

The Advance FORWARD Committee met on Friday, April 8, 2011 at 11:30 a.m. in the Peace Garden Room. In attendance were Angela Bachman, Canan Bilen-Green, Betsy Birmingham, Ann Burnett, Tom Carlson, Sandy Holbrook, Rhonda Magel, Kevin McCaul, Christi McGeorge, Julie Nash, Wendy Reed, Craig Schnell, and Donald Schwert.

#### **Annual Report & NSF Site Visit** – Canan

The site visit will be in either September or October. The annual report is due early summer; expect instructions from Sandy in early May.

#### **Faculty/Administrator Recruitment** – Kevin, Ann

The dean search for AHSS is going well. All the candidates have noted enjoying the opportunity to meet with FORWARD. Candidates have been excited to know that as dean of AHSS they can be involved with FORWARD and are interested in having the college be even more involved. Having the advocates at the interview was useful. If you have any comments about the candidates, please let the committee know. Betsy will do a summary for FORWARD to the committee.

The provost search is also ongoing. The search committee expects the president will have a good idea of who he will favor as a candidate by next Friday. The committee is looking for comments regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates which they will pass on to the president. The committee anticipates that a decision will be made as quickly as possible.

#### **Evaluation** – Christi

Dana Britton will provide a written report from her visit which will be attached to the annual report.

#### **Allies Program** – Tom

Advocates and allies had their last follow-up meeting last week. The final ally training for this academic year will be next Tuesday, April 12; eight individuals are signed up for the training. Having the trainings at lunch time has worked well. A list of departments without an advocate or ally was attached to the agenda. Advocates will work to target those departments in the fall. If you can think of people in those departments that you think would make good allies, please email Tom. Some of the departments listed do not have any male faculty. The interdisciplinary programs will also not be targeted as the faculty in those programs are part of other departments. There are some departments that have had faculty who have gone to the training but did not sign the ally agreement.

#### **Faculty Climate Training** – Betsy

The training program will be targeted to the unit level. Will start the training in the college of AHSS.

**CSWF – Wendy**

CSWF continues to work on policies. There have some housekeeping details left on policy 103. They hopefully will get feedback on the other policies soon. The commission has expressed concern over not having a chance to respond to language changes of their policies in committee that alter the intent of the policy.

**Child care Coordinating Committee – Kevin, Wendy**

The committee, which currently consists of five members, will be meeting with the president next week to receive the charge as to what they are being requested to do. The intent is to keep the committee small so they can move quickly. Currently the committee is collecting data including data from the child care center. It was noted that staff senate has selected three members that would have an interest in serving on a committee. Also noted was that the college of HD&E is recommending that gifts to the annual campaign be directed to the child care center.

**Research – Rhonda**

Rhonda distributed research topics she has been working on and results. One area researched was the relationship between health and work environment. The 2009 survey was used to calculate a composite health score and a work environment score. A significant relationship was found between health and work environment. Also produced a women faculty score. A relationship was also found between the work environment score and the women faculty score.

The second study examined gender differences in teaching, salary, and student ratings of instruction. (See attachment for results.)

**Junior Faculty Cohort Mentoring - Don, Wendy**

Have begun the process of calling mentors. It seems that groups are breaking down in the second year. Are still hoping to keep groups together for year 3.

**Mid-career Mentoring – Canan**

The evaluation for the March promotion to professor panel was distributed with the agenda. The next panel is scheduled for May but we do not have the new panelists yet. The panelists will be newly promoted professors. Mitch Owen will be on campus May 18 to do an all-day training for administrators and tenured faculty who may be aspiring to administrative positions.

**Grant Programs – Canan**

Three climate and gender grant applications were received. They will be reviewed externally and then will come to the internal committee. The deadline for Leap research and lab grant applications is April 29; please encourage participation.

