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1) **IDEAL Summary and Objectives**

IDEAL was a three-year NSF ADVANCE PAID project to seed equity and inclusion transformation within Science and Engineering (S&E) led by Case Western Reserve University (CWRU) with five regional public university partners, i.e. Bowling Green State University (BGSU), Cleveland State University (CSU), Kent State University (KSU), The University of Akron (UA), and The University of Toledo (UT). The goal of the partnership grant was to create an institutional learning community empowered to develop and leverage knowledge, skills, resources and networks to transform academic cultures and enhance equity and inclusion at research universities in the northern Ohio region. IDEAL adapted and disseminated the successful academic leadership development and institutional transformation methods developed by CWRU during its earlier five-year ADVANCE Institutional Transformation (IT) initiative, Academic Careers in Engineering and Science (ACES).

IDEAL facilitated the exchange of regional institutional policies, practices, and change initiatives that enhance gender and underrepresented minority equity and participation in academic science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). During the three-year IDEAL grant, faculty at each partner institution were empowered to undertake customized institutional transformation projects, either unique each year, or cumulative over the three years, to advance each university’s transformative theme as identified by the IDEAL Co-Director, an administrative leader on each campus.

Each institution annually selected a team of Change Leaders – three S&E department chairs or emerging faculty leaders - to participate in the IDEAL leadership development program. Each change leader received a $3,000 stipend. In year two (2010-11) and year three (2011-12) both CWRU and UT added a fourth change leader to their teams who was supported with a stipend by either their dean or the Provost. Kent State University used a fourth change leader as a bridge person between the year one to year two and year two to year three teams. This individual was supported by the office of the provost at KSU. Change leader teams from the six partner institutions met four times annually for the collective leadership development sessions and twice annually with their IDEAL Coach. Each team developed a customized Annual Change Project with plans and actions for improving gender and underrepresented minority equity in academic STEM, with emphasis placed on the implementation and sustainability of the project. Senior administrative leaders – presidents, provosts, deans and diversity officers – from each institution, along with Co-Directors, change leader teams and national speakers, gathered at two day-long Plenary Conferences (September 17, 2010 and September 16, 2011) to learn about the IDEAL change projects and share and share best practices in gender equity related institutional transformation among the learning community partners. A final plenary will be held October 5, 2012 to disseminate the final results and strengthen ongoing collaborations.

IDEAL’s proposed three-year multi-university partnership program, the first such collaboration in Ohio, enhanced the depth and effectiveness of leadership on each of the respective campuses, and established a collaborative institutional community of formal and informal academic leaders to serve as a community resource – a powerful force of cultural transformation and an incubator of innovation (Holly, 2004; see also Cox & Richlin, 2004). The creation of this institutional learning community continues to benefit not only the practices and policies of individual universities, but additionally informed the State of Ohio’s efforts to foster science and technology careers. Along with various science, technology and economic development
organizations, IDEAL sets a standard for the inclusion of women and underrepresented minority groups in STEM initiatives in northern Ohio’s major research universities.

a) IDEAL’s primary objectives were:

**Objective 1:** Create a regional learning community of academic leaders in northern Ohio that is informed about the factors responsible for the underrepresentation of women and minority groups in academic S&E and committed to transforming institutional cultures in S&E disciplines.

**Strategy:** CWRU adapted its successful leadership development and executive coaching program to create a regional learning community among six partner universities through an annual leadership development program consisting of training sessions as well as team coaching. The leadership development program contained segments specifically addressing the institutional factors that slow women’s advancement in S&E, including unconscious and systemic factors that preferentially disfavor and accumulate disadvantage for underrepresented groups. The content of the leadership development sessions, including PowerPoint presentations, are available on the IDEAL website under participant readings and resources [www.case.edu/provost/ideal/research.html](http://www.case.edu/provost/ideal/research.html).

**Objective 2:** Develop a cohort of formal and informal S&E leaders at each partner institution to implement, adapt and sustain customized change initiatives on individual campuses.

**Strategy:** Change leader teams at each partner institution identified and implemented annual change projects, and presented their ongoing results to the learning community during leadership development sessions. Each institution’s change projects were chosen to directly impact the S&E departments included in their IDEAL participation as well as directly or indirectly impact the larger university. The annual change projects cumulatively contributed to significant institutional transformation around an issue identified as important for S&E transformation at that university (e.g., recruitment of women S&E faculty, advancement and retention of women S&E faculty, departmental and institutional climate, resource equity, etc.). A detailed assessment about the success of the annual change projects is provided in the external evaluation report Appendix 1.

**Objective 3:** Assemble the senior academic leadership of partner universities to disseminate best practices from ADVANCE institutions, exchange regional institutional research, policies and practices, and evaluate change initiatives.

**Strategy:** To reinforce institutional commitment to gender equity change initiatives, IDEAL held two plenary conferences on September 17, 2010 and September 16, 2011 which were attended by senior university administrators, the change leader teams and the Advisory Board. Participants engaged with national experts and discussed each institution’s transformation efforts through presentations and poster sessions. Agendas and photographs of the plenary sessions are available on the IDEAL website at [www.case.edu/provost/ideal/plenary.html](http://www.case.edu/provost/ideal/plenary.html). Additional information about the impact of the plenary conferences is included in each Co-Director project summary (section 5 of this
report) and the external evaluation report Appendix 1, and individual plenary reports Appendix 1A and 1B.

b) **Broader Impact of Transformative Change**

IDEAL partner schools leveraged the transformational activities started by their IDEAL participation by applying for NSF *ADVANCE* Institutional Transformation grants (Kent State University, The University of Toledo) and planning for NSF *ADVANCE* Catalyst grants (Bowling Green State University, The University of Akron).

A total of twenty-five of the sixty-two IDEAL participants, (56 Change Leaders and six co-directors) have been promoted or appointed to roles of leadership within their institutions during or after their involvement with IDEAL, as indicated below.

- **Diana Bilimoria**, PhD, (Co-Principal Investigator and CWRU Co-Director), Professor of Organizational Behavior, appointed Key Bank Professor of Organizational Behavior, Weatherhead School of Management, CWRU.
- **Karen S. Bjorkman**, PhD, (Change Leader 2009 -10) Professor and Chair, Department of Physics & Astronomy, appointed inaugural Dean, College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, UT.
- **Maria Coleman**, PhD, (Change Leader 2010-11), professor of Chemical Engineering, appointed Co-Director, Institute for Sustainable Engineering Materials, UT.
- **Isabel Escobar**, PhD, (Change Leader 2010-11) Professor of Chemical Engineering and Interim Assistant Dean for Research Development and Outreach, appointed permanent Assistant Dean for Research Development and Outreach, College of Engineering; appointed co-chair the President’s 2012 Lecture Series on Diversity leading to the Women’s Empowerment Summit, UT.
- **Timothy Fisher**, PhD, (Change Leader 2009 -10), Professor, Department of Environmental Sciences appointed Department Chair of Environmental Sciences, UT.
- **Verna M. Fitzsimmons**, PhD, (Change Leader 2010-11), Associate Professor, College of Technology, KSU to CEO and Dean of Technology and Aviation, Kansas State University Salina.
- **Cyndee Gruden**, PhD, (Change Leader 2010-11), Associate Professor of Civil Engineering and Director of Civil Engineering Undergraduate Program organized a Forward to Professorship Workshop (in partnership with Isabel Escobar and Nancy Collins, (Change Leader 2009-10) for 24 underrepresented minority women assistant professors and post-docs in STEMM fields. Funding was obtained from George Washington University's NSF FORWARD-PAID grant.
- **Anurag Gupta**, PhD, (Change Leader 2010-11), Associate Professor, Department of Banking and Finance, promoted to Professor and appointed the chair of Banking and Finance Department, Weatherhead School of Management, CWRU.
- **Patricia A. Hogue**, MD, PhD, PA-C, (Change Leader 2011-12), Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Physician's Assistant Program, appointed co-chair the President’s 2012 Lecture Series on Diversity leading to the Women’s Empowerment Summit, UT.
- **Bina Joe**, PhD, (Change Leader 2011-12), Professor, Department of Physiology and Pharmacology, appointed to Director, Center for Hypertension and Personalized Medicine, UT.
- **Kathleen Kash**, PhD, (Change Leader 2009-10), Professor and Associate Chair, Department of Physics, appointed as Chair, Department of Physics
• Andrew Layden, PhD, (Change Leader 2010-11), Associate Professor, Department of Physics, promoted to Professor, Department of Physics, BGSU.
• Sheryl Milz, PhD, (Change Leader 2011-12) Associate Professor and Interim Chair, Department of Public Health and Preventative Medicine, appointed permanent Chair and Co-Director of the Northwest Ohio Consortium for Public Health, UT.
• Dara Musher-Eizenman, PhD, (Change Leader 2010-11), Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, promoted to Professor, Department of Psychology, BGSU.
• Kathleen McNamara, PhD, (Change Leader 2009-10), Professor, Department of Psychology, appointed Chair, Department of Psychology, CSU.
• Marilyn Norconk, PhD, (Change Leader 2010-11), Associate Professor, Anthropology, promoted to Professor, Anthropology, KSU.
• Penny Poplin Gosetti, PhD, (Co-Director), Interim Vice Provost for Academic Innovation, appointed Vice Provost for Assessment, Accreditation, and Program Review, UT.
• Judit Puskas, PhD, (Change Leader 2010-11), Professor, Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering, named the Austin Chemical Chair, UA.
• Brian Randolph, PhD, (Change Leader 2010-11), Professor of Civil Engineering and Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, appointed Senior Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies; appointed to one of the five NCA-HLC criterion teams (early 2011) during preparations for the 2012 accreditation site visit, joining steering committee meetings for the final year of preparations (2011-12).
• Sheila Roberts, PhD, (Change Leader 2009-10), Associate Professor, Department of Geology, promoted to Professor, UT.
• Daniel A. Scherson, PhD, (Change Leader 2009-10), Charles F. Mabery Professor of Research, Department of Chemistry, appointed to the university-wide Faculty Development Council, CWRU.
• Ruth Siegel, PhD, (Change Leader 2011-12), Professor, Director of the Pharmalogical Sciences Consortium Core Image Analysis Facility, Department of Pharmacology, appointed Co-Chair, SOM Faculty Council ad hoc IDEAL Action Committee, CWRU.
• Deanne Snavely, PhD, (IDEAL Co-Director), Interim Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (BGSU), appointed the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Indiana State University of Pennsylvania.
• Linda M. Subich, PhD, (Change Leader 2009-10), Professor and Assistant Chair, Department of Psychology, appointed Associate Dean, Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences, UA.
• Michael Tubergen, PhD, (Change Leader 2009-10), Professor and Acting Chair, Department of Chemistry, appointed Chair, Department of Chemistry, KSU.

2) Participants
   a) Senior Personnel
      Principal Investigator
      Lynn T. Singer, PhD (Deputy Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, CWRU) was the PI of CWRU’s ADVANCE IT (ACES) project. Dr. Singer worked with the senior leadership of partner institutions and with the IDEAL Co-PIs to lead and oversee all proposed elements. Dr. Singer chaired the two plenary conferences. She oversaw the annual reporting to NSF.
Co-Principal Investigator
Diana Bilimoria, PhD (Key Bank Professor of Organizational Behavior, CWRU) was a Co-PI of the ADVANCE IT (ACES) program at CWRU. Dr. Bilimoria oversaw the design and implementation of the leadership development program and planning of the plenary conferences. Dr. Bilimoria led and taught in IDEAL’s leadership development program, coordinated other instructors as needed, and coordinated and supervised the Team Coaches. She chaired the annual meetings of the Advisory Board, oversaw internal and external evaluation efforts, and engaged in a variety of dissemination and outreach activities.

Co-Principal Investigator
Helen Qammar, PhD (Director, Institute for Teaching and Learning and Associate Professor of Chemical Engineering, UA) oversaw partner institution relationships. She participated in the planning of the leadership development program and the plenary conferences, as well as participated in annual reporting to NSF, evaluation efforts, and dissemination of program outcomes through various channels.

Project Director
Amanda Shaffer, former Manager of Faculty Diversity and Development on the ADVANCE IT (ACES) program at CWRU, led the day-to-day planning, implementation and administrative functions of the IDEAL Project. She coordinated the leadership development programs, faculty group coaching, annual change project implementation, and the annual plenary conferences and the annual reporting to NSF. She also tracked expenditures and contract terms, implemented the program and coaching assessment surveys and evaluation, oversaw logistics connected to and provided resources for the leadership development program including teaching materials, participant materials and web-based resources.

Co-Directors:
Each partner institution was led by an IDEAL Co-Director over the project’s three-year duration. Co-Directors chose the overall institutional transformation theme for their change projects, annually selected the change leader team at their universities, advised on the selection of annual change projects, coordinated team coaching meetings, engaged their university’s senior administration to provide resources and supports for successful implementation of the annual change projects, and served on IDEAL’s advisory board. The Co-Directors were:

- Helen Qammar, PhD, Director, Institute for Teaching and Learning and Associate Professor of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering (UA)
- Julie Barnes, PhD, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (BGSU), replaced Deanne Snavely, Interim Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences as Co-Director in June 2011.
- Diana Bilimoria, PhD, Key Bank Professor of Organizational Behavior (CWRU)
- Paul P. Lin, PhD, Associate Dean, Fenn College of Engineering (CSU)
- Mary Louise Holly, PhD, Professor, Teaching, Leadership and Curriculum Studies; Co-Director, Igniting Streams of Learning in Science (KSU)
- Penny Poplin Gosetti, PhD, Vice Provost for Assessment, Accreditation, and Program Review (UT).
Team Coaches:
Each institution was provided an IDEAL Team Coach to facilitate the planning of the annual change projects undertaken by each Change Leader Team. The team coach, who was assigned to the same institution for the duration (three years) of the project, traveled to each partner university’s campus twice a year for group-coaching sessions, and advised on each change project’s plans and evaluation. Coaches were drawn from the pool of coaches who worked on CWRU’s ACES project as academic executive coaches and other professional coaches. The team coaches for IDEAL were: Deborah A. O’Neil, PhD (BGSU), Helen Williams, PhD, (CWRU and UA), Cheryl Greer Jordon, PhD, (CSU), Susan Freimark (KSU), and Margaret M. Hopkins, PhD, (UT). Two coaches (at BGSU and UT) were ongoing faculty in their institutions.

b) Additional Personnel
External Evaluator:
Mary Wright, PhD, Director of Assessment and Associate Research Scientist, Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) at the University of Michigan conducted the summative evaluation as described in the Evaluation section of the project proposal.

Work-study students:
Anthony Castellaneta and Sara McCormick, under supervision of the Project Director, updated the IDEAL website and provided clerical support for academic year 2010 - 2012.

Advisory board: In addition to the Co-Directors from the partner institutions the Advisory Board included four external members:

- W. A. "Bud" Baeslack III, PhD, Provost and Executive Vice President, Case Western Reserve University
- Melissa Cardenas, PhD, Director, Academic Quality Assurance, Ohio Board of Regents (OBOR)
- Byron C. Clayton, EDM, Vice President, NorTech
- Abigail Stewart, PhD, Professor of Psychology and Women's Studies, and Director of the ADVANCE Program at the Institute for Research on Women and Gender, University of Michigan.

c) Change Leader Teams by Partner School (titles as of the participation year)
Bowling Green State University
2011/12
Royce Ann Martin, PhD, Associate Professor, Aviation Studies
Diem Nguyen, PhD, Associate Professor, Mathematics and Statistics
Karen Root, PhD, Associate Professor, Biological Sciences

2010/2011
Andrew Layden, PhD, Associate Professor, Physics
Dara Musher-Eizenman, PhD, Associate Professor, Psychology
Margaret (Peg) M. Yacobucci, PhD, Associate Professor, Geology

2009/2010
Laura M. Leventhal, PhD, Professor, Computer Science.
Helen J. Michaels, PhD, Associate Professor, Biological Science
Sheila Roberts, PhD, Associate Professor, Geology

Case Western Reserve University Change Leaders
2011/12
Walter Boron, MD, PhD, Professor and Chairman, Physiology and Biophysics
Alison Hall, PhD, Associate Dean of Graduate Education and Professor, Neuroscience
Ruth Siegel, PhD, Professor, Director of the Pharmalological Sciences Consortium
Core Image Analysis Facility, Department of Pharmacology
Neena Singh, MD, PhD, Professor, Pathology

2010/2011
Anurag Gupta, PhD, Associate Professor, Banking and Finance
Erin Lavik, PhD, Associate Professor, Biomedical Engineering
Jagdip Singh, PhD, Professor and Chair, Marketing and Policy Studies
GQ Zhang, PhD, Professor, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science

2009/2010
Daniela Calvetti, PhD, Professor and Chair, Mathematics
Kathleen Kash, PhD, Professor, Physics
Daniel A. Scherson, PhD, Charles F. Mabery Professor of Research, Chemistry

Cleveland State University Change Leaders
2011/12
Fouad Abou-Ghalioum, PhD, Associate Professor, Engineering Technology
Jorge Gatica, PhD, Professor and Graduate Program Director, Chemical and Biomedical Engineering
Connie Hollinger, PhD, Professor, Psychology

2010/2011
Mekki Bayachou, PhD, Associate Professor, Chemistry
Susan Bazyk, PhD, Associate Professor, Occupational Therapy and Physician Assistant Program
Nilufer Dural, PhD, Associate Professor, Civil And Environmental Engineering

2009/2010
Paul P. Lin, PhD, Associate Dean and Professor, Mechanical Engineering
Kathleen McNamara, PhD, Professor, Psychology
Barbara H. Margolis, PhD, Professor, Mathematics.

