that they receive/received feedback on their progress toward tenure and promotion (mean = 3.46 for women, 2.58 for men, 2.92 overall)*.

Professional Activities
- 39% of women and 27% of men faculty indicated that they are interested in taking on formal leadership positions at NDSU (32% overall). An additional 39% of women and 27% of men said they were not sure if they are interested (30% overall). Among these interested (or unsure) respondents, 46% of women and 13% of men indicated that there are barriers preventing them from taking on such a position (26% overall)*. Barriers include lack of openings, limited internal support, and family commitments as well as gender issues such as few women in leadership roles and a male dominated environment.

*Differences in responses based on gender statistically significant at p < .05

- Regarding statements about the resources available to them at NDSU, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  o Women faculty agreed less than men faculty that they have colleagues on campus who do similar research (mean = 2.56 for women, 2.93 for men, 2.79 overall).
  o Women agreed somewhat less than men that they have colleagues or peers who give them career advice or guidance when they need it (mean = 2.94 for women, 3.08 for men, 2.98 overall).
  o Women agreed more than men that they have sufficient teaching support (mean = 2.47 for women, 2.15 for men, 2.23 overall).
  o Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether they have enough office support (mean = 3.06 for women, 3.13 for men, 3.12 overall).

- Regarding statements about interactions with colleagues and others in their primary department/unit, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  o Women faculty agreed less than men faculty that they are treated with respect by staff (mean = 3.31 for women, 3.77 for men, 3.62 overall)*, by colleagues (mean = 3.00 for women, 3.43 for men, 3.28 overall), by their department chair/head (mean = 3.31 for women, 3.61 for men, 3.49 overall), and by students (mean = 3.25 for women, 3.57 for men, 3.47 overall).
  o Women agreed less than men that colleagues in their department solicit their opinion about work-related matters (mean = 3.00 for women, 3.37 for men, 3.24 overall).
  o Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether they feel that their colleagues value their research (mean = 2.94 for women, 2.96 for men, 2.96 overall).
  o Women agreed less than men that they feel like they "fit" in their department (mean = 2.87 for women, 3.27 for men, 3.15 overall).
  o Women agreed much more than men that they encounter unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with colleagues (mean = 2.73 for women, 1.97 for men, 2.20 overall)*.
  o Women agreed more than men that they feel excluded from an informal network in their department (mean = 2.31 for women, 1.97 for men, 2.09 overall) and that they feel isolated in their department (mean = 2.00 for women, 1.62 for men, 1.74 overall).
  o Women agreed somewhat more than men that they feel isolated on the NDSU campus overall (mean = 1.73 for women, 1.57 for men, 1.63 overall).
  o Women agreed somewhat less than men that they do a great deal of work that is not formally recognized by their department (mean = 2.80 for women, 2.97 for men, 2.89 overall).

- Regarding statements about their participation in the decision-making process in their primary department/unit, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  o Women agreed less than men that committee assignments are rotated fairly to allow for participation of all faculty (mean = 2.27 for women, 2.75 for men, and 2.59 overall).
  o Women faculty agreed less than men faculty that department meetings allow for all faculty members to share their views (mean = 2.88 for women, 3.14 for men, 3.07 overall).
  o Women agreed less than men that they feel like full and equal participants in problem-solving and decision-making (mean = 2.73 for women, 3.07 for men, 2.96 overall).
  o Women agreed much less than men that their department chair/head involves them in decision-making (mean = 2.44 for women, 3.07 for men, 2.85 overall).
  o Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether they have a voice in how resources are allocated (mean = 2.53 for women, 2.55 for men, 2.53 overall).

*Differences in responses based on gender statistically significant at p < .05

Satisfaction with NDSU

- Regarding statements about satisfaction with NDSU among tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of AFSNR, on a 4-point scale (1=very dissatisfied, 4=very satisfied):
  - Women faculty were somewhat less satisfied than men faculty, in general, with their job at NDSU (mean = 3.22 for women, 3.42 for men, 3.36 overall).
  - Women were less satisfied than men with the way their career has progressed at NDSU (mean = 2.94 for women, 3.29 for men, 3.18 overall).

NDSU Programs and Resources
- Tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of AFSNR who had heard of each program, reported the value of various programs on the NDSU campus, on a 4-point scale (1=not at all valuable, 4=very valuable):
  - Women faculty rated the extension of the tenure clock program as somewhat more valuable than men faculty did (mean = 3.25 for women, 3.00 for men, 3.07 overall).
  - Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether the new faculty orientation program (mean = 2.94 for women, 3.03 for men, 3.00 overall) and the spousal/partner hiring program (mean = 3.00 for women, 2.97 for men, 2.96 overall) are valuable.
  - Women rated the faculty mentoring program as less valuable than men did (mean = 2.72 for women, 3.17 for men, 3.00 overall).

Balancing Personal and Professional Life
- Regarding statements about balancing personal and professional lives among tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of AFSNR, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women faculty agreed much less than men faculty that they are usually satisfied with the way in which they balance their professional and personal life (mean = 2.56 for women, 3.06 for men, 2.90 overall).

- Regarding statements about their department/unit's support of work life balance, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women faculty agreed much more than men faculty that the department is supportive of family leave (mean = 3.55 for women, 3.00 for men, 3.21 overall)* and that their department has a supportive policy for faculty who have a new baby (mean = 3.50 for women, 2.79 for men, 3.03 overall)*.
  - Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether most faculty in their department are supportive of colleagues who want to balance family and career lives (mean = 3.18 for women, 3.19 for men, 3.19 overall) and whether it is difficult for faculty in their department to adjust work schedules to care for children or other family members (mean = 2.27 for women, 2.29 for men, 2.28 overall).