**Next FORWARD Meeting:** Wednesday, May 4 in the Prairie Room

**March 3, 2011**

**Departments without an Ally or Advocate:**

Accounting, Finance and Informational Systems  
Aerospace Studies  
Agribusiness & Applied economics  
Agriculture  
Allied Sciences  
Apparel, design and hospitality management  
Architecture and Landscape Architecture  
Civil Engineering  
Coatings and Polymetric Materials  
Construction management and Engineering  
Criminal Justice and Political Science  
Education  
Emergency Management  
Health, Nutrition and Exercise Science  
Management and Marketing  
Mechanical engineering  
Military science  
Modern Languages  
Music  
Natural Resources  
Nursing  
Pharmacy Practice  
Plant Sciences  
Sociology and Anthropology  
Theatre Arts  
University Studies  
Visual Arts

**Interdisciplinary Studies Programs (who do not have an Ally or Advocate):**

Biotechnology  
Food Safety  
Fraud investigation  
Gerontology  
International Studies  
Logistics  
Natural Resource Management  
Women's Studies

**Department Head and Chair Training**  
**Positive Departmental Climate: Strategies and Effective Practices**  
**March 9, 2011**

Attendance

Thirty individuals attended and 20 completed evaluations.

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

**I will be able to implement new strategies to create a more positive departmental climate as a result of attending this panel presentation.**

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	5.0	5.3
	Disagree	1	5.0	10.5
	Agree	11	55.0	68.4
	Strongly Agree	6	30.0	100.0
	Missing Data	1	5.0	
	Total	20	100.0	

**As a result of today's panel discussion, I am more aware of the challenges that interfere with a positive departmental climate**

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	5.0	5.0
	Disagree	1	5.0	10.0
	Agree	10	50.0	60.0
	Strongly Agree	8	40.0	100.0
	Total	20	100.0	

**I will be able to implement new strategies to directly address challenges that interfere with creating a more positive climate in my department as a result of my participation in today's panel discussion.**

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	5.0	5.3
	Disagree	2	10.0	15.8
	Agree	10	50.0	68.4
	Strongly Agree	6	30.0	100.0
	Missing Data	1	5.0	
	Total	20	100.0	

**The presentation was clear and well-organized**

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	5.0	5.0
	Agree	7	35.0	40.0
	Strongly Agree	12	60.0	100.0
	Total	20	100.0	

**I would recommend this panel presentation to others**

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	5.0	5.0
	Disagree	1	5.0	10.0
	Agree	7	35.0	45.0
	Strongly Agree	11	55.0	100.0
	Total	20	100.0	

**Rate the overall quality of this panel presentation**

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Below Average	2	10.0	10.0
Average	2	10.0	20.0
Above Average	11	55.0	75.0
Excellent	5	25.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	

Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form

1. What questions do you still have about fostering a positive climate in your department? Also, please list any topics that you would like to receive additional information about or that need further clarification.
  - I felt these were department specific and don't really relate to my department. Therefore I found it not very useful -- not things that apply, or that I can apply.
  - How do you deal with an unreasonable and hostile faculty? Whose positions are untenable.
  - This was one of the best sessions we've had. Very practical.
  - Setting expectations for collegiality and professionalism in a department.
  
2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the panel you attended today?
  - Having a wide range of experiences and length of service.
  - Diversity of views.
  - Good panel members/ open discussion.
  - Experienced panel members.
  - Great ideas. Very innovative. Good insights.
  - General idea of panel discussion was great and could be used more.
  - Hearing about challenges in recruiting & retention.
  - Excellent contrast of faculty and heads. Great choice of panelists.
  - The various insights and perspectives.
  - I can apply many things I learned in today's session.
  - "Culture of mutual respect." Understanding conflicting agendas.
  
3. How could this panel presentation be improved to be more beneficial to you?
  - More general—especially the chairs seemed to use this as a "here's my department, aren't we great!" Selling their department rather than really helpful suggestions.
  - Do more.
  - More examples of varying values.
  - More junior faculty.
  - Include recent hires on a panel.
  - Please address really difficult issues of department climate. These are the ones that matter.
  - Notes from the presenter would be helpful.
  