Kent State University Change Leaders
2011/12
Daniel Holm, PhD, Professor and Chair, Geology
Kathy Kerns, PhD, Professor, Psychology
Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, PhD, Associate Professor, Biological Sciences
Mandy Munro-Stasiuk, PhD, Associate Professor and Chair, Geography
2010/2011
Verna Fitzsimmons, PhD, Associate Professor, College of Technology
Daniel Holm, PhD, Professor and Chair, Geology
Marilyn Norconk, PhD, Associate Professor, Anthropology

2009/2010
Carmen Almasan, PhD, Professor, Physics
Andrew Tonge, PhD, Professor and Chair, Mathematics
Michael Tubergen, PhD, Professor and Acting Chair, Chemistry.

University of Akron Change Leaders
2011/12
Kathy Liszka, PhD, Professor, Computer Science
Richard Londraville, PhD, Professor, Biology
Ajay Mahajan, PhD, Associate Dean of Research, College of Engineering

2010/2011
Amy Milsted, PhD, Professor, Biology
Judit Puskus, PhD, Professor, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering
Mary Verstraete, PhD, Associate Professor and Coordinator of the Undergraduate Program, Biomedical Engineering

2009/2010
Edward A Evans, PhD, Associate Professor, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering
Linda M. Subich, PhD, Professor and Assistant Chair, Psychology
Claire A. Tessier, PhD, Professor, Chemistry

University of Toledo Change Leaders
2011/12
Robert Blumenthal, PhD, Professor, Medical Microbiology and Immunology
Patricia Hogue, MD, PhD, Associate Professor and Chair, Physician's Assistant Program
Bina Joe, PhD, Professor, Physiology and Pharmacology
Sheryl Milz, PhD, Associate Professor and Interim Chair, Public Health and Preventative Medicine

2010/2011
Maria Coleman, PhD, Professor, Chemical and Environmental Engineering
Isabel Escobar, PhD, Interim Assistant Dean for Research Development and Outreach College of Engineering; Professor, Chemical and Environmental Engineering; Acting Director of the Catharine S. Eberly Center for Women
Cyndee Gruden, PhD, Associate Professor, Civil Engineering.
Brian Randolph, PhD, Associate Dean of Engineering Undergraduate Studies, Honors Program Director and Professor, Civil Engineering

2009/2010
Karen S. Bjorkman, PhD, Professor and Chair, Physics & Astronomy
Nancy H. Collins, PhD, Professor, Medical Microbiology and Immunology
3) Leadership Development Program

a) Description of Program
The leadership development program was attended by the change leaders from the six partner institutions and consisted of four half-day group coaching based sessions featuring extensive cross-university interaction. The sessions were conducted bimonthly in each of the three years of the IDEAL project with the physical meeting location of the sessions rotating among partner institutions. In addition to making the burden of travel more equitable for all participants, the travel to the various locations allowed for additional interaction within the change leader teams and often with their co-director. In the project’s final year, one leadership development session was conducted virtually – change leaders from pairs of institutions in contiguous locations (BGSU & UT, CSU & CWRU, and KSU & UA) met together, and the three locations were connected via telepresence.

The format of the sessions included instruction, skill training, peer group exchange, networking, and group cohesion. Each session built on previous sessions as well as the needs of individuals and institutional cohorts. Cyberspace connectivity, distance learning technologies, and sharing of reading materials was used between sessions to continue the exchange of information, knowledge, and discussion of emergent issues. Each half-day session began with a one-hour working lunch that included structured conversations or instruction, followed by the three and half-hour working session. The program content disseminated the effective elements of NSF ADVANCE IT programs through instruction, experiential activities, group coaching, and action learning assignments between sessions.

Diana Bilimoria led the leadership sessions with additional content provided by Amanda Shaffer and Lynn Singer. Topics covered included Defining the Work of Academic Leadership, The Institutional Transformation Model, Building Influential Alliances, Leading for Change, Leadership Vision. Complete agendas for the four sessions, readings, presentations, and session evaluations are provided on the IDEAL website at www.case.edu/provost/ideal/research.html.

b) Evaluations of Leadership Development Program
Evaluation data indicated that the leadership sessions helped advance the IDEAL project’s key goals, particularly to provide information about reasons for faculty underrepresentation (Mean=3.2 to 3.9 out of 4.0 over the three years of the project), to create a regional learning community of academic leaders (M=3.4 to 3.7), and to increase change leaders’ commitment to gender equity change at their universities (M=3.4 to 3.8) (Table 1). Ratings for individual sessions were also high, with all mean ratings between 3 and 4 (signaling “good” to “excellent”) (Table 2). Interestingly, while change team leaders’ holistic evaluation of the leadership meetings showed a slightly increasing trend over the three years of IDEAL (Table 1), ratings of individual leadership meetings have been declining slightly (Table 2). Although the exact reasons for the contrary trends is unknown, it may be that year 3 change team leaders experienced less growth from their
individual sessions compared to their predecessors, because they had the benefit of interacting with years 1 and 2 change team leaders on campus and had also gained additional familiarity with the materials due to attendance at the plenary conferences.

Additional feedback was gathered during campus interviews by external evaluator Mary Wright asking the change teams to reflect on the sessions. Participants noted the provided literature on organizational development, search committees, and organizational climate were particularly helpful to them and had made them well-informed advocates about gender equity in STEM. Several respondents described instances where they had used information and strategies from the sessions, particular in serving on administrative and faculty search committees. Participants also found the leadership development sessions to be particularly useful for more effectively meeting with faculty at other institutions, learning about ideas generated at other campuses, and getting feedback on one’s own initiative.

Although most change team leaders indicated that the leadership sessions were helpful, a few key suggestions arose multiple times across the campuses. Some faculty (particularly those in the Schools of Medicine) sought more “time efficient” meetings, finding it difficult to leave their campus for a day (inclusive of travel). This group suggested that more online meetings or perhaps shorter meetings would be more effective. Although shorter meetings were not suggested by those in other fields, other faculty suggested changes in format, with more emphasis on interaction throughout the day. For example, one faculty member described feeling “frustrated that we had limited time and we had to sit and listen to material.”

Table 1: End-of-Year Holistic Evaluation of Leadership Development Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informed you about the factors responsible for the underrepresentation of</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women and minority groups in academic S&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased your understanding of institutional cultures in S&amp;E disciplines</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased your visibility and influence in your university</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased your view of yourself as an academic leader</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased your commitment to implement and sustain gender equity</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change at your university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped you build stronger relationships and support systems within your university</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped you feel part of a regional learning community of academic</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaders in Northern Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scale is 1-4, where 1=poor and 4=excellent.*

Table 2. Individual Leadership Meeting Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1 2009-10</td>
<td>Session 1 2010-11</td>
<td>Session 1 2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2 2009-10</td>
<td>Session 2 2010-11</td>
<td>Session 2 2011-12 (Video conference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3 2009-10</td>
<td>Session 3 2010-11</td>
<td>Session 3 2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1 2010-11</td>
<td>Session 3 2010-11</td>
<td>Session 4 2010-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2 2010-11</td>
<td>Session 4 2010-11</td>
<td>Session 4 2011-2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) Plenary Conferences

To reinforce institutional commitment to gender equity change initiatives, IDEAL held two plenary conferences, on September 17, 2010 and September 16, 2011, which were attended by senior university administrators (provosts, deans, diversity officers, and others), the change leader teams and the Advisory Board. Participants engaged with national speakers (in 2010, Brenda Manuel, Associate Administrator for Diversity and Equal Opportunity, NASA, and in 2011, Margaret Tolbert, Senior Advisor for the Office of Integrative Activities, NSF), and the campus change teams presented on their year’s change project. Afternoon sessions included a presentation from a representative from the Ohio Board of Regents and table discussions. Agendas and photographs are provided on the IDEAL website at www.case.edu/provost/ideal/plenary.html and additional detailed information about the impact of the plenary conferences may be found in the external evaluation report Appendix 1A and Appendix 1B.

Both plenary events were well attended. In 2010, there were 133 invitees and 85 attendees, and in 2011, there were 101 invitees and 94 participants. In both years, attendees included nearly all IDEAL participants from the six participating universities, and a third to nearly half of the administrative leadership from these institutions.

Both years’ Plenary Conferences were also well evaluated immediately after the event. As seen in Table 3, the overall mean in 2010 was 3.6 (on a scale of 1-4, where 4=excellent), with 100% of respondents evaluating the conference as “excellent” or “good.” The overall mean score was the same in 2011 (M=3.6), with again a very high proportion of respondents (98%) reflecting that the session was “excellent” or “good.” Comparisons by role (presented in the Year 1 and 2 external evaluation reports www.case.edu/provost/ideal/) suggest that conference ratings were quite similar for change team leaders and high-level administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall rating</th>
<th>2010 (N=55)</th>
<th>2011 (N=47)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>% Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scale is 1-4, where 1=poor and 4=excellent.*

Table 3: Post-Event Plenary Conference Evaluation, 2010 and 2011
At the 2012 campus visits by external evaluator Mary Wright, many change team leaders named plenary conferences as one of the most valuable components of IDEAL. Beginning change team leaders valued how it “jumpstarted” their projects, and those finishing a project year found it valuable to present initiatives in front of a high-profile audience and interact with change team leaders from other IDEAL project years from their campuses. In addition to change team leaders’ feedback, it is important to note that at campus visits, several high-level administrators credited the plenary conferences with helping to inform them about IDEAL and for effective sharing of best practices.

Due to the high impact of this activity, the IDEAL leadership has scheduled a closing plenary gathering for October 5, 2012 to discuss three-year outcomes, institutionalization strategies and successes, as well as ongoing regional collaborative potential.

5) Project Activities by Partner Institution: Co-Director Summary and Year 3 Report

A Co-Director summary report of the overall impact of IDEAL precedes the year 3 annual change project report from the change leader teams. Each change project report describes the overall project and theme, the goals and objectives of the project, the activities undertaken, accomplishments or findings from the project, recommendations and sustainability plans and dissemination activities and plans. Faculty Composition data for IDEAL departments (selected S&E departments within each school) and broader university leadership by gender and underrepresented minority status Pre-IDEAL (2008-9) and at Last Year of Grant (2011-12) for all six partner institutions is presented in the next section of this report titled Three-Year NSF Indicator Data (section 6).

a) Bowling Green State University

Institutional Contexts for Transformation

The Bowling Green State University IDEAL departments are the following eight departments in the College of Arts and Sciences: Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Geography, Environmental Health, Mathematics, Physics and Astronomy, and Computer Science.

Bowling Green State University
Co-Director Three-Year Project Summary
(See Appendix 2 for full report)

Co-Director: Julie Barnes, PhD, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences
1. Institutional Transformation Theme: Build Intellectual Community & Collegiality
   
a. Impact of change projects on the university over three years
   BGSU has seen change at many levels in the last three years. During this time period, there have been three changes in the Provost position. In July 2011, Dr. Mary Ellen Mazey became the eleventh president of the university. In the fall of 2010, the full-time faculty voted to unionize and contract negotiations are currently under way.

   There have been staff changes in other offices on campus that also have had an impact on the level of success of the IDEAL project, most notably in the Offices of Equity and Diversity and Institutional Research. The three staff members of Equity and Diversity staff retired over a two-year period (2009-11). A new director was named in fall 2011 and another staff member was hired in spring 2012. The director of Institutional Research and another staff member left in August 2011.

   In this environment, the three IDEAL change teams have had a modicum of success in achieving substantive change. We conducted the climate survey and collected baseline data in year one. This will serve us well as we move forward with the new administration. The most visible impact may be the hiring of three women in tenure-track positions in STEM areas this year. The change teams conducted recruiting workshops on search committee processes and implicit bias and contributed to this outcome. Several of the faculty personnel policies that the IDEAL teams were supporting will become articles in the collective bargaining agreement.

   b. Reception received from campus leaders and faculty to the change projects
   Provost Borland (2009-11) supported the IDEAL project by hosting a web site for the project and disseminating the analysis of the climate survey that was conducted in year one. Dr. Borland also participated in one of the IDEAL plenary sessions. Dean Morgan-Russell has formed a college-level diversity committee, supported IDEAL projects with funding, and has encouraged participation in IDEAL programming and change team projects. Faculty have attended or participated in several events with favorable feedback. Faculty on STEM search committees participating in the implicit bias workshops provided positive feedback. This year’s change team met with the new director of Equity and Diversity and there is potential for future collaborations. Several change team members met with the Vice President for Research and Economic Development this spring and he is supporting their writing an ADVANCE IT proposal.

   c. Policies, practices implemented, in planning stages etc.
   The College of Arts and Sciences is committed to institutionalizing the search committee training sessions. The benefit of these sessions will extend beyond the science areas in the college. In the past, the College of Arts and Sciences has taken the lead in professional development for department chairs. In the future, we will explore partnering with other colleges and the Office of Equity and Diversity to promote additional training in this area.

   The change teams had planned on supporting and developing several policies that would benefit female faculty. This has transitioned to the collective bargaining table.
A need for mentoring has been identified and the College will partner with one or two departments to explore different models. It is anticipated that the Provost will be investing faculty lines in the sciences and this will become a critical need to ensure success of new tenure-track faculty.

d. Impact of the plenary on the institutional progress
The plenary sessions were helpful in building an alliance with Dr. Borland while he was Provost. The exchange of ideas regarding change projects and the commitment at other institutions was inspirational.

2. Leadership Development Program
   a. Leadership movement of participants over three years
      Deanne Snavely, co-director for years one and two, is now dean of the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Andrew Layden and Dara Musher-Eizenman, year two change team leaders, were promoted to full professor this year. Several change team leaders have taken roles in search committees during this time period.

   b. Annual change projects
      Year 1: Deanne Snavely, Co-Director. The year 1 team initiated the discussion of gender issues in academe and collected baseline climate data. The team invited Dr. Bernice Sandler to campus. Dr. Sandler gave a talk on the application of Title IX in academia, presented to the Faculty Senate titled "Chilly Classroom Climate", and participated in a panel session about equity issues. With the assistance of the Office of Institutional Research, the team conducted a climate service that collected the baseline data. (See Appendix 2A – 2E)

      Year 2: Deanne Snavely, Co-Director. The year 2 team conducted a factor analysis of the climate survey data. With the help of Marketing and Communication, three short reports were developed from this analysis. These brochures have been posted at the Provost's IDEAL web site. (See Appendix 2A – 2E) The year 2 team developed a workshop on implicit bias in faculty searches and gave two presentations to members of STEM search committees. The team also set up the IDEAL web site and created a blog to solicit input from STEM faculty regarding gender issues. (See Appendix 2F)

      Year 3: Julie Barnes, Co-Director. The year 3 team included a faculty member from the College of Technology, extending the impact beyond the College of Arts & Sciences. The new dean of Technology attended the plenary. The team updated the IDEAL web site and continued the blog from year two. The search committee workshops were repeated with new participants. (See Appendix 2G) The team also conducted a survey of the STEM chairs in the Colleges of Arts & Sciences and Technology. Purpose of the survey was to ascertain awareness or knowledge of initiatives and best practices to support STEM faculty.

3. Best practices/promising practices for future
   The search committee training will be continued. Members of the Arts & Sciences Diversity Committee attended sessions this year in an effort to train more faculty to lead these sessions in the future. Areas outside of STEM will be included in future recruiting cycles.
Discussions with the Director of Equity and Diversity and the Provost may promote the practice outside of Arts and Sciences.

Several faculty personnel policies will be implemented in conjunction with the collective bargaining process. The BGSU Faculty Association and the Administration team have tentatively agreed on an Extension of the Probationary Period. A similar policy was under discussion and close to approval in the Faculty Senate when the faculty voted to form a union. Other policies are still in negotiation.