*Differences in responses based on gender statistically significant at $p < .05$

Highlights of the 2008 NDSU FORWARD Work/Life Survey Results of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty: *College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences*

Prepared September 2010

Introduction

The faculty work/life survey is part of the Advance FORWARD project at NDSU. This survey collected baseline data on a variety of topics important to faculty: the hiring process at NDSU, the tenure process at NDSU, professional activities, satisfaction with NDSU, NDSU programs and resources, balancing personal and professional life, women faculty at NDSU, and demographics. Survey data were collected mid-December 2008 through early February 2009 via a web survey, with NDSU IRB approval. Of the 224 tenured or tenure track faculty who responded to the survey, 51 indicated that the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences (AHSS) was the primary college to which they were assigned. The full report presenting detailed survey results, entitled *Faculty Work/Life Balance: Results of the 2008 NDSU FORWARD Survey,* is available on the NDSU FORWARD website at http://www.ndsu.edu/forward/. This mini-report presents highlights of the survey results for the College of AHSS – overall and by gender. When differences in responses based on gender were found to be statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level, they are marked with an *.

Overview

Women tenured and tenure track faculty in the College of AHSS were significantly less likely to agree than men faculty that their department has actively recruited women faculty. Women agreed much less than men that their department has identified ways to enhance the climate for women and that the department has taken steps to enhance the climate for women. Women were significantly more likely to have cited climate for women as an important reason for hesitating about accepting a position at NDSU.

Other statistically significant differences include that women, on average, agreed much less than men that their department has made an effort to promote women into leadership positions. A larger proportion of women than men indicated they are not sure if they are interested in taking on formal leadership positions at NDSU; gender issues were among barriers cited as preventing them from taking on such a position.

Women agreed much more than men that they encounter unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with colleagues. Women agreed much less than men that they feel their colleagues value their research. Women agreed much less than men that they feel like full and equal participants in problem-solving and decision-making or that they have a voice in how resources are allocated. Women agreed much less than men that they are usually satisfied with the way in which they balance their professional and personal life. Women agreed much less than men that their department is supportive of family leave.

*Differences in responses based on gender statistically significant at p < .05

Highlights for the *College of AHSS*

Characteristics of Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty in the College of AHSS
- 51 tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of AHSS responded to the survey; 51% (n=26) of respondents were women and 49% (n=25) were men.

- 39% of women and 40% of men faculty said they currently have children ages 18 or younger (39% overall). However, 52% of women compared to 79% of men said they have cared for or currently care for dependent children (63% overall)*.

- 27% of women and 12% of men said they have provided care for an aging parent or relative in the past three years (20% overall).

- 96% of women and 96% of men were of a majority status, i.e., self-identified as "white, not of Hispanic origin" (96% overall).

Women Faculty at NDSU
- Among tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of AHSS who gave an answer regarding statements about recruitment of, climate for, and leadership opportunities for women faculty in their primary department/unit, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women faculty agreed less than men faculty that the climate for women in their department is good (mean = 2.88 for women, 3.30 for men, 3.08 overall).
  - Women agreed much less than men that their department has identified ways to enhance the climate for women (mean = 2.46 for women, 3.10 for men, 2.76 overall)* and that their department has taken steps to enhance the climate for women (mean = 2.38 for women, 3.19 for men, 2.76 overall)*.
  - Women agreed much more than men that their department has too few women faculty in leadership positions (mean = 2.96 for women, 2.40 for men, 2.69 overall).
  - Women agreed much less than men that their department has made an effort to promote women into leadership positions (mean = 2.09 for women, 3.00 for men, 2.48 overall)*.
  - Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether there are too few women faculty in their department (mean = 2.15 for women, 2.08 for men, 2.12 overall).
  - Women agreed much less than men that their department has actively recruited women faculty (mean = 2.64 for women, 3.33 for men, 2.98 overall)*.

Hiring and Tenure Process
- 32% of women and 22% of men faculty were recruited to apply for a position at NDSU (24% overall).

- 50% of women had tenure compared to 75% of men, regardless of where they went through the process (61% overall).

- The three most common factors in faculty members' decision to accept a position at NDSU were colleagues in the department/unit/lab (46% of women, 52% of men, 49% overall); geographic location (42% of women, 36% of men, 39% overall); and teaching opportunities (39% of women, 36% of men, 37% overall).

- The three most common factors that caused faculty members to hesitate about accepting a position at NDSU were geographic location (65% of women, 40% of men, 53% overall); salary and benefits (50% of women, 48% of men, 49% overall); and prestige of university (27% of women, 32% of men, 29% overall). There was a statistically significant difference in responses based on the respondent's gender in indicating that climate for women was an important reason for hesitating about accepting a position at NDSU (27% of women, 4% of men, 16% overall)*.

*Differences in responses based on gender statistically significant at p < .05

- Among faculty who did (or will) experience the tenure process at NDSU, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - o Women and men faculty had similar opinions regarding whether they are/were satisfied with the overall tenure and promotion process (mean = 3.27 for women, 3.18 for men, 3.22 overall) and whether they receive/received feedback on their progress toward tenure and promotion (mean = 3.06 for women, 3.00 for men, 3.03 overall).

Professional Activities
- 27% of women and 63% of men faculty indicated that they are interested in taking on formal leadership positions at NDSU (43% overall) and an additional 46% of women and 17% of men said they were not sure if they are interested (31% overall)*. Among these interested (or unsure) respondents, 58% of women and 32% of men indicated that there are barriers preventing them from taking on such a position (45% overall). Barriers include lacking proper connections, lack of mentorship, conflict with upper administration, not having enough time to dedicate to additional responsibilities, and gender issues such as feeling that assertive women are penalized and positions being granted to men without a formal search process.

- Regarding statements about the resources available to them at NDSU, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - o Women faculty agreed much less than men faculty that they have enough office support (mean = 2.58 for women, 3.24 for men, 2.90 overall)*.
  - o Women agreed somewhat less than men that they have sufficient teaching support (mean = 2.46 for women, 2.56 for men, 2.51 overall).
  - o Women agreed somewhat less than men that they have colleagues or peers who give them career advice or guidance when they need it (mean = 2.69 for women, 2.96 for men, 2.82 overall).
  - o Women agreed less than men that they have colleagues on campus who do similar research (mean = 2.35 for women, 2.83 for men, 2.58 overall).