4. Please provide any additional comments you have about today's panel presentation and/or the FORWARD program in general.
  - I am tired of having a lot (majority) of men especially if we count Dr. Schnell, tell me how to improve campus climate—especially on a day when it is announced that daycare is being eliminated.
  - FORWARD program is a great program.
  - Discuss real case studies.

# “Save the Center”

The Center for Child Development has been on the NDSU/NDAC campus, in some format, for over 60 years. It has gone through many transformations, but it has always served the students, staff, faculty and community.



Currently, the University is experiencing economic issues and decisions. President Bresciani has made the decision that the university will not support the Center with appropriated dollars after June 30, 2011. He has also said that...“ any action or decision impacting a part of our campus community is the business of our entire campus community.”

Keeping the Center open requires the help of the entire campus community. Approximately \$150,000 is needed to have the Center operational during the 2011-2012 academic year (and that is with the assumption that the Center will remain in the current location).

## About the Center....



Our Center serves as a model both within the state and nationally. It was the first childcare facility in the state of North Dakota to receive accreditation from the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Although the Center is no longer a lab school to train students, it provides opportunities for faculty and students across the campus. The Center for Child

Development is much more than a childcare facility.

Please consider giving to the 2011 faculty/staff campaign and naming *The Center for Child Development* as the fund to receive your gift.

The children, the staff, the faculty and our NDSU students all say “thank you”!

Questions/Comments? Please contact Nancy Gress 231-8216 or [Nancy.Gress@ndsu.edu](mailto:Nancy.Gress@ndsu.edu)

# PLEDGE CARD

FACULTY & STAFF CAMPAIGN 2011

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Enclosed is my gift of \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Please show this gift was made by (*please print*) \_\_\_\_\_

My gift is designated to the Center for Child Development (*Fund #30117*)

- \$40 will sponsor a hour of care
- \$400 will sponsor a day of care
- other \_\_\_\_\_

## PAYMENT OPTIONS

**Check:** to NDSU Development Foundation

**Credit Card:**    VS    MC    DI    Amex

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Exp \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

**Payroll deduction:** My total gift of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ in increments of \$ \_\_\_\_\_

per pay period beginning \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_ (\$5 per day period minimum)

Please continue my donations (*check one*):

Until my pledge of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ is satisfied

Indefinitely, until I contact you.

I am a:     9     10     11     12 month employee

Please indicate month(s) you do NOT receive a paycheck

PeopleSoft ID# \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Daytime phone \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

## Research Topics- Advance/Forward April 8, 2011

### 1. Investigated relationship between health and work environment;

- Formed Composite Health Score- Based on responses to Worklife Survey-

Overall health; happy; fatigued; stressed; nervous; depressed; short-tempered; well-rested; physically fit

- Formed Work Environment Score –

Respected by colleagues; respected by students; respected by staff; respected by chair; excluded from informal network; encounter unwritten rules; colleagues solicit my opinion; research is mainstream; colleagues value my research; a lot of work not formally recognized; “fit in”; feel isolated in department; feel isolated at NDSU; full and equal participant; voice in resource allocation; meetings allow shared views; committee assignments are fair; chair involves me in decision-making; satisfaction with job at NDSU.

Note: A higher score is better for both

A significant positive correlation was found between health score and work environment score controlling for gender. Stem/Non-stem not significant and White/Non-white not significant.