The climate survey will be repeated during 2012-2013. It is hoped that conducting the survey every three years will be supported by the administration as part of its initiative to diversify the faculty.

4. Foundations for future progress
   a. Campus Alliances and Coalitions

   Over the last several years, many changes have occurred in the senior leadership positions at the university. See the table below. This has made establishing strategic alliances on campus a work in progress. With the appointment of a new president and provost this year, the environment appears to have stabilized for a while. This gives us a firmer foundation to build on for the future and the confidence that the alliances we establish will have time to grow.

   Another area to explore for cooperative work is with the University of Toledo. This year we exchanged some materials with the team at the Medical College and they invited us to participate in one of their mentoring programs. We need to expand on our opportunities to work with our colleagues at Toledo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date of Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>July 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost</td>
<td>November 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Research and Economic Development</td>
<td>August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Equity and Diversity</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>February 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Firelands</td>
<td>July 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Education and Human Development</td>
<td>July 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, University Libraries</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Musical Arts</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Technology</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Business Administration</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Health and Human Services</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Key Three Year Accomplishment
   Change leaders were asked what they thought was the key accomplishment of this project. The most common response was the climate survey. The data helps support the claim of many faculty that there is a problem a BGSU. One change leader wrote, “I think people were
in total denial and that other accomplishments such as educating search committees will be more successful in context when viewed with the climate survey.”

6. Sustainability Plans for Institutionalizing Activities

The College of Arts and Sciences has already taken the first steps at institutionalizing the search committee training workshops by involving members of the Arts and Sciences Diversity Committee. We hope to continue the peer-to-peer conversation about these issues. We will meet with the Director of Equity and Diversity regarding the expansion of the program to other units on campus.

The College of Arts and Sciences will take the initiative in requesting that the climate survey is conducted on a regular schedule. While originally conducted to identify gender issues, there are also few under-represented minority faculty in many programs on campus. The President has expressed her concern with this demographic and there should be support for institutionalizing the administration of this survey.

The Vice President for Research and Economic Development provided support for an ADVANCE IT grant application. Drs. Yacobucci and O’Neil attended meetings in Washington, D.C. to learn more about the program guidelines and requirements courtesy of funding by the Vice President’s office.

---

IDEAL Partner Institution Year Three Change Project Report:
Bowling Green State University

Co-Director:
Julie Barnes, PhD, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Year Three Change Project Team Members:
Dr. Karen Root, Associate Professor of Biological Sciences
Dr. Diem Nguyen, Associate Professor of Mathematics and Statistics
Dr. Royce Ann Martin, Associate Professor of Engineering Technologies

Team Coach: Dr. Deborah A. O’Neil, Assistant Professor of Management, BGSU

Institutional Transformation Theme (as defined by the Co-director in proposal):
“Build Intellectual Community & Collegiality”
The third year at BGSU continued the work of building an intellectual community and collegiality around diversity and inclusion in STEM. Our activities are designed to foster recruitment and retention of women students and faculty in STEM fields at BGSU.

Institutional Transformation Vision (created by Co-Director and change leader team):
Our vision is to transform the BGSU educational environment to be open and inclusive of women students and faculty members and to foster the recruitment and retention of female students and faculty.

Year Three Change Project Description:
The third year at BGSU continued the work of building an intellectual community and collegiality around diversity and inclusion in STEM. Our activities are designed to foster recruitment and retention of women students and faculty in STEM fields at BGSU.

Year Three Goals/Objectives of the Change Project:

a. Objectives: (1) Continue training for STEM faculty search committees to educate on implicit bias and gender equity issues in hiring in an effort to institutionalize process., (2) Survey Chairs and Directors to collect data on awareness of specific policies and initiatives, (3) Update the BGSU IDEAL website and promote on-line venues as mechanisms for sharing information, resources, and viewpoints.

b. Outcomes Sought: Increased awareness among STEM faculty of equity issues, including increased sensitivity to gender bias in hiring and recognition of differing perceptions of workplace climate between male and female faculty

Year Three Activities Undertaken:

a. Search Committee Training (See Appendix 2G)

With assistance from the year 2 team, the year 3 change team conducted two training sessions for STEM faculty search committees in Fall 2011. The Dean of Arts & Sciences was enlisted to encourage search committee members to attend the training. The team used the PowerPoint presentation developed in the previous year, and also provided handouts, including a suggested candidate evaluation tool. Members of the College’s Diversity Committee were also invited to attend the sessions.

A total of thirteen people attended, with representatives from three of the five STEM departments with tenure-track search committees. Four members of the Diversity Committee attended a session. Feedback was collected via anonymous evaluation forms, and was generally positive. Our question, “How much will you use this information in your role on a search committee,” yielded a score of 4.6 on a 1-5 scale (“none” to “very much”), indicating that the presentation was perceived as useful. In comparison, the score for this question was 4.3 last year. Representative comments included, “I think it is valuable to discuss these issues, so they are forefront in our minds as we evaluate faculty, hire new colleagues, and work to promote the best working environment for all,” and, “I think it is a good start to fix the problem.”

Three women were hired this year to tenure-track positions in STEM fields. The departments were Biological Sciences (attended training in 2010 and 2011), Chemistry (attended 2010), and Mathematics and Statistics (attended 2010 and 2011). We look forward to the upcoming recruiting year.

The participation of the Diversity Committee in the sessions this year was an attempt to broaden the number of faculty involved in such training for the future. The College hopes to expand this type of training to all search committees. We will also work with the Provost’s office and the Office of Equity and Diversity to expand this peer-based training to other colleges on campus.

b. Survey of Chairs and Directors

The team authored and distributed a survey to chairs and directors in STEM areas in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Technology. The cover letter described the IDEAL project and its goals. The purpose of the survey was to collect information on activities
and past practices that have already been implemented to support the underrepresented
groups in STEM areas at Bowling Green.

c. Website and Blog (See Appendix 2F)
The team updated and revised the BGSU IDEAL web site hosted by the Provost
(www.bgsu.edu/offices/provost/ideal/). A link to the site was added to the College’s
home page to increase the number of entry points to the BGSU IDEAL site.

There were issues with the blog set up by the year two team. A new blog (BGSTEM)
was implemented. Also, an opt-in discussion list was created. There are currently 26
participants in this list.

d. Meetings, attendees and dates:
  • Change Team Meetings (with occasional individual absences, meetings included
   Martin, Nguyen, and Root; Barnes and O’Neil attended some of them): July 5 (1st,
   2nd, and 3rd Year Teams), October 3, October 5, October 17, October 28, November
   21, December 2, 2011; February 17, February 21, February 28, March 27, 2012
  • Meeting with Director of the Office of Equity and Diversity: February 23, 2012 -
   Martin, O’Neil, Director Barbara Waddell
  • Meeting with Vice President of Research and Economic Development: March 28,
   2012 – Martin, Nguyen, Root, Yacobucci, O’Neil, VPREd Michael Ogawa
  • IDEAL Project Meetings
  • September 16, 2011 IDEAL Plenary Conference at Case Western Reserve - Barnes,
   Martin, Nguyen, Root, Layden, Musher-Eizenman, Yacobucci, O’Neil, Sue Houston
   (Vice Provost for Academic Programs), Faris Malhas (Dean of the College of
   Technology)
  • October 13 IDEAL Leadership Session #1 (Cleveland State U.) - Barnes, Root
  • November 3 IDEAL Leadership Session #2 (Kent State) - Martin, Nguyen, Root
  • March 2 IDEAL Leadership Session #3 (U. Toledo) - Barnes, Nguyen, Root
  • April 10 IDEAL Leadership Session #4 (Bowling Green State U.) - Barnes, Martin,
   Nguyen, Root, O’Neil
  • September 27 IDEAL Coach and Co-Director meeting to discuss Year 3 goals -
   Barnes, O’Neil
  • November 15 Search Committee Training Session - Layden, Yacobucci, Root
  • November 18 Search Committee Training Session - Layden, Yacobucci, Root
  • February 2 IDEAL Coach and Co-Director meeting - Barnes, O’Neil
  • February 17 IDEAL phone conference – Barnes
  • March 19 through 20, Hosted McMaster Lecturer Dr. Sherri Bale, GeneDx
  • March 19 Public lecture and reception, dinner with Dean and IDEAL Team.
  • March 20 Breakfast, lecture in science departments.
  • April 16 IDEAL evaluation visit

Year Three Resources/Alliances Harnessed Across Campus:
  • Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost: Provost Kenneth Borland
  • College of Arts and Sciences: Dean Simon Morgan-Russell, Associate Deans Julie
   Barnes and Franklin Goza, A&S Diversity Committee
  • STEM Chairs and faculty on search committees
• Office of Equity and Diversity, Director Barbara Waddell
• Women’s Center, Director Mary Kreuger
• Women’s Studies Program, Director Susana Peña

Year Three Project Accomplishments/Findings:
The second round of search committee training confirms that this activity has successfully raised awareness among STEM faculty of gender issues during the hiring process. This is reflected by the fact that three of the six STEM tenure-track positions were filled by women this year.
The team has been successful in continuing the dialog among faculty with the implementation of a discussion list. This has created a core group of individuals to form a foundation for a larger community of scholars. This will address some of the issues discovered in the climate survey regarding the sense of isolation and stress felt by women faculty.

Members of the year 2 and 3 teams and the Team Coach met with the Vice Provost of Research and Economic Development (VPRED) to determine the interest in applying for an ADVANCE IT grant. Support has been given to this initiative by the VPRED including travel to NSF to meet program officers.

Year Three Key Accomplishment/Finding:
The key accomplishment of this project was the climate survey and the factor analysis done in the data collected. The data helps support the claim of many faculty that there is a problem at BGSU.

Year Three Recommendations:
• The College of Arts and Sciences should work to institutionalize the training for faculty search committees and extend the presentations to Tenure & Promotion Committee members, and perhaps to other venues outside of the college.
• The College of Arts and Sciences should consider implementing a mentoring program for incoming STEM faculty along the lines of those designed by CWRU and other IDEAL schools.
• BGSU should work more closely with the groups at the University of Toledo.
• BGSU should conduct another climate survey sometime during the 2012-2013 academic year.
• BGSU should follow through with applying for an NSF ADVANCE grant.

Year Three Sustainability Plans for Institutionalizing Activities:
  a. Plans for Institutionalization/Sustainability
    • Search committee training will be continued in the College of Arts and Sciences.
    • Discussion List will be continued in order to continue building a core coalition of STEM faculty.
    • With a new president and provost, we have the opportunity to build on the work that has been done during the 3 years of the IDEAL program and ensure that a focus on strengthening our STEM faculty continues.

  b. Challenges Encountered or Likely:
We may expect to see resistance to new programs as the Administration adapts to changes in State funding.

**Year Three Dissemination Activities and Plans:**

The discussion list and BGSTEM blog will be continued.

**b) Case Western Reserve University**

Institutional Context for Transformation

The Case Western Reserve University IDEAL Departments include all science departments in the College of Arts and Sciences (Anthropology, Astronomy, Biology, Chemistry, Geological Sciences, Mathematics, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, and Statistics), all departments in the Case School of Engineering (Biomedical Eng., Chemical Eng., Civil Eng., Electrical Eng. & Computer Science, Macromolecular Science and Eng., Materials Science and Eng., and Mechanical and Aerospace Eng.) and five departments in the Weatherhead School of Management (Economics, Information Systems, Marketing and Policy Studies, Operations, and Organizational Behavior), and the School of Medicine Basic Science Departments (Anatomy, Biochemistry, Bioethics, Biomedical Engineering, Environmental Health Sciences, Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Genetics, Molecular Biology and Microbiology, Neurosciences, Nutrition, Pathology, Pharmacology, Physiology and Biostatistics)

**Case Western Reserve University**
**Co-Director Three-Year Project Summary**
(See Appendix 3 for full report)

Co-Director: Diana Bilimoria, KeyBank Professor and Professor of Organizational Behavior

1. **Institutional Transformation Theme as defined in the proposal**

   Case Western Reserve University’s (CWRU) IDEAL institutional transformation theme was: *Enhancing Collegiality and Inclusion in S&E.*

   The IDEAL project has been successful in advancing this theme in each of the four schools in which the program was conducted. In the College of Arts and Sciences a large number of faculty and the chairs of the science departments came together in small groups to discuss issues of importance to their professional and career development needs. In the Weatherhead School of Management and the Case School of Engineering, pre-tenure faculty needs for mentoring and career startup were prioritized. In the School of Medicine, faculty feedback on how to improve aspects of the School’s climate (particularly resource availability and sharing, collegiality, and support from department chairs) was sought. All these projects have provided an improved sense of faculty collegiality and inclusion.

   The plenary conferences of IDEAL have been held on the CWRU campus and have been extremely well received. These have served to bring together the university’s senior administrators together with IDEAL change leader participants around important topics of faculty recruitment, advancement and retention.
2. Leadership Development Program
   a. Leadership movement of participants over three years:
      Many of the change leader participants were already department chairs. Through the leadership development program, these individuals have gained an enhanced sense of what constitutes formal and informal leadership, have been guided to improve their departmental climates, and have gained new awareness of the career development needs of diverse faculty.

   b. Annual change projects
      The change projects have had enduring impact on the university over the three years of the IDEAL project. The year 1 project consisted of assessing the faculty development needs of assistant, associate, and full professors in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). A large number of faculty from the College’s science departments participated in focus groups to determine these needs, which were shared with the science department chairs and the CAS dean.

      The year 2 project was conducted in the Weatherhead School of Management (WSOM) and the Case School of Engineering (CSE). In both schools, the focus was on mentoring newly hired faculty and pre-tenure faculty. In WSOM, structured mentoring of assistant professors was designed and piloted, which was implemented in a year-long initiative the following year. In CSE, launch committees were designed and set up for newly hired faculty, which were implemented in a year-long initiative the following year. Plans are to continue implementation of these mentoring initiatives in both schools.

      The year 3 project’s goal was to improve the retention of tenured women faculty in the basic sciences of the School of Medicine by improving the overall climate. Four faculty discussions were conducted to develop recommendations from faculty feedback, which were then discussed with various SOM bodies including the executive council of faculty, the climate change taskforce, the basic science department chairs, and the SOM Dean. Overall, the projects have been extremely successful in galvanizing faculty at each of the participating schools to coalesce around important issues of faculty diversity and development. The projects have generally resulted in clear recommendations for actions by various school-specific administrative bodies.

3. Best practices/promising practices for future
   The mentoring and launch committee programs were very well received and hold great promise for implementation to develop future pre-tenure faculty as well.

   Growing out of the IDEAL program, and partially supported through another NSF ADVANCE PAID grant from George Washington University (FORWARD grant), the To Tenure and Beyond program brought together women S&E assistant professors from the IDEAL universities in a career development program focused on providing information and skills for moving through tenure and beyond. This program consisted of career development course sessions, individualized professional academic coaching sessions, and the development of career goals and plan.

4. Key Three Year Accomplishment
Since the annual change projects were conducted in four different schools, key accomplishments over the three years are reported for each school. At the College of Arts and Sciences, recommendations for faculty development at each career stage (assistant, associate, and professor) were developed. At the Weatherhead School of Management, a mentoring program for new faculty (less than three years at the school) has been implemented. At the Case School of Engineering, a launch committee process has been created for all newly arriving faculty members. At the School of Medicine, recommendations to improve faculty climate were developed in four areas: faculty recognition and engagement, research sustainability, promoting collaborative research, and promoting the careers of women faculty.

5. **Sustainability Plans for Institutionalizing Activities**
   Plans are underway (through support of the Dean’s office) to continue the implementation of mentoring relationships for pre-tenure faculty in the Weatherhead School of Management in future years.

   Plans are underway (through support of the Dean’s office) to continue the implementation of launch committees for new faculty in the Case School of Engineering in future years.

   In the School of Medicine, the Dean has reported that the search for a Vice Dean for Faculty Development and Diversity is almost completed. The School of Medicine Faculty Council voted unanimously to endorse the IDEAL team project report, and “concerns merit the implementation of a detailed action plan.” An ad hoc project report committee of the Council has been formed to implement the recommendations. Coordination with the Dean’s recently appointed climate taskforce is also underway.

   The To Tenure and Beyond program is planned to continue for at least one more year (2012), bringing together women faculty in the sciences and engineering from the IDEAL universities. It will be institutionalized for CWRU women faculty through the Women Faculty Leadership Development Institute of CWRU’s Flora Stone Mather Center for Women.