- Regarding statements about interactions with colleagues and others in their primary department/unit, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - o Women agreed less than men that they are treated with respect by colleagues (mean = 3.12 for women, 3.59 for men, 3.33 overall) and by their department chair/head (mean = 3.27 for women, 3.65 for men, 3.43 overall).
  - o Women faculty agreed somewhat less than men faculty that they are treated with respect by staff (mean = 3.50 for women, 3.77 for men, 3.63 overall).
  - o Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether they are treated with respect by students (mean = 3.42 for women, 3.45 for men, 3.44 overall).
  - o Women agreed somewhat less than men that colleagues in their department solicit their opinion about work-related matters (mean = 3.04 for women, 3.32 for men, 3.17 overall).
  - o Women agreed much less than men that they feel that their colleagues value their research (mean = 2.77 for women, 3.32 for men, 3.02 overall)*.
  - o Women agreed less than men that they feel like they "fit" in their department (mean = 3.00 for women, 3.41 for men, 3.19 overall).
  - o Women agreed much more than men that they encounter unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with colleagues (mean = 2.88 for women, 2.05 for men, 2.49 overall)*.
  - o Women agreed much more than men that that they feel excluded from an informal network in their department (mean = 2.35 for women, 1.82 for men, 2.10 overall).
  - o Women agreed more than men that they feel isolated in their department (mean = 2.08 for women, 1.59 for men, 1.85 overall) and that they feel isolated on the NDSU campus overall (mean = 2.23 for women, 1.77 for men, 2.02 overall).
  - o Women agreed more than men that they do a great deal of work that is not formally recognized by their department (mean = 2.96 for women, 2.64 for men, 2.81 overall).

*Differences in responses based on gender statistically significant at p < .05

- Regarding statements about their participation in the decision-making process in their primary department/unit, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women agreed much less than men that committee assignments are rotated fairly to allow for participation of all faculty (mean = 2.50 for women, 3.00 for men, and 2.74 overall).
  - Women agreed much less than men that they feel like full and equal participants in problem-solving and decision-making (mean = 2.73 for women, 3.29 for men, 3.00 overall)*.
  - Women agreed much less than men that they have a voice in how resources are allocated (mean = 2.27 for women, 2.95 for men, 2.60 overall)*.
  - Women faculty agreed less than men faculty that department meetings allow for all faculty members to share their views (mean = 3.05 for women, 3.48 for men, 3.26 overall).
  - Women agreed somewhat less than men that their department chair/head involves them in decision-making (mean = 2.91 for women, 3.16 for men, 3.02 overall).

Satisfaction with NDSU
- Regarding statements about satisfaction with NDSU among tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of AHSS, on a 4-point scale (1=very dissatisfied, 4=very satisfied):
  - Women faculty were somewhat less satisfied, in general, with their job at NDSU (mean = 2.96 for women, 3.20 for men, 3.08 overall) and with the way their career has progressed at NDSU (mean = 2.96 for women, 3.16 for men, 3.06 overall).

NDSU Programs and Resources
- Tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of AHSS who had heard of each program, reported the value of various programs on the NDSU campus, on a 4-point scale (1=not at all valuable, 4=very valuable):
  - Women faculty rated the new faculty orientation program (mean = 2.42 for women, 2.63 for men, 2.52 overall) and the spousal/partner hiring program (mean = 3.13 for women, 3.32 for men, 3.22 overall) as somewhat less valuable than men faculty did.
  - Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether the extension of the tenure clock program (mean = 3.09 for women, 3.05 for men, 3.07 overall) and the faculty mentoring program (mean = 2.56 for women, 2.48 for men, 2.52 overall) are valuable.

Balancing Personal and Professional Life
- Regarding statements about balancing personal and professional lives among tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of AHSS, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women agreed much less than men that they are usually satisfied with the way in which they balance their professional and personal life (mean = 2.23 for women, 2.88 for men, 2.55 overall)*.

- Regarding statements about their department/unit's support of work life balance, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women faculty agreed much less than men faculty that the department is supportive of family leave (mean = 2.71 for women, 3.57 for men, 3.10 overall)* and that their department has a supportive policy for faculty who have a new baby (mean = 2.68 for women, 3.36 for men, 2.97 overall).
  - Women agreed less than men that most faculty in their department are supportive of colleagues who want to balance family and career lives (mean = 3.17 for women, 3.52 for men, 3.34 overall).
  - Women agreed somewhat more than men that it is difficult for faculty in their department to adjust work schedules to care for children or other family members (mean = 2.04 for women, 1.82 for men, 1.93 overall).

*Differences in responses based on gender statistically significant at p < .05

Highlights of the 2008 NDSU FORWARD Work/Life Survey Results of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty: *College of Business*

Prepared September 2010

The faculty work/life survey is part of the Advance FORWARD project at NDSU. This survey collected baseline data on a variety of topics important to faculty: the hiring process at NDSU, the tenure process at NDSU, professional activities, satisfaction with NDSU, NDSU programs and resources, balancing personal and professional life, women faculty at NDSU, and demographics. Survey data were collected mid-December 2008 through early February 2009 via a web survey, with NDSU IRB approval.

Of the 224 tenured or tenure track faculty who responded to the survey, six indicated that the College of Business was the primary college to which they were assigned. Because of the small number of respondents and concerns about confidentiality, we are unable to present survey results for this college.

The full report presenting detailed survey results, entitled *Faculty Work/Life Balance: Results of the 2008 NDSU FORWARD Survey*, is available on the NDSU FORWARD website at http://www.ndsu.edu/forward/.

Highlights of the 2008 NDSU FORWARD Work/Life Survey Results of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty:
College of Engineering and Architecture

Prepared September 2010

Introduction

The faculty work/life survey is part of the Advance FORWARD project at NDSU. This survey collected baseline data on a variety of topics important to faculty: the hiring process at NDSU, the tenure process at NDSU, professional activities, satisfaction with NDSU, NDSU programs and resources, balancing personal and professional life, women faculty at NDSU, and demographics. Survey data were collected mid-December 2008 through early February 2009 via a web survey, with NDSU IRB approval. Of the 224 tenured or tenure track faculty who responded to the survey, 21 indicated that the College of Engineering and Architecture was the primary college to which they were assigned. The full report presenting detailed survey results, entitled *Faculty Work/Life Balance: Results of the 2008 NDSU FORWARD Survey*, is available on the NDSU FORWARD website at http://www.ndsu.edu/forward/. This mini-report presents highlights of the survey results for the College of Engineering and Architecture – overall and by gender. However, we recommend caution in generalizing these results to the entire college because of a combination of low numbers and a gender imbalance in the proportion of respondents versus non-respondents.