- Women faculty score= Number of women faculty score+Women Climate Score+Women Leadership score
- We also found that there was a positive significant relationship between the work environment score and the women faculty score
- No significant difference between Stem/Non-Stem

Brief review of other research studies conducted:

Abramson (2007) showed that the physical and mental health of mid-life women was affected by stress

Tytherleigh, et al. (2007) showed that women reported more physical and psychological health outcomes from stress (than men)- British Universities

Miner-Rubino, Settles, and Stewart (2009) examined 87 college educated white women – found that their perceptions of work environment were related to their job satisfaction and general health

(Miner-Rubino et al. (2009) also found a relationship between number of women and positions of women in the workplace and the work environment score (similar to our women faculty score))

2. Examined any gender differences in teaching, salary, and student ratings of instruction;

- Asked men and women faculty at NDSU about percentages of time they spent doing research; teaching; administration; and service; and the percentages of time they wanted to spend doing research; teaching; administration; and service. The percentage differences were compared between men and women in each of the categories. The largest and most significant difference was in teaching;
- Women reported wanting to spend about 11% less time in teaching and men about 5% (significant) – this was true with Stem/Non-Stem;
- Salary study conducted during 2008-2009- examined relationship between salary, gender, and student ratings of instruction;
- Calculated z-scores for each class based on student ratings of instruction; The z-scores for each class an instructor taught were added together and this was re-standardized into one overall z-score for the instructor; The sample average overall z-score for men was -.01 and for women it was -.07 (not significant).
- Average number of classes taught per academic year for women faculty was 2.73 and for men faculty, it was 2.85 (not significant).
- Model was formed predicting NDSU salary based on market salary and rank-when gender was added to the model, it was not significant; This was also true of race;
- Model was formed predicting NDSU salary based on market salary, rank, overall z-score, gender, the interaction term between gender and z-score, and whether or not a faculty member was in a STEM discipline. The z-score was significant and it did interact with gender; men on the average make \$1054.00 more for an increase of 1 standard deviation in their z-score and women make \$467.00 less for an increase of 1 standard deviation in their z-score.
- Research productivity not considered in the model (hard to consider across disciplines); Slobin, Magel, and McCullagh(2004) paired men and women faculty



of the same rank and discipline together and asked everyone completing the survey to provide a count of the number of publications, presentations, books, performances, etc. over their last year and then over their career. No significant differences were found between men and women over one year, but it was found that there was a significant difference over the course of their careers with men having more.

- Bellas and Toutkoushian (1999) reported that men on the average spend 6% more time than women on research and 6% less time than women on teaching.
- Sprague and Massoni(2005) and Laube, Massoni, Sprague, and Gerber (2007) indicate in their research that for women to receive better student ratings of instruction they need to be more nurturing and available to the students for questions. They need to have more office hours than men; They conclude that if the class size grows, nurturing takes a lot more time; (men need to be entertaining to get better SROIs)
- Fairweather (2005) studied faculty salaries- put measure of research productivity in model (number of publications, number of reviews, number of book chapters, etc. – did not include fine art presentations) – found that faculty salaries went up if a faculty member got an additional publication in a year and found they went down if a faculty member taught for an additional hour each week

**Promotion to Professor: Tips from Experienced College PTE Committee Members**  
**March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011**

Attendance

Forty-seven individuals attended and 35 completed evaluations.

- 28 individuals identified as faculty and one identified as staff, and 5 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	8.3	8.8
Agree	27	75.0	88.2
Strongly Agree	4	11.1	100.0
Missing Data	2	5.6	
Total	36	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 Disagree	4	11.1	13.3
Agree	24	66.7	93.3
Strongly Agree	2	5.6	100.0
Missing Data	6	16.7	
Total	36	100.0	

**As a result of my participation in this session, I will be able to implement new strategies in my own process of becoming a full professor**

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	4	11.1	13.8
Agree	17	47.2	72.4
3.50	1	2.8	75.9
Strongly Agree	7	19.4	100.0
Missing Data	7	19.4	
Total	36	100.0	

**I would recommend this panel discussion to others**

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	2	5.6	5.7
2.50	1	2.8	8.6
Agree	16	44.4	54.3
Strongly Agree	16	44.4	100.0
Missing Data	1	2.8	
Total	36	100.0	