---

**IDEAL Partner Institution Year Three Change Project Report:**
Case Western Reserve University

**Co-Director:**
Diana Bilimoria, PhD, Professor, Key Bank Professor of Organizational Behavior; Co-Principal Investigator IDEAL

**Year Three Change Project Team Members:**
Walter Boron, MD, PhD, Chair of Physiology and Biophysics
Alison Hall, PhD, Associate Dean for Graduate Education
Ruth Siegel, PhD, Professor of Pharmacology
Neena Singh, MD, PhD, Professor of Pathology

**Team Coach:** Helen Williams, PhD
Institutional Transformation Theme (as defined by the Co-director in the proposal): “Enhancing Collegiality and Inclusion in S&E”
This theme solidifies and extends to other S&E departments the pilot project successfully implemented in the Case School of Engineering during ACES.

Institutional Transformation Vision:
The vision for this effort is to improve faculty climate by enhancing collegiality and inclusion via a grass roots movement where all faculty are given the opportunity to contribute recommendations for the process and to benefit from resources arising from implementation of the resulting recommendations.

Year Three Change Project Description:
The goal of the change project is to improve retention of tenured women faculty in the Basic Sciences of the School of Medicine by improving the overall climate.

Goals/Objectives of the Change Project:
Objectives:
Seek faculty input in instituting the following changes:
1. Improve the research climate by improving access to existing research resources and promoting collaborative activities
2. Improve recognition of women faculty in service, teaching and research
3. Improve transparency and equity of decision-making by the Dean and department chairs
4. Improve faculty loyalty and morale by increasing participation in University governance at all levels

Outcomes Sought:
Using the results of the SOM Faculty Climate Survey the change leader team proposed a series of faculty discussion groups with tenured basic science faculty in order to recommend activities for career development and climate improvement. The focus group comments were distilled into a summary of concerns and suggestions and then shared with key stakeholders. Feedback from stakeholders was provided on ordering the priorities and suggestions for implementation. The report and a document of implementation suggestions was presented and discussed with the dean of the school and the governing body of the SOM, the Faculty Council. See appendix 3A for the report and Appendix 3B for the implementation suggestions.

Additional outcomes:
• Focus groups provided an avenue for faculty to voice their concerns candidly and without fear—no such forum or avenue existed before this project
• Criteria for faculty compensation are being consolidated by Department Chairs for approval by the Dean
• Some Chairs took active interest in reading ‘raw’ faculty comments to understand their concerns and take action
• Faculty Council is actively involved in taking the project forward by electing an Implementation Committee that takes the IDEAL reports and identifies and pursues specific action outcomes.
• Senior administration is now more fully informed of faculty concerns.
• Senior administration has made all documents public and openly acknowledged a need for action in an all-faculty email.
Activities Undertaken:
Implementation Plan:
1. Inform dean and department chairs that of IDEAL project, focus groups and supplemental interviews
2. Conduct 3-4 focus groups and supplemental interviews of men and women tenured basic science faculty to determine ideas to improve the climate
3. Develop a report and rough draft action plan based on results
4. Discuss report, priorities and action plan with stakeholders
   a) Provost
   b) Dean
   c) Department Chairs
   d) Faculty Council
   e) Research Committee (unable to meet with committee prior to project end)
   f) Ad Hoc Climate Task Force Committee
5. Finalize report and implementation suggestions and disseminate

Evaluation Metrics:
1. Documented actions taken by the administration, department chairs and faculty based on Implementation Suggestions.
2. Increase in communication from dean

Activities:

November 2011:
1. Ruth will gather relevant data on retention of women tenured faculty including numbers leaving, and any climate survey data. And request email addresses for tenured BS faculty from Dan Anker.
2. Amanda will prepare draft email invitation and questions for focus groups and distribute to the team.
3. Ruth, Neena and Amanda will schedule focus group dates and locations for December.
4. Walter will add the IDEAL update to the agenda of the 16 November chairs meeting. Alison will update the chairs at that meeting about the project and the focus groups.
5. Walter, Neena and Ruth will attend Leadership session #2 at KSU on 30 November and call Alison on her cell phone from the car to update everyone on the project.

December/January
1. Ruth, Neena and Amanda will conduct focus groups. To be completed by 31 January 2012
2. Alison will contact Faculty Council and Research Committee to request IDEAL focus group results discussion on the agenda no later than 15 March 2012
3. Walter to schedule focus group results report on chairs meeting agenda. All team members to attend.

February
1. All team meeting to discuss results of focus groups and shape into a report and rough action plan

March
1. Meetings with Dean, Faculty Council, Research Committee and Climate Task Force Committee to discuss results and rough action plan. All team members to attend.
2. Meeting with department chairs to prioritize action plan. All team members to attend.
3. Coaching meeting with Helen Williams and all team members.

**Resources/Alliances Harnessed Across Campus:**
Stakeholder cooperation in the development of the report and implementation suggestions, including faculty, department chairs, committees and dean.

2. Administrative commitment to instituting changes that enhance organizational effectiveness, women faculty retention and climate improvement.

3. Faculty commitment to engaging and cooperating with administration to discover and implement innovating ways of improving morale, scholarship, research, and revenue for the University

**Project Accomplishments/Findings:**

See Appendix 3A for the School of Medicine IDEAL Team Project Faculty Discussion Group Summary, Narrative Report and Consolidated Comments, April 13, 2012

**Key Accomplishment/Finding:**
After soliciting extensive feedback from stakeholders the Faculty Discussion Report was used to generate a table of Implementation Suggestions, which were subsequently submitted to the Dean of the school and the Faculty Council for further action. (See Appendix 3B)

**Recommendations:**
1. Commitment of the Dean and department chairs to identify achievable climate change implementation goals.
2. Commitment of the faculty and school-wide committees to assist the Dean and department chairs with implementation of chosen climate change goals.

**Sustainability Plans for Institutionalizing Activities:**
The School of Medicine Faculty Council voted unanimously to endorse the IDEAL team project report and have formed an ad hoc committee to review the IDEAL reports to develop an action plan for climate improvement.

**Dissemination Activities and Plans:**
The Dean has posted the full report and implementation suggestion on the faculty affairs website (casemed.case.edu/facultyaffairs/) and has pledged to increase two-way communication around the issues raised in the report and create a means for faculty to voice further concerns anonymously.

c) **Cleveland State University**

Institutional Contexts for Transformation

Cleveland State University IDEAL Departments include all departments in the Fenn College of Engineering (Chemical & Biomedical, Civil & Environmental, Electrical & Computer, Mechanical, and Engineering Technology) and six departments in the College of Science (Biology, Chemistry, Health Sciences, Mathematics, Physics, and Psychology).
Co-Director: Three-Year Project Summary
(for full report see Appendix 4)

Co-Director:
Paul P. Lin, PhD, Professor of Mechanical Engineering and Associate Dean of Engineering

1. Institutional Transformation Theme as defined in the proposal
   a. Impact of change projects on the university over three years:
      The most significant impact of the change projects was working with the Provost to promote the importance of faculty development, which led to creating a Faculty Enrichment and Leadership Center.

   b. Reception received from campus leaders and faculty to the change projects:
      The IDEAL project was well received by the university’s leaders such as the Provost, Vice President for Institutional Diversity, Dean of Science and Health Professionals, Dean of Engineering and Director of Center for Teaching Excellence, and others.

      In addition, the seminars and leadership courses attracted many faculty participants across the university. For each event, the number of participants ranged from 15 to 20 with the evaluation score of about 4.5 out of 5.0 on average.

   c. Policies, practices implemented, in planning stages etc.
      A new Faculty Enrichment and Leadership Center was created as a result of the IDEAL project.

   d. Impact of the plenary on the institutional progress
      The plenary conference offered good opportunities to learn the project activities of other IDEAL institutions.

2. Leadership Development Program
   a. Leadership movement of participants over three years:
      Dr. Katherine McNamara, one of the IDEAL team’s second year’s Change Leaders, became Chair of Psychology soon after serving as a Change Leader.

      Dr. Norbert Delatte became the Chair of Civil and Environmental Engineering soon after he participated in CSU Academic program in Spring 2010.

   b. Annual change projects
      Year One (Sep., 2009 – Aug., 2010):
      Goals/Objectives of Year-One Change Project:
      To clearly define the scope of the problem of under-representation of women and ethnic minorities in positions of leadership at CSU; to identify factors that create barriers to participation in leadership activities; to increase awareness of the problem and its causes among members of the CSU community.

      Year Two (Sep., 2010 – Aug., 2011):
      Goals/Objectives of Year-Two Change Project:
The primary goal was to explore possible development and implementation of a Center for Faculty Development and Leadership. Such a Center would serve as the hub for faculty development across the career, mentoring, and university initiatives aimed at creating inclusive academic environments.

**Year Three (Sep., 2011 – Aug., 2012):**
Goals/Objectives of Year-Three Change Project:
The main goal was to institutionalize faculty development and leadership by creating a university-wide center to help facilitate not only mentoring but also developing faculty’s career. In addition, the center will look for a way to develop excellence in academic leadership.

3. **Best practices/promising practices for future**
   Establishing a university-wide Faculty Enrichment and Leadership Center

4. **Foundations for future progress**
   a. The University’s Faculty Enrichment and Leadership Center
   b. NSF’s support for future grants related to faculty development and leadership

5. **Key Three Year Accomplishments** (see Appendix 4A)

   **Year One:**
   1. The team gathered data on select NSF indicators, such as the composition of male and female faculty at each rank, and their salary comparisons, as well as information about gender/minority representation in key leadership roles in the university and within the Engineering and Science colleges.
   2. Themes that emerged from focus group sessions indicated a need to examine policies, practices, and structures that influence faculty early in their careers at CSU – including those pertaining to recruitment of new faculty. According to focus group participants, engagement in leadership can be detrimental to one’s career path, and mixed messages are sometimes conveyed about the desirability of service and leadership, especially among women.
   3. The focus group participants expressed interest in receiving faculty mentoring.
   4. Many participants thought that CSU did not make leadership roles attractive. There should be a more in-depth exploration of the manner in which leadership is perceived at CSU.
   5. A semester-long leadership course offered in Spring 2010 by Dr. Chin Kuo was well received. All of the participants thought that the course would be beneficial to their career goal as an academic administrator, and they are more inclined to pursue an academic administration job in the future.

   The aforementioned findings led to focusing on how to better provide faculty mentoring and create inclusive academic environments in year two.

   **Year Two:**
   1. A variety of CSU stakeholders related to diversity management and faculty development were invited to attend a ‘stakeholder’ meeting to explore the possibility of developing a Center for Faculty Development and Leadership at CSU. The consensus of the group was that with limited resources, such a Center
might not be feasible at this time. The recommendation was to collaborate with Center for Teaching Excellence (CTL).

2. The tasks were to raise awareness of issues related to inclusive environments and faculty development by offering seminars.

3. A seminar focusing on *Life Events and the Academic Career* was conducted on April 14, 2011. The purpose of the session was to raise faculty awareness about the impact of life events (childbirth, adoption, illness, eldercare, etc.) on the academic career, and to inform faculty of best practices from other universities and engage participants in a discussion of possible life event strategies and policies for CSU faculty.

4. Another seminar about *Creating Inclusive and Productive Academic Environments* was conducted on April 26, 2011. The presentation quoted a study which found that the faculty who were under inclusive academic environments turned out to be more productive. In addition to the presentation, the faculty participants enjoyed their interactions with the presenter for about 20 minutes.

5. A leadership course was offered to faculty by Dr. Chin Kuo in Fall 2010. In comparison with the same course offered in Spring 2010, the number of participants, the female participants and the URM participants increased by 15%, 60% and 50%, respectively. The findings set the direction for the year-three team to work toward creating a center for faculty development and leadership.

**Year Three:**

1. A seminar on November 29, 2011 about *Best Practices in Faculty Mentoring* was well received. This is in preparation for creating a center in faculty mentoring.

2. A leadership seminar on March 6, 2012 was also well received by the participants. The seminar was entitled “Is Academic Administration the Right Career for me?” The talk focused on the pros and cons of becoming an administrator.

3. In early January, the project team submitted a proposal to the Provost about creating a Center for Faculty Development and Leadership. The team then met with the Provost and Vice Provost for Academic Planning two more times about the center.

4. In late March, the Provost approved the centers creation, and committed an annual budget of $75,000 for the center’s operation. Under the proposed governance structure, the Center for Teaching and Learning will be under the umbrella of the new center. Thus, promoting and developing teaching excellence for faculty will continue.

5. The new center is to be named “Faculty Enrichment and Leadership Center”, and there will be a Center Director and Faculty Advisory Committee.

The creation of such a center essentially achieves the IDEAL programs ultimate goal of institutionalization in terms of helping faculty to be successful in their careers, creating inclusive academic environments and providing coordination and support for faculty development and leadership.

6. **Sustainability Plans for Institutionalizing Activities**
The University allocated annual budget of $75,000 for operation of the newly created Faculty Enrichment and Leadership Center. The Provost thinks that the center will be sustainable in the future in terms of administration support and faculty’s interest.

IDEAL Partner Institution Change Project Year Three Report:
Cleveland State University

Co-Director: Paul Lin, PhD, Associate Dean, Fenn College of Engineering

Year Three Change Project Team Members 2011-2012:
Fouad Abou-Ghalioum, PhD, Associate Professor of Engineering Technology
Jorge E. Gatica, PhD, Professor of Chemical and Biomedical Engineering
Constance Hollinger, PhD, Professor of Psychology

Team Coach: C. Greer Jordan, PhD, Principal, Currie Rhodes Consulting & Research

Institutional Transformation Theme:
Encouraging Science and Engineering women and under-represented minority faculty to self-diagnose their knowledge of leadership, and gain that knowledge by actively participating in institutional policy-making committees such as the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council.

Institutional Transformation Vision:
Women and under-represented minorities will demonstrate greater engagement in leadership activities as a result of changes in policies, practices, and structures that may currently impede such engagement.

Year Three Change Project Description:
The year 3 change project focused on institutionalizing the team’s ultimate goal of developing a means for achieving excellence in faculty and academic leadership. As a result, a proposal for developing a Center for Faculty Development and Leadership was submitted to the Provost. The center was to have a Director and a Faculty Advisory Committee. Under the proposal, the Advisory Committee will consist of faculty representatives from each college. These representatives will be elected by their respective colleges and serve as liaisons between the center and their college. A representative of the IDEAL change leaders from year 1 through year 3 will become a member of this advisory committee during the first term of the Center’s Director.

Furthermore, the proposal requested that the Provost’s office provide financial resources and facilities for the center. A permanent budget line will include center’s operating expense and stipend for the center director. In addition, the Provost’s Office will provide the resources to support part-time clerical assistance (one secretary and/or a student assistant).

Year Three Goals/Objectives of the Change Project:
1. Promote the concept of faculty mentoring
2. Provide faculty with better understanding of the pros and cons of becoming an academic administrator
3. Develop and propose a sustainable structure for developing of faculty and leadership
4. Institutionalize faculty development and academic leadership by creating a Center for Faculty Development and Leadership

**Year Three Activities Undertaken:**

*Number/dates of meetings of the change leader team:*

- IDEAL Plenary Conference at CWRU 9/17/11
- CSU IDEAL Team meeting with Team Coach at CSU 10/05/2011
- Leadership Session #1 at CSU 10/13/2011
- IDEAL Team Meeting for Proposal Development 11/16/2011
- Sponsored a Seminar on Faculty Mentoring 11/29/2011
- Leadership Session #2 at KSU 11/30/2011
- IDEAL Team Meeting for Faculty Development Proposal 12/05/2011
- IDEAL Team Meeting with Provost about the Team’s Proposal 01/12/2012
- IDEAL Team Meeting with Provost & VP for Academic Planning 02/02/2012
- Sponsored a Seminar on Academic Leadership 03/06/2012
- Leadership Session #3 at CWRU 03/12/2012
- IDEAL Team Meeting with VP for Academic Planning and others 04/02/2012
- Leadership Session #4 at BGSU 04/10/2012
- Co-Director met with Mary Wright and Amanda Shaffer 04/24/2012
- Co-Director met with Deans of Science and Engineering 04/24/2012
- Meeting with Provost and Vice Provost, and Mary Wright and Amanda Shaffer 04/24/2012
- All Change Leaders met with the Evaluator, Mary Wright 04/24/2012

*Dates of meetings with the team coach:*

10/05/2011, Co-director met with Team Coach at CSU. However, there was no second meeting with the coach in Spring 2012 due to her resignation.

*Details of meetings with Provost, deans and other senior university administrators:*

On 01/12/2012, the IDEAL team met and discussed with the Provost about the team’s proposal for creating a Faculty Development and Leadership Center.

On 02/02/2012, the team continued to discuss with the Provost, Vice Provost for Academic Programs Sutton, Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Associate Dean Rakos from College of Science and Health Professionals about creating the center.

On 04/02/2012, the team met with the Vice Provost for Academic Planning Lagrange and Associate Dean Rakos about the center, and learned that the Provost liked the idea and has allocated budget for creating a center called Faculty Enrichment and Leadership Center, which essentially is the same as a faculty development and leadership center, but broader in scope.