Overview

Women tenured and tenure track faculty in the College of Engineering and Architecture were much less likely than men faculty to have tenure. Women agreed much less than men that their department has actively recruited women faculty. Women agreed much less than men that the climate for women in their department is good and agreed much less that their department has identified ways to enhance the climate for women or taken steps to enhance the climate for women. Women agreed much more than men that they encounter unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with colleagues.

Women agreed much more than men that their department has too few women faculty in leadership positions and agreed much less that their department has made an effort to promote women into leadership positions. Among faculty who indicated they are interested in (or are unsure about) taking on formal leadership positions at NDSU, a much higher proportion of women indicated that there are barriers preventing them from taking on such positions.

Women agreed much less than men that they are usually satisfied with the way in which they balance their professional and personal life. Women agreed much less than men that their department is supportive of family leave.

Highlights for the *College of Engineering and Architecture*

Characteristics of Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty in the College of Engineering and Architecture
- 21 tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of Engineering and Architecture responded to the survey; 71% (n=15) of respondents were men and 29% (n=6) were women.

- 50% of women and 40% of men faculty said they currently have children ages 18 or younger (43% overall). However, 67% of women compared to 79% of men said they have cared for or currently care for dependent children (71% overall).

- No women and 13% of men said they have provided care for an aging parent or relative in the past three years (10% overall).

- 67% of women and 73% of men were of a majority status, i.e., self-identified as "white, not of Hispanic origin" (71% overall).

Women Faculty at NDSU
- Among tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of Engineering and Architecture who gave an answer regarding statements about recruitment of, climate for, and leadership opportunities for women faculty in their primary department/unit, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  o Women faculty agreed much less than men faculty that the climate for women in their department is good (mean = 2.17 for women, 3.33 for men, 3.00 overall).
  o Women agreed much less than men that their department has identified ways to enhance the climate for women (mean = 2.17 for women, 2.92 for men, 2.68 overall) and that their department has taken steps to enhance the climate for women (mean = 2.33 for women, 2.92 for men, 2.74 overall).
  o Women agreed much less than men that their department has actively recruited women faculty (mean = 2.60 for women, 3.14 for men, 3.00 overall).
  o Women agreed much more than men that their department has too few women faculty in leadership positions (mean = 3.67 for women, 2.80 for men, 3.05 overall).
  o Women agreed much less than men that their department has made an effort to promote women into leadership positions (mean = 1.83 for women, 2.58 for men, 2.33 overall).
  o Women agreed somewhat more than men that there are too few women faculty in their department (mean = 3.17 for women, 3.07 for men, 3.10 overall).

Hiring and Tenure Process
- 17% of women and 25% of men faculty were recruited to apply for a position at NDSU (19% overall).

- 33% of women had tenure compared to 80% of men, regardless of where they went through the process (67% overall).

- The most common factor in faculty members' decision to accept a position at NDSU were teaching opportunities (50% of women, 53% of men, 52% overall). Other common factors included geographic location (33% of women, 20% of men, 24% overall); opportunities available for spouse/partner (50% of women, 13% of men, 24% overall); quality of public schools (0% of women, 33% of men, 24% overall); and colleagues in the department/unit/lab (33% of women, 20% of men, 24% overall).

- The three most common factors that caused faculty members to hesitate about accepting a position at NDSU were salary and benefits (100% of women, 53% of men, 67% overall); geographic location (67% of women, 47% of men, 52% overall); and support for research (50% of women, 33% of men, 38% overall).

- Among faculty who did (or will) experience the tenure process at NDSU, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  o Women faculty agreed somewhat less than men faculty that they are/were satisfied with the overall tenure and promotion process (mean = 2.50 for women, 2.78 for men, 2.67 overall) and that they receive/received feedback on their progress toward tenure and promotion (mean = 2.50 for women, 2.78 for men, 2.67 overall).

Professional Activities

- 33% of women and 33% of men faculty indicated that they are interested in taking on formal leadership positions at NDSU (33% overall) and an additional 50% of women and 33% of men said they were not sure if they are interested (38% overall). Among these interested (or unsure) respondents, 100% of women and 30% of men indicated that there are barriers preventing them from taking on such a position (53% overall). Barriers include balancing requirements of family and getting established in their academic career, mismatch between position requirements and standard education levels in their field, and political issues.

- Regarding statements about the resources available to them at NDSU, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women and men faculty had similar opinions regarding whether they have enough office support (mean = 2.67 for women, 2.73 for men, 2.71 overall).
  - Women agreed much less than men that they have sufficient teaching support (mean = 2.00 for women, 2.53 for men, 2.38 overall).
  - Women agreed more than men that they have colleagues or peers who give them career advice or guidance when they need it (mean = 2.83 for women, 2.46 for men, 2.58 overall).
  - Women agreed less than men that they have colleagues on campus who do similar research (mean = 2.33 for women, 2.80 for men, 2.67 overall).

- Regarding statements about interactions with colleagues and others in their primary department/unit, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women faculty agreed less than men faculty that they are treated with respect by staff (mean = 3.33 for women, 3.67 for men, 3.57 overall) and by their department chair/head (mean = 2.83 for women, 3.27 for men, 3.14 overall).
  - Women agreed somewhat less than men that they are treated with respect by students (mean = 3.33 for women, 3.60 for men, 3.52 overall).
  - Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether they are treated with respect by colleagues (mean = 3.33 for women, 3.27 for men, 3.29 overall).
  - Women agreed less than men that colleagues in their department solicit their opinion about work-related matters (mean = 2.67 for women, 3.07 for men, 2.95 overall).
  - Women agreed somewhat more than men that they feel that their colleagues value their research (mean = 2.83 for women, 2.67 for men, 2.71 overall).
  - Women agreed much more than men that they encounter unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with colleagues (mean = 3.00 for women, 2.43 for men, 2.60 overall).
  - Women agreed more than men that that they feel excluded from an informal network in their department (mean = 2.50 for women, 2.07 for men, 2.19 overall).
  - Women agreed less than men that they feel like they "fit" in their department (mean = 2.83 for women, 3.20 for men, 3.10 overall).
  - Women agreed more than men that they feel isolated in their department (mean = 2.33 for women, 1.87 for men, 2.00 overall).
  - Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether they feel isolated on the NDSU campus overall (mean = 1.83 for women, 1.87 for men, 1.86 overall).
  - Women agreed more than men that they do a great deal of work that is not formally recognized by their department (mean = 3.00 for women, 2.53 for men, 2.67 overall).