**Rate the overall quality of this panel**

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Average	9	25.0	28.1
Above Average	19	52.8	87.5
Excellent	4	11.1	100.0
Missing Data	4	11.1	
Total	36	100.0	

Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form

1. What questions do you still have after attending this panel? 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. Your suggestions will be used to structure future sessions on the promotion process to full professor.
  - How to prioritize.
  - Some good examples of excellent portfolio application might be helpful.
  - So is denial detrimental?
  - I wonder about cases where guidelines and documents are not followed by committees. What happens when there is a failure?
  - What is the relationship between (among) committees at different levels? How much weight does the department/college levels affect the university committee?
  - How can I publish?
  - How is the NDSU issue of females not making tenure?
  - Mentoring—how to find one; how to match research interests?
  - This would be more beneficial on a college level since it is hard to generalize across colleges.
  - How does promotion happen? By this, I mean to ask how the committees determine how the process unfolds—it seems a bottom-to-top process rather than an organic whole.
  - I think a workshop on “How to write your statement of context” would be useful. Show people how to work with criteria, evidence, context, etc.
  - See question before.
  - Advice for women and minorities.
  - Try to use anonymous case studies.
  - Do all people (within a department) need to follow the same path to full professor? What if I’m not motivated by prestige & stature—can I still make full professor?
  - I don’t have questions just need to know how to balance life with work.
  - More tips on preparing the application.
  
2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the panel you attended today?
  - If you think you’re nearly ready to go through promotion ask your head/chair.
  - Tips for putting together document.
  - When are you ready. Strategy, goal setting, lay out road map.
  - The caution to not let research percentage fall too low in position description.
  - The admission that scholarship is defined differently was good to hear.
  - Specifics—definitions of scholarship, how the committees work in their reviews of work.
  - Overview of material (PTE) from across colleges.
  - Recognition of the “isolation” of being a researcher in a specific area no one else is involved in. Also, the “mentor” program is so important.
  - The panelists were well chosen and very informative.
  - Brought things to my attention that needed to be.
  - Mark was a terrific facilitator. Questions were on point, thoughtful and provoking.
  - When the Provost talked.
  - Having the different colleges explain the 10% per-class assignment vs arbitrary assigning a percentage for teaching.
  - A number of good points brought up.
  - It was useful to hear from PTE Committee member from varied colleges.
  - Process.
  - Hearing from different colleges.
  - Good discussion and admitting flaws in process to anticipate.
  - Getting the perspective of multiple unit.
  - The qualifications of the panelists.
  - Panel was well prepared. Moderator did a nice job.
  - Diversity of panelists/disciplines represented.

3. How could the panel be improved to be more beneficial to you?
  - They were good.
  - More who are full professors who've also been involved in PTE process.
  - Perhaps in each area show examples of excellent materials.
  - Advance FORWARD has done excellent work! Thank you for the opportunity to learn about tenure and promotion!
  - Microphones.
  - Maybe have some FULL professors on panel.
  - Smaller colleges, together rather than university wide.
  - More direct answers.
  - Encourage panelists to put together a tip sheet. Also consider identifying more direct topics and suggestions. E.g. service- what's appropriate, when is too much. Teaching: strategies for documenting good teaching—materials, observations, student work, etc.
  - Follow-up notes would be useful.
  - More specific examples of past documents that were strengths and weaknesses.
  - Provide more time for general questions.
  - Not sure the reasons why one should go up for full were very convincing.
  - It was very helpful.
  - Use a microphone.
  
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.
  - Good job by the panel.
  - Thank you for the elegant meal.
  - Include the entire trajectory from assistant to full.
  - Not much credibility from those not having achieved PROFESSOR.
  - Need a microphone.
  - Having served in a PTE committee at the department level, I have perhaps had more information than others at my rank.
  - The FORWARD program is great. I do have the feeling that not being promoted to full professor means not making the appropriate contribution to the university.