On 04/24/2012, Mary Wright, Amanda Shaffer and Paul Lin met with the Provost Mearns and Vice Provost Lagrange for about 45 minutes, and Mary and Amanda were delighted to hear the university has solidified its commitment in creating and sustaining the center. Provost Means also mentioned that the President was aware of the center creation, but had not been told about the detailed plan.
Year Three Resources/Alliances Harnessed Across Campus:
IDEAL sessions were offered in collaboration with the Center for Teaching Excellence. All deans and faculty were invited to the two IDEAL sessions.

The team also received encouragements from Dr. Njeri Nuru-Holm, Vice President for Institutional Diversity, about creating the faculty center. Under her guidance, the Fenn College of Engineering at CSU formed a college-wide Diversity Committee in May 2011, and has held several meetings (once a month) and a multicultural event advancing faculty and staff diversity awareness on March 23. The committee also is planning a one-week-long college-wide Diversity Awareness Meeting in October 2012. This Committee consists of representatives from students, staff and faculty, in addition to the Dean of Engineering and a member of the Industrial Advisory Board. Two of year-three IDEAL change leaders are also part of the Committee.

Year Three Project Accomplishments/Findings:
Detailed description of project activities – what, who, when, how:
1) A seminar on November 29, 2011 about Best Practices in Faculty Mentoring was well received (feedback evaluation: 4.53/5.00). This is in preparation for creating a center in faculty mentoring.
2) A leadership seminar on March 6, 2012 was also well received by the participants (feedback evaluation: 4.73/5.00). The seminar was entitled “Is Academic Administration the Right Career for Me?” The talk focused on the pros and cons of becoming an administrator.
3) In early January, the project team submitted a proposal to the Provost about creating a Center for Faculty Development and Leadership. The team then met with the Provost and Vice Provost for Academic Planning two more times about the center.
4) In late March, the Provost approved the center creation, and committed an annual budget of $75,000 for the center’s operation. Under the proposed governance structure, the Center for Teaching Excellence will be under the umbrella of the new center. Thus, promoting and developing teaching excellence for faculty will continue.
5) The new center is to be named “Faculty Enrichment and Leadership Center”, and there will be a Center Director and Faculty Advisory Committee.

Year Three Recommendations:
There are specific goals for each IDEAL project year. Having to choose different change leaders every year would lose continuity and also require time for transition. For future reference, we recommend that the same change leaders participate in the project over the entire project period.

Year Three Sustainability Plans for Institutionalizing the Activities/Recommendations of the Change Project
The newly created Faculty Enrichment and Leadership Center will be sustainable since it has permanent annual budget of $75,000, in addition to supporting the stipend for the center director. The center plans to train mentors, conduct various seminars about faculty mentoring and creating inclusive academic environments and many others.

Year Three Challenges Encountered or Likely:
1. Some degree of disconnect between change-leaders teams from one year to the next.
2. Budget uncertainty in future years may affect the center’s operation budget.
3. The newly created center certainly needs administration support. However, this year’s IDEAL team has some concern about the degree of administration’s involvement, which might have some impact on the center’s future direction.

Year Three Dissemination Activities and Plans:
1. Continue to work with the newly created Faculty Enrichment and Leadership Center to help disseminate faculty development and leadership activities.
2. The IDEAL team will continue to be engaged in Multi-Cultural and Diversity Awareness activities by interfacing with the College and University Diversity Committees.
3. The IDEAL website will continue to provide electronic literatures about best practices on faculty mentoring and inclusive academic environments.

d) Kent State University

Institutional Contexts for Transformation

Kent State University IDEAL Departments include eight departments in the College of Arts & Sciences (Anthropology, Chemistry/Chemical Physics, Computer Science, Geography, Geology, Sociology/Justice Studies, Mathematical Sciences, and Physics) and the College of Technology.

Kent State University
Co-Director Three-Year Project Summary
(See Appendix 5 for full report)

Co-Director: Mary Louise Holly, Professor, Teaching, Learning, Curriculum Studies
Co-Director, Igniting Streams of Learning in Science

1. Institutional Transformation Theme: Enhancing the climate for scholarly and collegial community in the College of Arts and Sciences.
   a. Impact of change projects on the university over three years
      The impact of the change projects on the university over three years has been cumulative, significant, and evolving.

      Soon after the project began we realized that our Institutional Theme, identifying the initial focus on Women in STEM (Arts and Sciences), was going to engage scholarship broadly and include the larger university community. The partnerships developed early on reflected this greater breadth. Institutional backing of this broad engagement was evident in a letter from Senior Associate Provost Tim Chandler to the university community in the spring of 2011. In his letter to faculty and university officers, he articulated our goals, provided a summary of our activities, enclosed an IDEAL pamphlet describing the project, referred readers to our web site, and enjoined the entire KSU community to participate, “I fully support the goals of NSF KSU-IDEAL and know that you join me in doing all you can to enhance the climate for scholarly activity and collegial relations.”
The impacts of the climate survey were multiple, engaging faculty members and administrators in A&S and University administrators in the issues. The survey was one of our most significant initiatives because it provided a baseline of data and unearthed perceptions of institutional barriers for STEM women and others. The response of KSU-IDEAL to the survey was to make the results known, to engage administrators and faculty colleagues on the issues, and to collaborate with several offices in developing responsive programs accessible to all members of the faculty and administration.

To summarize, the impact of change projects on the university over three years can be characterized as cumulative (We started with a survey, studied the issues, developed partnerships, created workshops and programs and enabled transformative change in awareness and functioning related to women in STEM career development), significant (Women in STEM education and research became one of four priority areas for the university, and evolving. (The subject of career advancement, e.g. promotion from Associate to Full, for women in STEM is the signature thrust of the KSU NSF ADVANCE-IT proposal submitted during year 3.))

b. Reception received from campus leaders and faculty to the change projects
The reception of campus leaders, both administrators and faculty, has been positive and strong. One sees this positive character not only in “reception” of project projects but in the active participation by KSU leadership and the KSU community: participation in the creation of workshops and events, funding for IDEAL activities and programs, visible endorsement and acknowledgment of IDEAL activities and programs, and perhaps most importantly, the incorporation of the goals of IDEAL into the elucidated goals for the future of the University.

Support for KSU-IDEAL has included:
- The KSU Administration, including the President, Vice Presidents, Provost, Deans, Chairs and Directors were strongly supportive throughout the three year IDEAL grant period. IDEAL leaders engaged regularly with University leadership, notably with Senior Associate Provost Tim Chandler, Vice President DEI Alfreda Brown, and A&S Dean Timothy Moerland. Secretarial and administrative support, most notably from the Provost’s Office, including the Faculty Professional Development Center, was unflagging and critical to the success of the program.
- The KSU IDEAL program was the avenue to Kent State’s NSF- ADVANCE-IT grant proposal submission.
- The continuing support and evolving partnership with Vice President Alfreda Brown is central to the KSU-IDEAL program success, most notably to enabling change leader conversation with the highest levels of the university administration, which resulted in the creation and work of the Women in STEM task force.
- IDEAL programs and workshops were well attended and well received by faculty and administrators with a number of campus offices sharing Co-sponsorship of IDEAL Events (e.g. see Appendix 5B, pgs. 65-68).
- The graduate students who participated in IDEAL programs engaged in valuable professional experiences as they contributed to the continuing conversation. This value was recognized by the KSU Department of Graduate Studies that not only endorsed the program but provided continuing support for a Graduate Research Associate (see Appendix 5B, pg. 5).
• Reception of the KSU-IDEAL program from the Provost’s Office, from year 1 on, has been strong and positive. The commitment of Senior Associate Provost Tim Chandler to the success of the KSU-IDEAL change leaders and program has been foundational to each year’s success. Virtually all of the programs and support requested have been forthcoming.

While the number of successful IDEAL programs, the number of and reception by participants, and financial support, were indicators of the reception received from campus leaders and faculty to the change projects, what was more salient as indicators of IDEAL impact was the influence of the goals of IDEAL on the agenda for the University. Issues identified, raised, and acted upon by KSU-IDEAL change leaders were preeminent in the creation of the task force on women in STEM, on the elevation of Women in STEM to one of four University priorities, and the focus on investigating and enhancing pathways and support for promotion of Women in STEM at the Associate to Full Professor levels as the signature issue of the KSU’s NSF-ADVANCE-IT proposal.

c. Polices, practices implemented, in planning stages etc.
The KSU IDEAL project has provided an avenue for identifying the need for change, bringing the opportunity for change to the awareness of the university community and supporting the institutionalization of revised practices and policies. Needs for change and progress have been found in some very different places ranging from presidential directives to department level discussion and revision of procedures.

Creation of the Task Force on Women in STEM Education and Research
The creation of the Task Force was the direct response to the KSU-IDEAL recommendations for a Presidential Commission on Women that we presented in May 2011. The Task Force was carefully conceptualized, members identified and forty-three have agreed to serve. Based on a retreat and meetings during Spring 2012, the IDEAL team synthesized and crafted recommendations which were then presented to President Lefton in July 2012 (see Appendix 5C).

Development and submission of the KSU NSF-ADVANCE-IT proposal
KSU-IDEAL initiated and prepared the institutional groundwork for the NSF-ADVANCE-IT proposal by conceptualizing and involving key faculty and administrators in developing the proposal. By studying the issues identified in the climate survey and focus group data and bringing together a diversity of people through IDEAL programing, change leaders were able to make distinctions among the various elements and factors affecting career development of women in STEM which became KSU’s signature proposal project (see Appendix 5B for Program at a Glance, pg. 97).

LEAP initiatives being planned and implemented. Studying the issues, obstacles, and challenges faced by women in STEM lead to: 1) making connections across campuses and to other IDEAL and ADVANCE-IT institutions, 2) the development of the conceptual framework (see KSU Appendix 5B, pgs. 96, and 110-11) and paths to address obstacles and challenges. Research and resources available through NSF ADVANCE institutions became instrumental in planning and implementing programs at KSU. Studying each strand of LEAP – Leadership, Equity, Advancement, and Policy – the IDEAL team developed a framework to address the network of factors that, when addressed as a
constellation, can help to mitigate obstacles and to unlock opportunities. In short, addressing LEAP elements can support institutional transformation. Three issues included in LEAP and relevant here are the faculty Mentor Program, current Equity Analysis, and further data analysis of the Climate Surveys (Years 2010; 2012).

- **Mentor Program.** Elements of a mentor program were piloted during years 2 and 3 of the IDEAL program for women in STEM seeking promotion from associate to full professor.

- **Equity Analysis.** KSU change leaders have begun analysis of NSF Indicator variables, starting with current faculty salary by gender and rank. Analysis of the data will be complete by September 2012.

- **Climate Survey Institutionalization.** The KSU-IDEAL Climate Survey, administered during years 1 and 3 of IDEAL could now be conceptualized as part of a larger survey created and distributed annually university-wide by DEI, and integrated into an institutionalized process linked with the national Diversity and Equity Scorecard.

**PAID proposal in development.** A proposal to study and advance policies and practices particularly around African, American, Latino, Asian, Native American (AALANA) women in STEM is currently under development for submission to NSF in Fall 2012. The proposal is to study the unique perspectives and professional development support necessary to be responsive to AALANA women in STEM. Submission Fall 2012.

**Enhanced University-wide generative discussion of KSU as a Family Friendly Workplace.** The efforts of KSU-IDEAL have influenced broad based discussion of the issues subject to collective bargaining at KSU. KSU has three unions, two for faculty and one for staff. As part of the original IDEAL survey and subsequent focus groups, it has been recognized that there are issues related to KSU as a “family friendly workplace” that are important to the broad community and which we addressed in KSU-IDEAL program offerings.

**Intra-university and inter-university connections and programs.** As described elsewhere in this report and the KSU Appendices, many connections have been made across divisions and units of the university (DEI, Academic, Departments, Schools, Colleges, Campuses) to study and take advantage of the NSF sponsored IDEAL program and resources. We were provided the opportunity to look carefully at both the unique and shared challenges to women in STEM at the eight-campus system that is Kent State University. IDEAL sponsored programs enabled faculty members to connect across campuses and divisions, while linking our work to the larger IDEAL and ADVANCE national networks. Two members of the year 2 team participated in the NSF JAM sessions, and brought a wealth of ideas and information back to KSU. These connections came about as a result of the strong foundation and the collegial stewardship of partner institution learning communities (LCs) and the larger IDEAL LC by CWRU’s IDEAL leaders (Lynn Singer, Diana Bilimoria, Amanda Shaffer) and KSU-IDEAL Coach Susan Freimark.

**Center for Excellence in STEM Research and Education**
During the IDEAL period, a new Center for Excellence in STEM Research and Education has come into existence, funded jointly by the College of A&S and the College of Education, Health, and Human Services. Links between the IDEAL program (KSU
ADVANCE-IT proposal, Task Force Recommendations with Faculty and Student sections) and the new Center will continue to strengthen the potential impacts of opportunities on women in STEM Education and Research, both faculty and students, and thus, on institutional transformation.

**Handbook Sections on Diversity**

As an important part of the reappointment, tenure and promotion processes, Faculty Handbooks (at departmental, college, and university levels) have traditionally served as defining documents for substance and process in the preparation and evaluation of files. During the time of the IDEAL program, there has been much change and uncertainty related to budgets (national, state, university), collective bargaining and negotiations, including organizational factors that influence the R/T/P processes and professional development. A step forward in diversity and a potentially significant benefit to women in STEM has been taken in at least one Science department, and potentially in the College of Arts and Sciences, and, beyond. During year 1 of IDEAL, change leader Michael Tubergen, Professor and Department Chair of Chemistry and Biochemistry, called attention to an addition to the Department of Chemistry’s Faculty Handbook: a paragraph describing the importance of diversity and implications for the functioning of the department, from meetings to reviews. IDEAL circulated this example widely (e.g. A&S; EHHS), including through change leader conversations with the chair of A&S who said that this would be a good addition to the College Handbook. We find, therefore, indicators that this important policy will be moving forward, enabled by the work of KSU-IDEAL change leaders.

d. **Impact of the plenary on the institutional progress**

The IDEAL plenaries at CWRU have been highly valuable in promoting cohesion among the teams, engaging people across institutions, and providing a larger context within which to grow as people in various roles, and, as transformative institutions. The plenaries have been an essential element of the heuristic learning community framework, for linking and generating resources, for sharing experiences and knowledge, and for planning.

The KSU team was able to gain perspective through sharing KSU activities and plans with the teams from our peer institutions, a process that was as valuable in its informal character as in the programmed presentations and exchanges. The plenary enhanced our approach to accomplishing our core goal of institutional change. Sharing with peers led to understanding the similarity of challenges being met and therefore the relevance of strategies of other institutions to our own. Consequently, the planning activities which our team have been more informed and each year they represented a bold step forward in our progression.

The inclusion of administrators was a particularly strong feature of the plenaries. For KSU, participation of the Dean of A&S, VP Research, VP Diversity, and Senior Associate Provost provided the opportunity to share different dimensions of thinking and enabled deeper insights into and understanding of the issues, contexts, and resources available to address institutional challenges, while more adequately illustrating the purpose and value of the IDEAL project. After the plenaries, we experienced an enhanced common foundation and ability to communicate across roles and institutions and noticed that participants’ perceptions of the value of the IDEAL
project was much enhanced. This appreciation was reflected in cooperation, collaboration, and institutional commitment generally, including financial support from KSU offices.

2. Leadership Development Program
   
a. Leadership movement of participants over three years
   
In the course of the three-year IDEAL program, leadership development has grown. The program has touched and moved people at all levels in the KSU campus system including Presidential, Provostial, VP, Deans, Chairs and Directors, Faculty (general and Change Leaders), and Graduate Student levels. Key aspects of KSU-IDEAL’s leadership development over time are indicated in the table below.