- Regarding statements about their participation in the decision-making process in their primary department/unit, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women faculty agreed somewhat less than men faculty that department meetings allow for all faculty members to share their views (mean = 3.17 for women, 3.36 for men, 3.30 overall).
  - Women agreed somewhat less than men that they feel like full and equal participants in problem-solving and decision-making (mean = 2.67 for women, 2.86 for men, 2.80 overall).

- o Women agreed somewhat less than men that they have a voice in how resources are allocated (mean = 2.50 for women, 2.71 for men, 2.65 overall).
- o Women agreed less than men that committee assignments are rotated fairly to allow for participation of all faculty (mean = 2.67 for women, 3.00 for men, and 2.90 overall).
- o Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether their department chair/head involves them in decision-making (mean = 2.67 for women, 2.64 for men, 2.65 overall).

Satisfaction with NDSU
- Regarding statements about satisfaction with NDSU among tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of Engineering and Architecture, on a 4-point scale (1=very dissatisfied, 4=very satisfied):
  - o Women faculty were less satisfied than men faculty, in general, with their job at NDSU (mean = 2.67 for women, 3.00 for men, 2.90 overall).
  - o Women and men had similar levels of satisfaction regarding the way their career has progressed at NDSU (mean = 2.83 for women, 2.80 for men, 2.81 overall).

NDSU Programs and Resources
- Tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of Engineering and Architecture who had heard of each program, reported the value of various programs on the NDSU campus, on a 4-point scale (1=not at all valuable, 4=very valuable):
  - o Women faculty rated the new faculty orientation program (mean = 2.83 for women, 2.73 for men, 2.76 overall) as somewhat more valuable than men faculty did.
  - o Women rated the spousal/partner hiring program (mean = 4.00 for women, 3.15 for men, 3.35 overall), the extension of the tenure clock program (mean = 4.00 for women, 2.50 for men, 2.88 overall), and the faculty mentoring program (mean = 3.00 for women, 2.50 for men, 2.63 overall) as much more valuable than men faculty did.

Balancing Personal and Professional Life
- Regarding statements about balancing personal and professional lives among tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of Engineering and Architecture, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - o Women agreed much less than men that they are usually satisfied with the way in which they balance their professional and personal life (mean = 2.17 for women, 3.00 for men, 2.76 overall).

- Regarding statements about their department/unit's support of work life balance, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - o Women faculty agreed much less than men faculty that the department is supportive of family leave (mean = 2.25 for women, 3.00 for men, 2.81 overall) and that their department has a supportive policy for faculty who have a new baby (mean = 2.00 for women, 3.00 for men, 2.76 overall).
  - o Women agreed much less than men that most faculty in their department are supportive of colleagues who want to balance family and career lives (mean = 2.60 for women, 3.14 for men, 3.00 overall).
  - o Women agreed somewhat more than men that it is difficult for faculty in their department to adjust work schedules to care for children or other family members (mean = 2.00 for women, 1.77 for men, 1.82 overall).

Highlights of the 2008 NDSU FORWARD Work/Life Survey Results of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty: *College of Human Development and Education*

Prepared September 2010

Introduction

The faculty work/life survey is part of the Advance FORWARD project at NDSU. This survey collected baseline data on a variety of topics important to faculty: the hiring process at NDSU, the tenure process at NDSU, professional activities, satisfaction with NDSU, NDSU programs and resources, balancing personal and professional life, women faculty at NDSU, and demographics. Survey data were collected mid-December 2008 through early February 2009 via a web survey, with NDSU IRB approval. Of the 224 tenured or tenure track faculty who responded to the survey, 29 indicated that the College of Human Development and Education (HDE) was the primary college to which they were assigned. The full report presenting detailed survey results, entitled *Faculty Work/Life Balance: Results of the 2008 NDSU FORWARD Survey,* is available on the NDSU FORWARD website at http://www.ndsu.edu/forward/. This mini-report presents highlights of the survey results for the College of HDE – overall and by gender.

Overview

Women tenured and tenure track faculty in the College of Human Development and Education were much less likely than men faculty to have tenure. Among faculty who indicated they are interested in (or are unsure about) taking on formal leadership positions at NDSU, a much higher proportion of women indicated that there are barriers preventing them from taking on such positions. Gender issues were among the barriers cited. Women agreed much more than men that they encounter unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with colleagues. Women agreed much less than men that department meetings allow for all faculty members to share their views and that their department chair/head involves them in decision-making. Women agreed much less than men that their department has a supportive policy for faculty who have a new baby.

Highlights for the *College of HDE*

Characteristics of Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty in the College of HDE
- 29 tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of HDE responded to the survey; 38% (n=11) of respondents were men and 62% (n=18) were women.

- 33% of women and 46% of men faculty said they currently have children ages 18 or younger (38% overall). However, 33% of women compared to 64% of men said they have cared for or currently care for dependent children (45% overall).

- 11% of women and 9% of men said they have provided care for an aging parent or relative in the past three years (10% overall).

- 83% of women and 91% of men were of a majority status, i.e., self-identified as "white, not of Hispanic origin" (86% overall).

Women Faculty at NDSU
- Among tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of HDE who gave an answer regarding statements about recruitment of, climate for, and leadership opportunities for women faculty in their primary department/unit, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women faculty agreed somewhat less than men faculty that the climate for women in their department is good (mean = 3.17 for women, 3.45 for men, 3.28 overall).
  - Women agreed much less than men that their department has identified ways to enhance the climate for women (mean = 2.50 for women, 3.22 for men, 2.78 overall) and that their department has taken steps to enhance the climate for women (mean = 2.50 for women, 3.25 for men, 2.77 overall).
  - Women agreed more than men that their department has too few women faculty in leadership positions (mean = 2.67 for women, 2.36 for men, 2.55 overall).
  - Women agreed much less than men that their department has made an effort to promote women into leadership positions (mean = 2.15 for women, 3.00 for men, 2.50 overall).
  - Women agreed somewhat more than men that there are too few women faculty in their department (mean = 1.67 for women, 1.45 for men, 1.59 overall).
  - Women agreed less than men that their department has actively recruited women faculty (mean = 2.94 for women, 3.40 for men, 3.12 overall).