KSU-IDEAL Leadership Development: Key Aspects over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WISG* draft report; IDEAL theme and vision</td>
<td>Meetings with WISC Bernice Sandler – Plenary, wkshps; Proposal: Commission on Women</td>
<td>Task Force Women STEM Ed &amp; Res; Develop and submit recommendations to KSU Pres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Issues, Resources, Coalitions</td>
<td>Programs: Plenary, wkshps, focus groups</td>
<td>Programs: Plenaries, wkshps, focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEAL Quarterly Mtgs; Plenary CWRU</td>
<td>IDEAL Quarterly Mtgs; Plenary CWRU; JAM at the NSF</td>
<td>IDEAL Quarterly Mtgs; Plenary CWRU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and conduct Climate Survey A&amp;S</td>
<td>Focus Groups; Analyze and present results</td>
<td>Re-administer Climate Survey; institutionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCE resources Establish KSU eligibility</td>
<td>Begin NSF ADVANCE-IT prop Focus: Assoc to Full; 8 Campus Sys</td>
<td>Submit KSU NSF ADVANCE-IT proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st IDEAL external Evaluation Site Visit</td>
<td>Consult Mary Wright: program, grant proposal</td>
<td>Final external Evaluation Site Visit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WISG: Women in Science Working Group (see Appendix 5B for report, pp. 22-23; and list of members, pp. 24-25)

With the rich opportunities provided by the NSF-IDEAL program, change leaders took advantage of the broad range and diversity of resources, each scholar according to their unique experiences, interests, and responsibilities. In the mix of departments, five change leaders were full professors, four were department chairs, and four were at the critical career juncture between associate and full professor. One change leader was promoted to full professor during the project. One chair had been newly appointed, one had been chair for three years, and a two had been chairs for well over five years. One change leader had experience as an Interim Dean. One change leader was in her first year at KSU. One change leader was heavily involved with advising, program development, and outreach, while others were heavily engaged with longstanding and extensive research agendas. The unique perspectives that each change leader brought to the learning community have been key to change project success. To summarize and provide a sampling of the results of the NSF-IDEAL project on the change leaders from their perspectives:

- **Called on for expertise.** Change leaders became known in their departments, their colleges, and the university at large as resource people related to women in STEM.
  
  “People in my department come and talk to me about these issues. [Now] I can feel and
see the resistance and understand the [family related] issues.” At the end of the academic year, when asked what had been the most useful sessions of the Chairs/Directors bi-weekly meetings and professional development sessions, the IDEAL related workshop facilitated by change leaders was one of two sessions lauded. The change leaders exemplify the kinds of excellence in leadership envisioned in the NSF-IDEAL proposal.

• **Broader and more complex perspectives; Made connections.** The connections made both within the IDEAL network and with other ADVANCE institutions through quarterly meetings, participation at the NSF Joint Annual Meeting in Washington DC, meetings with ADVANCE program officers, and the continuing rich program and expertise shared by CWRU ADVANCE leadership Lynn Singer, Diana Bilimoria, and Amanda Shaffer, as well as work with our CWRU coach Susan Freimark, KSU IDEAL change leaders have taken on broader perspectives and taken actions within their departments and colleges that would not have been possible before. CWRU did more than model and facilitate change projects, they exemplified the best of collegial relationships with KSU and other IDEAL partner institutions. The facilitation of sharing across IDEAL institutions, where change leaders could bring their change project experiences to the larger community and take back ideas and feedback were invaluable. According to a chair “This [IDEAL] was a wake-up call for me. I realized how conservative my perspective had been.” A change leader giving an update to Faculty Senate stated “That was the first time I have ever been to Faculty Senate. That is another world!”

• **Confidence and acting on new options.** “The biggest change [for me] has been more confidence. This is what the literature says—this is not just my, or a colleague’s, issue. It’s evidence based. Now I have confidence in sharing. All the personal reading [with IDEAL] struck me. All the barriers for women in asking for help. We have all been reluctant to ask for input and support fearing to be seen as inadequate or weak. It’s ok to ask, especially for our non-tenured colleagues!” With expanded perspectives of what it means to lead and to facilitate, several change leaders participated in the Dean’s Leadership Workshop, and reframed elements of their own professional portfolios to include the leadership they provided in program development and outreach as well as professional advising of students and colleagues.

• **IDEAL Department Development.** One chair reported initiating a careful departmental study of disciplinary majors (male, female, URM) and faculty related to indicator data and “doing a massive sweep through our department looking for balance. URM, females . . . we are a middle aged department of mainly white males, and all on board to change that.” The Diversity section of the Handbook in Chemistry became an example for other departments and colleges, thus enhancing the potential professional development of all who perceive an enriched platform for understanding, presenting, and evaluating scholarly work. Relatedly, a change leader department chair offered: “I have a much more mature view of women in STEM . . . an enhanced understanding of issues allows [me to have] a better articulation and stronger leadership [in my department and college] “.

• **Agents of Institutional Transformation.** Preparing the KSU-NSF ADVANCE-IT proposal was both a transformational experience for years 2 and 3 change leaders who worked as a team throughout proposal development, and a transformational process for all who supported this effort, for those who contributed to the thinking and logistical discussions and conversations of the vision what LEAP could be for KSU. Enjoining conversation and committed action across different divisions and departments of the
university, the change leaders became agents of change critical to the Institutional Vision created by the year 1 change leaders.

3. **Best practices/promising practices for future**
Several practices have been important to the success of the KSU IDEAL program and will continue to inform future work.

- **Learning Community format.** The KSU change leaders were formed as, and functioned as, a learning community (LC). This included weekly meetings in which generative discussion often included others and supported scholarly progress with creative ideas, continuity, and momentum. The LC, on all levels (institutional, role-related across institutions) was a great place to share ideas, questions, and research, to enable these ideas to grow and become amplified.

- **Focus group workshops.** Beginning with climate survey follow-up focus groups, the IDEAL team and coach Susan Freimark created several focus workshops for women in STEM on promotion from associate to full professor level (see Appendix 5B, pgs. 59-61). There was strong appreciation voiced for offering workshops on these topics (e.g. see Appendix 5B, pgs. 59-61 and pgs. 47-49).

- **Co-sponsorship of IDEAL programs.** Bringing together people from a diversity of departments, campuses and offices enabled KSU IDEAL to invite co-sponsorship of events. This was worthwhile on many levels: buy-in, awareness and understanding issues, advertising, diversity of input, and investment.

- **NSF ADVANCE-IT proposal development and submission.** Studying the issues identified in the climate survey and focus groups enabled us to bring together challenges in an organized way. LEAP – Leadership, Equity, Advancement, and Policy (see Appendix 5B, pg. 97) became organizing themes with which to study and develop initiatives that could move the university forward.

4. **Foundations for future progress**
The foundations for future progress at KSU lie in the internal and external relationships, collaborations, alliances, resources, and ways of working developed as part of the IDEAL grant. We coordinated and linked resources, capitalizing on current relationships and resources and on creating new alliances. The learning community format of NSF-IDEAL enabled sharing, acquiring, and leveraging resources as we worked on focused goals toward common ends.

Campus Alliances and Coalitions: There were three major undertakings by IDEAL that required alliances and coalitions across the eight-campus system, and that reached beyond KSU to IDEAL partners and to other ADVANCE institutions:

- NSF-ADVANCE-IT grant proposal (see Appendix 5B, pg. 91) development and submission,
- Task Force on Women in STEM Education and Research, Commission, (was a direct outcome of IDEAL. In the announcement by President Lefton, “The task force will recommend actions to promote the participation and success of under represented groups at all level of STEM education and research.” See KSU Appendix 5B, pgs. 13-14, “Top-of-Mind Issues” and pg. 84) and
- Climate Survey and Foundational programs.

5. **Key Three Year Accomplishment**
The key three-year accomplishment of KSU-IDEAL was to bring substance and life to the Institutional Transformation Vision crafted by the year 1 change leaders:
Vision: A university system that embraces widespread collegiality across a diverse faculty and administration, with an environment that promotes and supports a vibrant community of scholars in pursuit of academic excellence. Change projects endorsed and accepted by the upper administration; a strong collaboration between faculty and administration that results in a more vibrant community of scholars.

Bringing substance and life to the vision meant that the change leaders had success in igniting, cultivating, and coordinating conversations around issues related to women in STEM throughout university, at all levels. Issues related to women in STEM education and research are now viewed as one of four university priority areas. Bringing issues to the forefront was accomplished by multiple means, but most importantly by collaboration on the KSU NSF-ADVANCE-IT grant proposal and with the Task Force on Women in STEM Education and Research. Bringing together major divisions of the university around common themes articulated in ADVANCE IT proposal and Commission helped to make Women in STEM a University priority.

Living the vision meant people seeing and talking differently – aware of issues: the challenges of women in STEM at the associate to full level, on all KSU campuses. Living the vision meant putting a spotlight not only on issues, but also on relationships and ways of working with others to address the issues.

6. Sustainability Plans for Institutionalizing Activities
There are a number of current efforts which are already institutionalized or which have avenues into the future. Plans have been articulated in extramural proposals, in Task Force recommendations, and in KSU-IDEAL Years 1-3 Reports (see Appendix 5b, sections 1, 2, and 3), and in Foundations for Future Progress, of this report.

• **NSF ADVANCE-IT grant proposal** - Key ideas (see KSU Appendices A-C) developed in the proposals are being implemented. These include continuing programing for and study of (1) the transition from associate to full professor (2) equity study (3) Mentor program (4) women in STEM at RCs (5) Service.

• **Change Leaders** – The change leaders in IDEAL are now and will be institutional leaders who, while engaged in the IDEAL partnership, developed understandings, attitudes, insights and knowledge to influence and shape practices within their respective departments. Four change leaders are currently department chairs. The other five change leaders are senior members of their departments and agents of change within these departments.

• **Definition and weight given to service** - The issue of service (women making institutionally significant service contributions that are not being acknowledged for promotion or salary evaluation), was brought to the foreground in focus groups, workshops, plenaries, and the Task Force retreat and recommendations, and is being discussed at the department level. It is an issue nationally and at KSU. We see that avenue as a direct link to institutionalization and we expect some of these conversations and practices to change as a result of our efforts.

• **Mentor program** – Various aspects of a mentor program have been and are being implemented, both within the A&S and also at the university level. Continued planning and implementation is ongoing in A&S and is part of Task Force Recommendations.

• **Equity study** – The equity study by started during year 1 and continued into year 3 with collection and analysis of NSF Indicator Data will continue into fall 2012.
• **Climate survey** – KSU-IDEAL Climate Survey will no longer be needed as the main ideas will be part of the larger institutionalized survey sponsored by the DEI. KSU-IDEAL has been an effort of unexpected challenge, opportunity, and success. “We” have grown from nine change leaders, a graduate research associate, a secretary, and a co-director to part of a university movement to enlarge the educational opportunities for women in STEM education and research. As a result of the NSF-IDEAL partnership and our connection to the rich resources of the NSF IDEAL network, our KSU learning community will continue.

---

**Kent State University**

**Year Three Change Project Report**

**Co-Director:**
Mary Louise Holly (Founding Director, Faculty Professional Development Center; Co-Director, Igniting Streams of Learning in Science; Professor, Teaching, Learning, Curriculum Studies)

**Year Three Change Leaders:**
- Carla Goar, PhD, Associate Professor, Sociology
- Daniel Holm, PhD, Professor and Department Chair, Geology
- Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, PhD, Associate Professor, Biological Sciences
- Mandy Munro-Stasiuk, PhD, Professor and Department Chair, Geography

**Team Coach:** Susan Freimark

**Graduate Research Assistant:** Judy Rittman, Doctoral Student, Higher Education Administration

**Institutional Transformation Theme:**
Enhancing the climate for scholarly and collegial community in the College of Arts and Sciences

**Institutional Transformation Vision:** A university system that embraces widespread collegiality across a diverse faculty and administration, with an environment that promotes and supports a vibrant community of scholars in pursuit of academic excellence.

**Year Three Change Project Description:**
The KSU Change Project 2011/2012 built on and extended the year 1 foundation as well as advance year 2 initiatives. Specifically, members of IDEAL as well as administrators and faculty worked as a team on the preparation of an NSF ADVANCE-IT proposal submitted in November 2011. The KSU ADVANCE proposal team was supported by upper administration including the Office of the President, Office of the Provost, Vice President of the Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, and the Dean of the College Arts and Sciences. IDEAL Change Leaders were instrumental in the formation of the KSU Presidential Task Force on Women in STEM Education and Research as well as the Task Force Retreat (2/10/12) and follow up to prioritize recommendations. The KSU IDEAL year 3 team provided leadership in synthesizing and preparation of recommendations for the President that was gleaned from the retreat and meetings. These recommendations focus on initiatives to benefit KSU women in STEM Education and Research, including AALANA women.

KSU IDEAL’s communication and support network was expanded and strengthened. This network includes: Office of the President, Office of the Provost, Division of Diversity, Equity,
and Inclusion, VP for Research and Sponsored Programs, KSU STEM Research and Education Center, Women’s Center, Faculty Professional Development Center, University of Michigan – CRLT, NSF, CWRU, Dr. Bernice Sandler, Dr. Brenda J. Allen, and Dr. Julie Des Jardins.

Women faculty from all KSU campuses were invited to participate in focus groups held in September 2011. The focus group topic explored KSU women faculty advancing from associate to full professor. Information gathered during these focus groups informed the development of several initiatives included in the KSU ADVANCE proposal as well as recommendations to the President regarding KSU women in STEM (e.g., institution wide faculty mentoring program; increased transparency in regard to factors leading to promotion; defining and making transparent that which is considered service).

Communication, consciousness-raising, and publicity for the IDEAL program and issues continued throughout the KSU campuses. Ongoing conversations occurred between IDEAL members and the Office of the Provost, Dean of Arts and Sciences, Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, Research and Sponsored Programs. IDEAL members presented IDEAL updates to the KSU Chairs and Directors meetings (October 2011; February 2012).

KSU IDEAL invited two nationally renowned scholars and speakers to campus to support IDEAL initiatives. Partnering with CWRU, KSU IDEAL hosted Dr. Brenda J. Allen for several well-attended and well-received sessions with students, faculty, and administrators, including:

- Dinner with IDEAL team members
- Breakfast with IDEAL team members
- Lunch and workshop with KSU URM women faculty and graduate students: “Interactions of Gender and Race in Communication”, attended: 25, avg. rating: 4.9/5
- Campus-wide plenary, “Toward More Successful Communication and Negotiation”, attended by: ~60 (Available at www.kent.edu/IDEAL )
- Concluding conversation with year 3 IDEAL change team.

KSU IDEAL hosted Dr. Julie Des Jardins for a series of discussions and a plenary address that aligned with IDEAL initiatives:

- Lunch with KSU IDEAL Change Team Members year 1 - 3
- Discussion with KSU History Faculty and graduate students
- Campus-wide plenary and reception, “The Hidden History of Women in Science”, attended by: 104 (Available at www.kent.edu/IDEAL )
- Dinner and concluding conversation with KSU IDEAL members and History faculty

These two events built on the foundation of year 2 with Bernice Sandler workshops and plenary. Both events were publicized throughout campus media and co-sponsored by the Office of the Provost, Dean of Arts and Sciences, Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. Both events were made available via KSUtube as well as the KSU IDEAL website (podcasts remain available).

The KSU IDEAL group continued two-hour weekly meetings throughout year 3. These weekly meetings frequently included invited KSU administrators and faculty members (e.g., VP Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; The Women’s Center; Office of Research Planning, Institutional Effectiveness; STEM Research and Education Center).
**Year Three Goals:**
Continue to enlarge conversation, create and integrate opportunities, and to increase visibility of IDEAL program and research. (See Appendix 5A pages 12-14)

1. Preparation and submission of NSF ADVANCE-IT proposal (continuation of year 2) with an interdisciplinary team including faculty, administrators, graduate students, from the College or Arts & Sciences, and College of Education, Health, and Human Services, Office of the President, Office of the Provost, and Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.
2. Institutionalizing initiatives as included in the KSU NSF ADVANCE-IT proposal (e.g., faculty mentoring program and equity analysis).
3. Provide leadership for the KSU Presidential Task Force for Women in STEM Education and Research.
4. Conduct follow-up and comparative analysis to the 2010 climate survey in the College of Arts & Sciences. (See Appendix 5B pages 16-26 for data related to the NSF KSU IDEAL’s Memorandum of Understanding variables; entire data set with all items has not been included).

Many outcomes were sought and achieved in year 3 in regard to KSU IDEAL goals:

1. IDEAL increased visibility on campus and enlarged the conversation taking place within the KSU community through IDEAL programs, projects, and initiatives (e.g., NSF ADVANCE proposal team was interdisciplinary);
2. Increased communication opportunities and awareness and understanding of KSU IDEAL program among KSU Chairs and Directors by presentations at two KSU Chairs and Directors meetings as well a workshop;
3. KSU Women in Science luncheon held in partnership Arts and Sciences invited Geology speaker, Dr. Francisca E. Oboh-Ikuenobe;
4. Nationally recognized invited speakers, Dr. Brenda J. Allen and Dr. Julie Des Jardins led to enriched and enlarged conversations regarding issues related to women, and to women in STEM education and research. Both IDEAL sponsored engagements received campus wide publicity and participation;
5. An enriched and updated, and evolving website with resources and information related to IDEAL initiatives (e.g., Presidential Task Force members were directed to IDEAL Website for retreat materials; podcasts of KSU plenary presentations given by Bernice Sandler, Brenda J. Allen, and Julie Des Jardins; Chairperson Resources);
6. Articulated support at the Presidential level for sustainability of NSF KSU IDEAL initiatives (September 2011 President’s State of the University Address; Formation of KSU Presidential Task Force on Women in STEM Education and Research);
7. A follow up climate survey in College of Arts & Sciences was administered in April 2012. Results are being analyzed in regard to baseline data collected in 2010;
8. KSU IDEAL Year 3 Change Leaders Jenny Marcinkiewicz and Daniel Holm began conducting an equity analysis. This analysis involved collection of KSU data regarding current faculty salary by gender and rank.
9. The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences has committed and articulated support to implement a pilot faculty mentoring program. IDEAL team members are partnering and consulting with Susan Freimark (IDEAL Coach) and CWRU’s IDEAL leadership in the design and implementation of a faculty mentoring program at KSU.
10. Both the equity analysis and the pilot faculty mentoring program will serve as strong bridges to the future with actions to be taken at KSU in the academic year 2012-2013 furthering the KSU IDEAL goals and objectives.