Hiring and Tenure Process
- 53% of women and 30% of men faculty were recruited to apply for a position at NDSU (41% overall).

- 24% of women had tenure compared to 73% of men, regardless of where they went through the process (41% overall).

- The three most common factors in faculty members' decision <u>to accept a position</u> at NDSU were teaching opportunities (61% of women, 55% of men, 59% overall); colleagues in the department/unit/lab (56% of women, 46% of men, 52% overall); and geographic location (33% of women, 73% of men, 48% overall).

- The three most common factors that caused faculty members' <u>to hesitate about accepting a position</u> at NDSU were geographic location (61% of women, 27% of men, 48% overall); salary and benefits (44% of women, 55% of men, 48% overall); and prestige of university (22% of women, 36% of men, 28% overall).

- Among faculty who did (or will) experience the tenure process at NDSU, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women faculty agreed less than men faculty that they are/were satisfied with the overall tenure and promotion process (mean = 3.08 for women, 3.44 for men, 3.23 overall).
  - Women agreed more than men that they receive/received feedback on their progress toward tenure and promotion (mean = 4.00 for women, 3.63 for men, 3.84 overall).

Professional Activities
- 28% of women and 46% of men faculty indicated that they are interested in taking on formal leadership positions at NDSU (35% overall) and an additional 56% of women and 18% of men said they were not sure if they are interested (41% overall). Among these interested (or unsure) respondents, 40% of women and 29% of men indicated that there are barriers preventing them from taking on such a position (36% overall). Barriers include not having tenure, not having enough experience, lack of transparency in how people receive appointments, issues with colleagues, and gender issues such as too few role models, being perceived as less qualified as a woman, and feeling that outspoken women are penalized.

- Regarding statements about the resources available to them at NDSU, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women and men faculty had similar opinions regarding whether they have enough office support (mean = 3.17 for women, 3.09 for men, 3.14 overall).
  - Women agreed somewhat more than men that they have sufficient teaching support (mean = 2.94 for women, 2.73 for men, 2.86 overall).
  - Women agreed somewhat more than men that they have colleagues on campus who do similar research (mean = 2.88 for women, 2.73 for men, 2.82 overall).
  - Women agreed more than men that they have colleagues or peers who give them career advice or guidance when they need it (mean = 3.24 for women, 2.90 for men, 3.11 overall).

- Regarding statements about interactions with colleagues and others in their primary department/unit, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women faculty agreed somewhat less than men faculty that they are treated with respect by staff (mean = 3.71 for women, 3.91 for men, 3.79 overall) and by colleagues (mean = 3.18 for women, 3.36 for men, 3.25 overall).
  - Women agreed less than men that they are treated with respect by students (mean = 3.18 for women, 3.64 for men, 3.36 overall).
  - Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether they are treated with respect by their department chair/head (mean = 3.18 for women, 3.27 for men, 3.21 overall).
  - Women agreed somewhat less than men that colleagues in their department solicit their opinion about work-related matters (mean = 2.94 for women, 3.18 for men, 3.04 overall).
  - Women agreed less than men that they feel that their colleagues value their research (mean = 2.76 for women, 3.18 for men, 2.93 overall).
  - Women agreed less than men that they feel like they "fit" in their department (mean = 2.88 for women, 3.27 for men, 3.04 overall).
  - Women agreed somewhat more than men that that they feel excluded from an informal network in their department (mean = 2.18 for women, 2.00 for men, 2.11 overall).
  - Women agreed much more than men that they encounter unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with colleagues (mean = 2.53 for women, 1.91 for men, 2.29 overall).
  - Women agreed somewhat more than men that they feel isolated in their department (mean = 2.12 for women, 1.91 for men, 2.04 overall).
  - Women agreed less than men that they feel isolated on the NDSU campus overall (mean = 1.71 for women, 2.09 for men, 1.86 overall).
  - Women agreed more than men that they do a great deal of work that is not formally recognized by their department (mean = 3.29 for women, 2.82 for men, 3.11 overall).

- Regarding statements about their participation in the decision-making process in their primary department/unit, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  - Women faculty agreed much less than men faculty that department meetings allow for all faculty members to share their views (mean = 2.54 for women, 3.10 for men, 2.78 overall)
  - Women agreed much less than men that their department chair/head involves them in decision-making (mean = 2.31 for women, 2.90 for men, 2.57 overall).
  - Women agreed less than men that they feel like full and equal participants in problem-solving and decision-making (mean = 2.46 for women, 2.80 for men, 2.61 overall).
  - Women agreed less than men that they have a voice in how resources are allocated (mean = 2.00 for women, 2.40 for men, 2.17 overall).
  - Women agreed somewhat less than men that committee assignments are rotated fairly to allow for participation of all faculty (mean = 2.62 for women, 2.80 for men, and 2.70 overall).

Satisfaction with NDSU
- Regarding statements about satisfaction with NDSU among tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of HDE, on a 4-point scale (1=very dissatisfied, 4=very satisfied):
  o Women and men faculty had similar levels of satisfaction, in general, with their job at NDSU (mean = 3.39 for women, 3.36 for men, 3.38 overall) and with the way their career has progressed at NDSU (mean = 3.44 for women, 3.45 for men, 3.45 overall).

NDSU Programs and Resources
- Tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of HDE who had heard of each program, reported the value of various programs on the NDSU campus, on a 4-point scale (1=not at all valuable, 4=very valuable):
  o Women faculty rated the extension of the tenure clock program (mean = 3.18 for women, 3.00 for men, 3.11 overall) and the new faculty orientation program (mean = 2.94 for women, 2.73 for men, 2.86 overall) as somewhat more valuable than men faculty did.
  o Women rated the spousal/partner hiring program (mean = 3.44 for women, 2.91 for men, 3.24 overall) and the faculty mentoring program (mean = 2.83 for women, 2.27 for men, 2.62 overall) as much more valuable than men did.