Year Three Activities Undertaken:
See Appendix 5A, pgs. 12-14 titled “NSF KSU IDEAL Year 3”

Year Three Resources/Alliances Harnessed Across Campus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Project Role</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singer</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>PI IDEAL</td>
<td>CWRU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lynn.singer@case.edu">Lynn.singer@case.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilimoria</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>CO-PI IDEAL</td>
<td>CWRU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Diana.Bilimoria@case.edu">Diana.Bilimoria@case.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaffer</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>CWRU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Amanda.shaffer@case.edu">Amanda.shaffer@case.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freimark</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Team Coach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Freimark Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>External Evaluator</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mcwright@umich.edu">mcwright@umich.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>Mary Lou</td>
<td>Co-Director</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mholly@kent.edu">mholly@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almasan</td>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Change Leader 1</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:calmasan@kent.edu">calmasan@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonge</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Change Leader 1</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:atonge@kent.edu">atonge@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubergen</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Change Leader 1</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mtuberge@kent.edu">mtuberge@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzsimmons</td>
<td>Verna</td>
<td>Change Leader 2</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vfitzsim@kent.edu">vfitzsim@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holm</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Change Leader 2/3</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dholm@kent.edu">dholm@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norconk</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Change Leader 2</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mnorconk@kent.edu">mnorconk@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goar</td>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Change Leader 3</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cgoar@kent.edu">cgoar@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcinkiewcz</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Change Leader 3</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmarcink@kent.edu">jmarcink@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munro-Stasiuk</td>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>Change Leader 3</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmunro@kent.edu">mmunro@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Women’s Center</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hadams@kent.edu">hadams@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alemagno</td>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:salemagn@kent.edu">salemagn@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth</td>
<td>Stephane</td>
<td>Provost Office</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sbooth@kent.edu">sbooth@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Alfreda</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abbrown@kent.edu">abbrown@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:acase@kent.edu">acase@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Provost Office</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tchandler@kent.edu">tchandler@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowther</td>
<td>Janis</td>
<td>IRB - Psychology</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jcrowther@kent.edu">jcrowther@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Interim Dean of College of Tech</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jgraham@kent.edu">jgraham@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haley</td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>A &amp; S</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mhaley@kent.edu">mhaley@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes-Nelson</td>
<td>Geraldine</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ghnelson@kent.edu">ghnelson@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Women’s Studies</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:slholt@kent.edu">slholt@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iverson</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Higher Ed Admin</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:siverson@kent.edu">siverson@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerns</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Psych - Survey</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kkerns@kent.edu">kkerns@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumar</td>
<td>Satyendra</td>
<td>Research &amp; Sponsored Programs</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:skumar@kent.edu">skumar@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Lefton</td>
<td>Lester</td>
<td>KSU President</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lepton@kent.edu">lepton@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mack</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>NSF ADVANCE Prog Dir</td>
<td>NSF</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kmack@nsf.gov">kmack@nsf.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGimpsey</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>VP Research &amp; Sponsored</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wmcgimps@kent.edu">wmcgimps@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merryman</td>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmerryman@kent.edu">mmerryman@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moerland</td>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Dean, College of A&amp;S</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tmoerland@kent.edu">tmoerland@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal-Barnett</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>African-Am.</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year Three Project Accomplishments/Findings:

Focus Groups: The overarching themes that emerged from the focus groups held in regard to advancing from associate to full professor for KSU faculty women centered on the following: Lack of transparency in what is needed for RTP; Service hours not recognized / service not well defined; Role of Dept. Chair in regard to RTP; Role of mentoring in advancing through academic ranks. These themes were incorporated into the KSU NSF ADVANCE-IT proposal initiatives as well as being incorporated into initial recommendations resulting from the Presidential Task Force on Women in STEM Education and Research.

NSF ADVANCE-IT Foundation, Connections, Alliance Building: Support was given to the NSF IDEAL team to attend the NSF JAM 2012. KSU IDEAL team members (Mary Louise Holly, KSU IDEAL Co-Director and Daniel Holm, years 2-3 KSU IDEAL Change Leader) as well as KSU Vice President of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, Alfreda Brown attended.

IDEAL Sponsored Programs: Themes related to gender and racial differences in communication and the resulting effects regarding RTP among faculty were discussed during Dr. Brenda J. Allen’s workshops and plenary at KSU. These sessions were attended by over 100 KSU faculty members, administrators, and students.

The national conversation regarding the role in women in science was furthered at KSU during the plenary session and discussions with Dr. Julie Des Jardins. Issues related to departmental climate, policies that affect retention of women faculty, and historical developments in the contribution of women to scientific discovery were discussed.

President Lefton Makes Women in STEM a University Priority: Additionally, during the third year of KSU IDEAL, administrative support for IDEAL related issues as well as issues related to KSU women in STEM was most evident. This support was articulated...
by the President in his State of the University address (9/11) as well as the support shown by the Office of the President, Office of the Provost, Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion for the creation of the KSU Presidential Task Force on Women in STEM Education and Research.

Year Three Key Accomplishment/Finding

Furthering Momentum for Institutional Transformation: Key accomplishments of year 3 were the continued positive communication, activity, and momentum generated while bolstering institutional understanding and support for issues related to women in STEM at KSU. Alliances were not only established but enabled actions that furthered institutional transformation as groups identified resources, studied both local and larger landscapes, and developed plans for institutional programing described in the NSF ADVANCE-IT grant proposal and in recommendations of the Presidential Task Force for Women in STEM Education and Research. Several top administrators from different divisions and offices as well as faculty from different disciplines, colleges and campuses collaborated to develop recommendations for President Lefton in regard to KSU women in STEM.

Dr. Alfreda Brown, Co-chair of the Task Force, met regularly with IDEAL team members to develop and frame recommendations and implementation plans. IDEAL sponsored workshops, plenary sessions, and presentations accomplished the goal of increasing the visibility of IDEAL and IDEAL’s initiatives throughout campus. The submission of the KSU NSF ADVANCE-IT proposal accomplished the goal of bringing together campus administrators and faculty to assess existing resources and identify resources and programs needed for institutional change as issues related to KSU women in STEM are now a top priority within the KSU Strategic Plan. Task Force Recommendations will be implemented by the soon-to-be created Commission on Women in STEM Education and Research.

Year Three Recommendations:

IDEAL Leadership: It is imperative that IDEAL team members continue to provide leadership and to remain actively involved in the soon-to-be created Task Force for Women in STEM Education and Research, the newly created KSU STEM Education and Research Center, and initiatives proposed in the NSF ADVANCE-IT proposal (mentoring programs, initiatives to support women leadership and promotion to full professor).

IDEAL on-going Communication: Regular updates to the KSU IDEAL website with most recent research will be necessary. Communication between the KSU IDEAL team members and other IDEAL institution members will need to be ongoing with scheduled meetings, continued programming, and electronic communication (e.g., KSU IDEAL facebook site created in year 3).

Grants and Focused Initiatives: Build on and expand ideas, activities, and programs described in the KSU-NSFADVANCE-IT grant proposal and Presidential Task Force Recommendations, including:

- Mentor program,
- Equity Analysis,
- Focus on Associate to Full Professor and leadership for women in STEM,
- Investigation of multiple campus systemic professional development, and
Institutionalization of the Climate Survey by integration with on-going KSU Diversity-Equity Scorecard data collection, analysis, goal-directed program development and implementation.

Year Three Sustainability Plans for Institutionalizing Activities/Recommendations of Change Project

The level of administrative support has increased and this momentum will continue with the creation of Commission on Women in STEM Education and Research at the Presidential level to implement recommendations of the Task Force. Support for recommendations brought forth by the Task Force along with well articulated implementation plans are needed for sustainability. Ongoing climate studies supported by the institution will be administered and analyzed for trends, and become part of yearly and bi-yearly programming across colleges and campuses (see 5th bullet point above in year 3 recommendations).

Continuing the dialogue with upper administration as well as continued partnering with both on campus offices as well as off campus institutions including IDEAL partners and offices will support the continuation and further development of institutional activities. An anticipated challenge is the level of competition for funding (and shrinking budgets of granting institutions), both internally and externally, to further IDEAL initiatives. IDEAL members have indicated strong support to submit a subsequent NSF ADVANCE-IT proposal if the current pending proposal is not accepted. Plans to apply for a NSF ADVANCE-PAID proposal to study the unique needs of AALANA women in STEM are in process.

Year Three Dissemination Activities and Plans:

1. A letter from the Office of the Provost to all KSU faculty will include information from the IDEAL final report, highlighting accomplishments of all three years of the KSU IDEAL project, including access to results from the 2010 and 2012 Climate Surveys.
2. Updates and additions to the KSU IDEAL website will be made including links with resources (www.kent.edu/IDEAL).
3. Presentations and workshops with KSU Chairs and Directors will continue with CWRU ADVANCE-IT leadership consultation and facilitation.
4. Communication between IDEAL team members and KSU administrators (President, VP Diversity Equity Inclusion, and Provost) will continue.
5. Plans are underway for papers or presentations of the NSF KSU IDEAL project at national forums such as NSF JAM, WEPAN, and disciplinary conferences of Biological Sciences, Geography, Geology, and Sociology.
6. Plans are underway for NSF KSU IDEAL project presentation at the NSF CWRU IDEAL Plenary in October 2012.

e. University of Akron

Institutional Contexts for Transformation

University of Akron IDEAL Departments include all College of Engineering departments (Biomedical, Chemical and Biomolecular, Electrical, Mechanical, and Civil) and six departments in the School of Arts and Science (Chemistry, Theoretical & Applied Mathematics, Psychology, Geology & Environmental Science, Computer Science and Biology).
Co-Director: Helen Qammar, PhD, Director of the Institute for Teaching and Learning, Associate Professor Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering

1. Institutional Transformation Theme as defined in the proposal

“Faculty Hiring that Makes a Difference”. UA proposes a transformational theme to redesign faculty recruitment and hiring practices in STEM departments. Faculty leadership skills will be essential to encourage departmental faculty to scrutinize current practices and gain an enhanced appreciation of the importance of diversity hiring for student success. IDEAL participants will work closely with other units on campus involved with the university goal of inclusive excellence and diversity.

   a. Impact of change projects on the university over three years

   The 11 IDEAL STEM departments are Biomedical Engineering, Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering, Civil Engineering, Electrical & Computer Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Biology, Chemistry, Geology & Environmental Science, Math, Computer Science and Psychology.

   The efforts of each annual change project team have led to enhanced faculty diversity in STEM fields, specifically, women faculty. The initial data collection and analysis phase resulted in the university president issuing an important and clear message on the importance of faculty diversity. From the second year, improved presentation of department faculty composition data, more frequent campus conversations on diversity hiring as well as enhanced search committee workshops led more search committees to implement best practices. Some tangible examples of change include:

   • Of the 10 Engineering searches occurring from 2009 – 2011, all but one committee had at least one female committee member. This contrasts with engineering search committees from 2006 – 2008 where 14 out of the 19 successful searches had no female committee members.

   • All search plans for 2009 – 2011 included pro-active networking as a strategy to enhance the candidate pool whereas less than 30% used this strategy in the searches from 2006 – 2008.

   • 40% of faculty searches in engineering from 2009 – 2011 resulted in hiring a female faculty compared to 22% in 2006 – 2008.

   • Civil Engineering which had only a single female faculty member for more than the previous 10 years successfully hired two female faculty from 2009 – 2011.

   • The percent of female faculty in Biomedical Engineering now exceeds the percent of female PhD recipients in that field based on data from ASEE (American Society of Engineering Education, 2011).

   • Chemistry which had not hired a female faculty during the previous ten years successfully hired a female in both 2011 and 2012.

   • Math which last hired a female faculty in 2007 successfully hired a female in 2012.

   The culminating impact has been the inclusion of a significant emphasis on diversity hiring within the university’s Achieving Distinction initiative. Proposals related to new
faculty hiring within this initiative will be judged based in part on the criteria “Contribution to the diversity of people, thoughts, and ideas including connections to globally relevant academic programs.” Third-year change leaders plan to continue contributing to this initiative through evaluation of the diversity content within proposals and having one IDEAL team member sit on the University Council Talent & Human Resources Committee of University Council.

b. Reception received from campus leaders and faculty to the change projects
Initial conversations with campus leadership revealed a relatively pessimistic view of the potential to improve faculty diversity simply through the application of best practices in diversity hiring. At that time, administrator’s explanation for the long-term trend in underrepresentation for female faculty in STEM departments was to identify the problem as a shortage of available diverse candidates, i.e. a pipeline problem. Over the next three years this perspective has radically changed. College search committees are now required to attend a Human Resources workshop which includes examples of how to enhance diversity in candidate pools. Many of the search committees have begun to implement best practices such as having a diverse committee, implementing pro-active search practices and to a limited extent including an emphasis on diversity in search position advertisements. Campus leaders seemed appreciative of supplementary information such as the 2015 forecast of departmental faculty retirements due to newly revised retirement benefits as well as the analysis of salary equity that showed no observable gender bias.

Both STEM colleges are now scrutinizing all hiring practices, candidate pools and are looking for solutions to overcome the so-called “pipeline problem” rather than simply suggest that search committees are powerless to overcome limited numbers of available female candidates. Summary reports from the IDEAL project are now well received and generate constructive conversations on how to improve diverse hiring in all underrepresented groups. Administrators who have attended the plenary have also become more interested in topics from other IDEAL projects such as mentoring and campus climate.

c. Polices, practices implemented, in planning stages etc.
The following practices have been put into place as a result of the IDEAL grant:
• Institutional Research will regularly collect NSF indicator data to provide continued updates on faculty diversity in STEM departments.
• The Institute for Teaching and Learning will maintain the IDEAL website displaying trends in faculty composition, NSF Indicator data and continue to periodically analyze other metrics such as salary equity and promotion statistics.
• A customized Human Resources workshop is available for departmental search committees. Trends in diversity hiring and comparative data published on our IDEAL website for that discipline are available for inclusion in these workshops.
• Human Resources has implemented an electronic database to document each faculty hiring process including search plans, advertisements and applicant demographics. It is now possible to analyze trends on diversity of applicants and interviewees with respect to faculty hiring search processes.
• Faculty composition and comparison data will be regularly disseminated through an annual report to the Office of Academic Affairs. Individual charts for each STEM department are provided via links from three university websites, the
IDEAL project in the Institute for Teaching and Learning, the Office of Inclusion and Equity and Human Resources.

The following faculty hiring policy is in the final implantation stage:
The Expectations of Faculty Searches policy contains specific wording on improving diversity within the faculty. For example, “It is expected that each search committee will invite to campus (the “short list”) a group of applicants that represent the diversity of the applicant pool and also offer the potential to enhance and increase the diversity on campus and within the respective department and college.” And relevant to women in STEM “The University of Akron is particularly committed to hiring new faculty in areas where diversity is most lacking as determined by Talent Development & Human Resources.”

d. Impact of the plenary on the institutional progress
Over the course of this three year project the university administration has increasingly seen the plenary as an opportunity for academic leadership to gain substantial insight on issues related to diversity hiring and leadership opportunities for women faculty in STEM. For example, the university was represented at the first plenary by only one college dean and an associate dean. As a direct result, that College started focused conversations with women faculty on improving the campus climate and implemented improved documentation of diversity in searches. The second plenary was attended by five university administrators including the Vice President of Human Resources and the Chief Diversity Officer. Following this plenary, national speakers were brought to campus and significant enhancements to search committee workshops occurred. Administrators in both STEM colleges increased their scrutiny of faculty composition trends and actively questioned why some departmental searches resulted in very limited diverse candidate pools. In addition, it became obvious that results from other IDEAL projects initiated more conversations on campus climate, faculty mentoring and female faculty promotion.