Balancing Personal and Professional Life
- Regarding statements about balancing personal and professional lives among tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of HDE, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  o Women agreed less than men that they are usually satisfied with the way in which they balance their professional and personal life (mean = 2.72 for women, 3.09 for men, 2.86 overall).

- Regarding statements about their department/unit's support of work life balance, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  o Women faculty agreed much less than men faculty that their department has a supportive policy for faculty who have a new baby (mean = 2.22 for women, 3.10 for men, 2.68 overall).
  o Women agreed less than men that the department is supportive of family leave (mean = 2.75 for women, 3.20 for men, 3.00 overall).
  o Women agreed somewhat less than men that most faculty in their department are supportive of colleagues who want to balance family and career lives (mean = 3.31 for women, 3.50 for men, 3.38 overall).
  o Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether it is difficult for faculty in their department to adjust work schedules to care for children or other family members (mean = 1.94 for women, 1.89 for men, 1.92 overall).

Highlights of the 2008 NDSU FORWARD Work/Life Survey Results of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty:
College of Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Sciences

Prepared September 2010

The faculty work/life survey is part of the Advance FORWARD project at NDSU. This survey collected baseline data on a variety of topics important to faculty: the hiring process at NDSU, the tenure process at NDSU, professional activities, satisfaction with NDSU, NDSU programs and resources, balancing personal and professional life, women faculty at NDSU, and demographics. Survey data were collected mid-December 2008 through early February 2009 via a web survey, with NDSU IRB approval.

Of the 224 tenured or tenure track faculty who responded to the survey, six indicated that the College of Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Sciences was the primary college to which they were assigned. Because of the small number of respondents and concerns about confidentiality, we are unable to present survey results for this college.

The full report presenting detailed survey results, entitled *Faculty Work/Life Balance: Results of the 2008 NDSU FORWARD Survey*, is available on the NDSU FORWARD website at http://www.ndsu.edu/forward/.

Highlights of the 2008 NDSU FORWARD Work/Life Survey Results of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty: *College of Science and Mathematics*

Prepared September 2010

Introduction

The faculty work/life survey is part of the Advance FORWARD project at NDSU. This survey collected baseline data on a variety of topics important to faculty: the hiring process at NDSU, the tenure process at NDSU, professional activities, satisfaction with NDSU, NDSU programs and resources, balancing personal and professional life, women faculty at NDSU, and demographics. Survey data were collected mid-December 2008 through early February 2009 via a web survey, with NDSU IRB approval. Of the 224 tenured or tenure track faculty who responded to the survey, 28 indicated that the College of Science and Mathematics was the primary college to which they were assigned. The full report presenting detailed survey results, entitled *Faculty Work/Life Balance: Results of the 2008 NDSU FORWARD Survey*, is available on the NDSU FORWARD website at http://www.ndsu.edu/forward/. This mini-report presents highlights of the survey results for the College of Science and Mathematics – overall and by gender. However, we recommend caution in generalizing these results to the entire college because of a combination of low numbers and a gender imbalance in the proportion of respondents versus non-respondents.

Overview

Women tenured and tenure track faculty in the College of Science and Mathematics were much less likely than men faculty to have tenure. Other noteworthy differences include that women, on average, agreed much more than men that their department has too few women faculty in leadership positions and much less than men that their department has actively recruited women faculty. Women agreed much more than men that they feel isolated in their department. Women agreed much less than men that they feel like full and equal participants in problem-solving and decision making and that they have a voice in how resources are allocated.

Highlights for the *College of Science and Mathematics*

Characteristics of Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty in the College of Science and Mathematics
- 28 tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of Science and Mathematics responded to the survey; 57% (n=16) of respondents were men and 43% (n=12) were women.

- 75% of women and 63% of men faculty said they currently have children ages 18 or younger (68% overall). However, 83% of women compared to 77% of men said they have cared for or currently care for dependent children (71% overall).

- 8% of women and 7% of men said they have provided care for an aging parent or relative in the past three years (7% overall).

- 83% of women and 94% of men were of a majority status, i.e., self-identified as "white, not of Hispanic origin" (89% overall).

Women Faculty at NDSU
- Among tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of Science and Mathematics who gave an answer regarding statements about recruitment of, climate for, and leadership opportunities for women faculty in their primary department/unit, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  o Women faculty agreed somewhat more than men faculty that the climate for women in their department is good (mean = 3.17 for women, 2.92 for men, 3.04 overall).
  o Women agreed less than men that their department has identified ways to enhance the climate for women (mean = 2.00 for women, 2.36 for men, 2.20 overall).
  o Women agreed somewhat less than men that their department has taken steps to enhance the climate for women (mean = 2.11 for women, 2.27 for men, 2.20 overall).
  o Women agreed much more than men that their department has too few women faculty in leadership positions (mean = 3.75 for women, 2.86 for men, 3.27 overall).
  o Women agreed somewhat less than men that their department has made an effort to promote women into leadership positions (mean = 2.10 for women, 2.27 for men, 2.19 overall).
  o Women agreed more than men that there are too few women faculty in their department (mean = 3.25 for women, 2.87 for men, 3.04 overall).
  o Women agreed much less than men that their department has actively recruited women faculty (mean = 2.67 for women, 3.20 for men, 2.96 overall).

Hiring and Tenure Process
- 40% of women and 44% of men faculty were recruited to apply for a position at NDSU (39% overall).

- 8% of women had tenure compared to 56% of men, regardless of where they went through the process (36% overall).

- The four most common factors in faculty members' decision <u>to accept a position</u> at NDSU were colleagues in the department/unit/lab (58% of women, 38% of men, 46% overall); opportunities available for spouse/partner (42% of women, 31% of men, 36% overall); research opportunities (25% of women, 31% of men, 29% overall); and climate of the department/unit/lab (25% of women, 31% of men, 29% overall).

- The four most common factors that caused faculty members <u>to hesitate about accepting a position</u> at NDSU were salary and benefits (33% of women, 75% of men, 57% overall); geographic location (50% of women, 50% of men, 50% overall); prestige of university (25% of women, 38% of men, 32% overall); and quality of students (42% of women, 19% of men, 29% overall).

- Among faculty who did (or will) experience the tenure process at NDSU, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  o Women faculty agreed less than men faculty that they are/were satisfied with the overall tenure and promotion process (mean = 3.00 for women, 3.31 for men, 3.19 overall) and that they receive/received feedback on their progress toward tenure and promotion (mean = 3.14 for women, 3.62 for men, 3.45 overall).

Professional Activities
- 33% of women and 44% of men faculty indicated that they are interested in taking on formal leadership positions at NDSU (39% overall) and an additional 33% of women and 50% of men said they were not sure if they are interested (43% overall). Among these interested (or unsure) respondents, 25% of women and 27% of men indicated that there are barriers preventing them from taking on such a position (26% overall). Barriers include lack of time, family situation, and politics.

- Regarding statements about the resources available to them at NDSU, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  o Women faculty agreed much less than men faculty that they have enough office support (mean = 2.30 for women, 3.20 for men, 2.84 overall).
  o Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether they have sufficient teaching support (mean = 2.33 for women, 2.33 for men, 2.33 overall).
  o Women agreed much more than men that they have colleagues or peers who give them career advice or guidance when they need it (mean = 3.25 for women, 2.73 for men, 2.96 overall).
  o Women and men had similar opinions regarding whether they have colleagues on campus who do similar research (mean = 2.67 for women, 2.60 for men, 2.63 overall).

- Regarding statements about interactions with colleagues and others in their primary department/unit, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  o Women faculty agreed less than men faculty that they are treated with respect by staff (mean = 3.50 for women, 3.80 for men, 3.67 overall).
  o Women agreed somewhat less than men that they are treated with respect by students (mean = 3.33 for women, 3.53 for men, 3.44 overall) and by colleagues (mean = 3.25 for women, 3.53 for men, 3.41 overall).
  o Women agreed somewhat more than men that they are treated with respect by their department chair/head (mean = 3.58 for women, 3.40 for men, 3.48 overall).
  o Women agreed somewhat less than men that colleagues in their department solicit their opinion about work-related matters (mean = 3.17 for women, 3.33 for men, 3.26 overall).
  o Women agreed less than men that they feel that their colleagues value their research (mean = 2.67 for women, 3.07 for men, 2.89 overall).
  o Women agreed somewhat less than men that they feel like they "fit" in their department (mean = 2.92 for women, 3.20 for men, 3.07 overall).
  o Women agreed less than men that they encounter unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with colleagues (mean = 1.83 for women, 2.15 for men, 2.00 overall).
  o Women agreed more than men that that they feel excluded from an informal network in their department (mean = 2.25 for women, 1.87 for men, 2.04 overall).
  o Women agreed much more than men that they feel isolated in their department (mean = 2.50 for women, 1.87 for men, 2.15 overall).
  o Women agreed somewhat more than men that they feel isolated on the NDSU campus overall (mean = 1.83 for women, 1.73 for men, 1.78 overall).
  o Women agreed much less than men that they do a great deal of work that is not formally recognized by their department (mean = 2.25 for women, 2.80 for men, 2.56 overall).

- Regarding statements about their participation in the decision-making process in their primary department/unit, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  o Women faculty agreed somewhat less than men faculty that department meetings allow for all faculty members to share their views (mean = 3.25 for women, 3.38 for men, 3.32 overall).
  o Women agreed somewhat less than men that committee assignments are rotated fairly to allow for participation of all faculty (mean = 2.67 for women, 2.77 for men, and 2.72 overall).
  o Women agreed much less than men that they feel like full and equal participants in problem-solving and decision-making (mean = 2.75 for women, 3.31 for men, 3.04 overall) and that they have a voice in how resources are allocated (mean = 2.50 for women, 3.08 for men, 2.80 overall).
  o Women agreed somewhat more than men that their department chair/head involves them in decision-making (mean = 3.17 for women, 2.92 for men, 3.04 overall).

Satisfaction with NDSU
- Regarding statements about satisfaction with NDSU among tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of Science and Mathematics, on a 4-point scale (1=very dissatisfied, 4=very satisfied):
  o Women faculty were less satisfied than men faculty, in general, with their job at NDSU (mean = 2.83 for women, 3.13 for men, 3.00 overall).
  o Women and men had similar levels of satisfaction regarding the way their career has progressed at NDSU (mean = 2.83 for women, 2.88 for men, 2.86 overall).

NDSU Programs and Resources
- Tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of Science and Mathematics who had heard of each program, reported the value of various programs on the NDSU campus, on a 4-point scale (1=not at all valuable, 4=very valuable):
  o Women faculty rated the faculty mentoring program (mean = 2.00 for women, 2.67 for men, 2.38 overall) as much less valuable than men faculty did.
  o Women rated the spousal/partner hiring program (mean = 3.55 for women, 3.36 for men, 3.44 overall) as somewhat more valuable than men did.
  o Women rated the new faculty orientation program (mean = 2.42 for women, 2.57 for men, 2.50 overall) and the extension of the tenure clock program (mean = 3.33 for women, 3.50 for men, 3.42 overall) as somewhat less valuable than men did.

Balancing Personal and Professional Life
- Regarding statements about balancing personal and professional lives among tenured or tenure track faculty in the College of Science and Mathematics, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  o Women agreed less than men that they are usually satisfied with the way in which they balance their professional and personal life (mean = 2.50 for women, 2.81 for men, 2.68 overall).

- Regarding statements about their department/unit's support of work life balance, on a 4-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly):
  o Women agreed somewhat more than men that their department has a supportive policy for faculty who have a new baby (mean = 3.00 for women, 2.75 for men, 2.87 overall).
  o Women faculty agreed less than men faculty that the department is supportive of family leave (mean = 2.90 for women, 3.20 for men, 3.00 overall).
  o Women agreed less than men that most faculty in their department are supportive of colleagues who want to balance family and career lives (mean = 2.83 for women, 3.29 for men, 3.08 overall).
  o Women agreed somewhat less than men that it is difficult for faculty in their department to adjust work schedules to care for children or other family members (mean = 2.00 for women, 2.14 for men, 2.08 overall).