2. Leadership Development Program
   a. Leadership movement of participants over three years
      • First year IDEAL team member Linda Subich, Professor of Psychology, became the Associate Dean of the Buchtel College of Arts & Science.
      • Second year IDEAL team member Judit Puskas, Professor of Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering, was named the Austin Chemical Chair.

3. Best practices/promising practices for future
   The three-year IDEAL project should yield promising practices and lessons learned for universities involved in strategic hiring initiatives. IDEAL change leaders will be involved with a qualitative analysis of proposals submitted to the Achieving Distinction initiative. This analysis should yield answers to such questions as:
      • How well do faculty articulate best hiring practices in response to the initiative’s diversity criteria, Contribution to the diversity of people, thoughts, and idea and is this in relative balance with the primary criteria of multidisciplinary research capabilities?
      • Are faculty seeking additional resources to enhance the diversity-hiring element of their proposal, for example, by asking for advice from IDEAL change leaders or attending a targeted workshop on these topics?
• From an assessment of department searches not resulting from the Achieving Distinction initiative, do we see enhanced application of best practice in those departments who have submitted an Achieving Distinction proposal? Lessons learned from the evaluation of Achieving Distinction proposals may yield useful information for other institutions who are undergoing strategic hiring while also maintaining a commitment to diversity of the faculty.

4. Foundations for future progress
   
   e. Campus Alliances and Coalitions
   The IDEAL projects have established firm alliances between the Institute for Teaching & Learning (website, faculty development, reports to Office of Academic Affairs), the Department of Talent Development & Human Resources (search committee workshops), Institutional Research (continued data collection) and the Office of Inclusion & Equity (speakers and communications). Each of these offices will continue to work on behalf of the academic colleges to continue the IDEAL project on diversity hiring of women in STEM.

5. Key Three Year Accomplishment
   There are two foundational elements defining the key accomplishment from the IDEAL project: 1) we now have people, i.e. IDEAL change leaders, who are quite knowledgeable on best practices and 2) we now have a process for continued data collection and analysis. These components create the essential elements for continued evaluation of diversity within STEM departments.

   These two components will be critical to the success of The University of Akron’s Strategic Investment Program- Achieving Distinction, a 10-year blueprint for increasing multidisciplinary research at the university by hiring over 150 faculty members in the next 10 years. Beyond enhanced multidisciplinary scholarship, this strategic initiative quite specifically requires that “Diversity of people, thoughts, and perspectives must be enhanced.” The success of this component of the Achieving Distinction initiative will require evaluation metrics of the kind already in place from our annual IDEAL change projects to ensure that the diversity criteria is not overshadowed by the criteria for multidisciplinary scholarship. Examples of metrics include:
   • Trends in faculty diversity by gender and rank. (See Appendix 6 for example)
   • Patterns in new hires by gender and department
   • Comparison with national data on research faculty compositions by gender and department
   • Qualitative assessment of search plans resulting from successful Achieving Distinction proposals including evidence of best practices

   Senior academic leadership and Human Resources has agreed to allow IDEA change leaders access to the needed information to begin this evaluation. It is expected that additional evaluation measures will be developed after the initial phase.

6. Sustainability Plans for Institutionalizing Activities
   
   The campus alliances established as a result of this IDEAL project permit the following sustainable activities:
   • Each Fall semester all faculty data will be updated, displayed on the IDEAL web site and disseminated to the provost, chief diversity officer, Human Resources and both academic deans. (See Appendix 6 for an example)
• For the first time, include a STEM faculty member (i.e. a former IDEAL change leader) on the Talent Development & Human Resources subcommittee of University Council.
• Each summer, complete a comprehensive qualitative analysis of search committee practices using information from the new HR database. This analysis will now include demographics of candidate pools by department. (See Appendix 6 for example)
• Year 3 IDEAL team members will maintain a diversity listserv as a pro-active step in diversifying candidate pools.
• Associate Deans will ask faculty presenting at professional conferences to display the Be a Part of the Changing Face of The University of Akron flyer to promote our strategic goal of inclusive excellence. (See appendix 6A)
• IDEAL team members will perform an annual evaluation of proposals asking for new faculty positions as part of the Achieving Distinction initiative and provide a critique on the diversity criteria to the provost. (See Appendix 6A)
• Hold a series of Faculty Thinking Community workshops to allow STEM faculty to think through best diversity hiring practices and strategies for diversity hiring in a multidisciplinary framework as part of the Achieving Distinction initiative. Discussion topics will include the following:
  o What makes a search process an effective diversity search? What can department faculty do to yield a diverse candidate pool and on what timeline?
  o What are the different opinions between departments on the merit and value of diversity hires? Who does it benefit and why is it a laudable goal for a search process?
  o What level of diversity do you need to achieve to surpass the goals of Vision 2020? What measures would you want to track to make sure your hiring process is effective and minimizes bias?
  o What components are needed to enhance your Achieving Distinction proposal to meet the diversity criteria for this initiative? How can the department be more attractive to a diverse candidate?

The University of Akron
Year Three Change Project Report
(See Appendix 6A for report with graphics)

Co-Director:
Helen Qammar, PhD, Associate Professor Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering and Director Institute for Teaching and Learning

Year Three Change Project Team Members:
Kathy Liszka, PhD, Professor and Interim Chair, Department of Computer Science
Richard Londraville, PhD, Professor, Department of Biology
Ajay Mahajan, PhD, Associate Dean for Research, College of Engineering

Team Coach: Helen Williams, PhD

Institutional Transformation Theme
“Faculty Hiring that Makes a Difference”. UA proposes a transformational theme to redesign faculty recruitment and hiring practices in STEM departments. Faculty leadership skills will be essential to encourage departmental faculty to scrutinize current practices and gain an enhanced appreciation of the importance of diversity hiring for student success. IDEAL participants will work closely with other units on campus involved with the university goal of inclusive excellence and diversity.

**Institutional Transformation Vision**

*Our science, engineering and mathematics departments will be recognized on The University of Akron campus for championing the value of diversity in both students and faculty.*

**Year Three Change Project Description:**
The year three team identified a project that supported both the mission of the IDEAL project and the unique strategic goals of UA. UA has laid out a 10-year roadmap of strategic planning (Vision 2020), where it needs to enhance and expand the mission of the university while dealing with the practical realities of declining state support and a wave of retirements anticipated in 2015 (when the retirement income formula changes). The UA administration is embracing these changes as an opportunity, and plans to hire over 150 faculty members over the next 10 years. These hires will be considered strategic hires, and will be used to invest in successful programs/emerging areas of scholarship and support regional partnerships. Complementing that goal, all the strategic hires will be joint appointments across multiple departments/colleges, to further enhance interdisciplinary collaboration and support of emerging areas of research/scholarship. We see this as a unique and timely opportunity to affect the faculty candidate pool in terms of quantity, quality, and diversity.

**Year Three Goals/Objectives of the Change Project:**
Develop and implement best practices aimed at increasing diversity in the candidate pools for these approximately 150 strategic hires and others at the University

**Year Three Activities Undertaken:**
The team met regularly during year 3, and involved other constituents on campus, including the Provost (Dr. Mike Sherman). The team built on the considerable work done by teams for Years 1 and 2, led by Helen Qammar and Mary Verstraete. The team is confident that the IDEAL teams over the last three years have influenced policy and verbiage coming from the University leadership. The team then developed a set of 10 concrete action items, and assigned specific action items to each member. The team met every week to monitor the progress.

**Year Three Resources/Alliances Harnessed Across Campus:**
The following offices supported the IDEAL project:
1. Provost’s office
2. Talent Development and Human Resources
3. Institutional Research
4. Deans Offices (Engineering, Arts & Sciences)

**Year Three Project Accomplishments/Findings** (See Appendix 6A for graphics)
The 10 outcomes are listed below:
1. After months of work and several iterations, Provost Mike Sherman released “The University of Akron’s Strategic Investment Program-Advancing Distinction: Request for Proposals.” This is a 10-year blueprint for increasing multidisciplinary research at the university by
hiring over 150 faculty members in the next 10 years. The first principle is dedicated to defining multidisciplinary, but the second principle specifically states: Diversity of people, thoughts, and perspectives must be enhanced. There are five additional principles.

2. A second document “Expectations for Faculty Searches” is a guideline for fulfilling the second principal stated in the RFP. This guideline provides significant detail on how diversity will be achieved. The second paragraph states the key components of Vision 2020 will be achieved in the context of global relevance by creating a diverse environment that recognizes and values difference in all of its iterations for inclusive excellence. It goes on to define a diverse faculty population and states that it is expected that each search committee will invite to campus (the ‘short list’) a group of applicants that represent the diversity of the applicant pool and also offer the potential to enhance and increase the diversity on campus and within the respective department and college. The University of Akron is particularly committed to hiring new faculty in areas where diversity is most lacking as determined by Talent Development & Human Resources.

3. The website that describes (see Appendix 6A for graphics) the Provost’s Achieving Distinction strategy explicitly states Diversity of People, thoughts, and perspectives must be enhanced as one of its core principles. These core principles are those that proposals will be judged against when decisions are made as to what programs receive new faculty/staff lines

www.uakron.edu/provost/achieving-distinction/

4. An IDEAL poster (See Appendix 6A for graphics) is being designed, such that any UA researcher attending a scientific meeting can post it, and thus advertise UA’s program to hire current and future faculty members. This poster prominently features UA’s dedication to enhancing diversity in making these hires.

5. A PowerPoint slide (See Appendix 6A for graphics) is being designed, along with a sample script, so that faculty giving seminar presentations at conferences and other institutions can advertise UA’s intention to hire and to increase diversity in faculty hires.

6. A listserv has been constructed (new-stemm@lists.uakron.edu) that targets STEM future faculty. Our goal is to proactively create a diverse pool for our future hires. We will begin to populate the list with our contacts at other IDEAL institutions, and from there add the greater IDEAL community. In addition, anyone who views the poster (item 4) will be given the opportunity to join the list. The list will be made available to the entire STEM community at the University, and will be kept updated. Participating University Provosts will be approached to see if each University would support 1-2 post-docs each year from this pool.

7. Each fall semester all faculty data will be updated, displayed on the IDEAL web site and disseminated to the provost, chief diversity officer, Human Resources and both academic deans. See Appendix 6A for example). For additional information, see www.uakron.edu/itl/IDEAL/research-reports-and-presentations/faculty-reports.dot

8. Facilitate Faculty Thinking Communities (FTCs). Provide faculty development opportunities through ITL to enable success in a critical aspect of Achieving Distinction proposals, diversity of people, thoughts, and ideas. Participants will thrash out the merit and value of diversity as well as the process for effective diversity searches.

9. Request membership of IDEAL team members on the University Council Talent & Human Resources Committee. Becky Hoover, Vice President for Talent Development and Human Resources will be approached to create this membership.

10. Use IDEAL teams as resource for proposal development for future Strategic Investment proposals. The concept is that most faculty teams writing these proposals are not well versed in the impact of diversity on hiring (either the data on diversity or their own inherent bias). We would offer to consult with these proposal teams, working through the College Deans (similar to PI’s needing to be coached on how to fulfill ‘broader impacts’ on NSF proposals).
Starting 2012-13, there will be public forums for staffing, and this topic will be brought up as point for discussion along with developing assessment and progress monitoring mechanisms.

**Year Three Recommendations**

On May 07, 2012, the team met with the Provost, Dr. Mike Sherman and presented him with the 3-page report outlining the 10 outcomes and recommended the implementation of outcomes 4-10 at the University level. In addition the team also recommended starting the conversations for the process of monitoring the progress of the Achieving Distinction program specifically for the diversity part.

The team recognizes that it too late to use outcomes 4-10 for this year (submission date for proposals is May 18, 2012), but recommended that these become part of the processes starting next year, and remain in place for the next 10 years (the anticipated duration of the Achieving Distinction program).

The Provost was very supportive of all the outcomes and suggested that the team contact Becky Hoover, Vice president for Talent Development and Human Resources to start the process of institutionalizing the IDEAL team membership in the University Council Talent and Human Resources Committee.

**Year Three Sustainability Plans for Institutionalizing the Activities**

Sustainability comes from institutionalizing the outcomes of this project. A 3-page report with the 10 outcomes was presented to the Provost on May 07, 2012. The Provost has given his approval for all 10 outcomes and suggested bringing the topic up on future open forums on staffing.

**Year Three Challenges Encountered or Likely:**

There were not any significant challenges in framing and executing the year 3 project, but it is anticipated that there may be challenges in the future in monitoring the progress of the institutionalized outcomes of this project.

**Year Three Dissemination Activities and Plans:**

The team would certainly like to disseminate the outcomes of this project at the University, regional and national level. The team will start with engaging its regional peer institutions in including them in the listserve, and will provide them with copies of the poster and the PowerPoint slide. Future activities include continuing the execution of the outcomes as part of the University Council, and developing new proposals/activities to take this project further.

**f. University of Toledo**

Institutional Contexts for Transformation

The University of Toledo IDEAL Departments include all six departments in the College of Engineering (BioEngineering; Chemical and Environmental; Civil; Electrical Eng. and Computer Science; Engineering Technology; and Mechanical, Industrial and Manufacturing) five departments in the College of Arts and Sciences (Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Environmental Sciences, Mathematics, and Physics and Astronomy) and are referred to collectively as Main Campus (MC). The UT College of Medicine (COM) is comprised of 22 academic or clinical departments with basic research scientists in either type of department. IDEAL COM faculty
composition data is based on the nature of the research carried out by individuals rather than departmental affiliation and is represented in separate tables.

University of Toledo
Co-Director Three-Year Project Summary
(See Appendix 7 for full report)

Co-Director:
Penny Poplin Gosetti, Vice Provost for Assessment, Accreditation, and Program Review

1. Institutional Transformation Theme as Defined in the Proposal

Creating a climate for successful retention, tenure, and promotion. Identify climate and culture factors that contribute to low rates of retention and advancement for women and underrepresented minorities in engineering and the natural sciences and develop and implement transformation strategies to create a climate of support and success.

a. Impact of change projects on the university over three years

Change projects impacted the university at both the college and the university levels.

- Previously located in the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S), the STEM areas of math and sciences are now located in their own college, the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM). The first change team, comprised of members from these units, chose to conduct a campus climate survey. The IDEAL faculty climate survey was included as part of a campus-wide climate survey for faculty, students, and staff. The results were shared to multiple constituencies across campus. The IDEAL survey has been permanently incorporated into the campus-wide survey which is administered every two years.

- The awareness generated from the year one change project in general, and the leadership development provided to two members specifically (one of whom is now dean of NSM and one of whom now chairs the department of environmental sciences in NSM), led to proactive advocacy by the new chair (Tim Fisher) for making two diversity offers in environmental sciences – two women, of which one was Hispanic. Although funding support was received, neither offer was accepted.

- Awareness building, both on the part of the college and on the part of the year two change team leaders, lead to a “first-time-ever moment” when the college supported successfully two spousal hires.

- Several team leaders from the change teams have become members of a grant-writing group that continues to submit proposals for an NSF ADVANCE grant that would advance the work that has begun with the IDEAL change teams.

- Although not directly attributable to the promotion and retention aims of UT-IDEAL, but an illustration of an institutional impact for IDEAL, was establishing an office to be used for UT women's programming and for providing references for the library's "Women in Science" portal.

b. Reception received from campus leaders and faculty to the change projects

Campus leaders and faculty responded favorably to the change projects with respondents ranging from those who participated and benefitted directly from the change projects, to those who became involved through provision of resources for the change projects. Examples include:
• Faculty from the College of Engineering participated in a mentoring program that created long-term peer advising teams consisting of untenured faculty, those preparing for promotion to professor, and senior faculty.
• Faculty from the College of Medicine and Life Sciences participated in a speed mentoring program that allowed untenured faculty and those preparing for promotion to meet with multiple former members of the APT committee. This initiative was prioritized based on data gathered from a meeting with target faculty. Immediate feedback was very positive, suggesting political support for this approach. The program will be housed in and sustained through the College Office of Diversity.
• Deans from the colleges involved in year 2 and 3 changes projects (engineering and medicine and life sciences) supported an additional team leader in years 2 and 3, funding the stipend from their college budgets.
• Drs. Gruden and Escobar from the year 2 change team organized a Diversity Forum for Engineering faculty and staff in February 2012. Over 80 people attended. As a result, all six departments in the College of Engineering repeated the program for all their first-year students through Professional Development classes, with total attendance over 600. This will become an ongoing activity.
• The College of Engineering, host of the year 2 change team, has established an Assistant Dean position that includes outreach.
• The Associate Vice-President for Equity, Diversity, and Community Engagement supported the year 1 change project by incorporating the proposed faculty climate survey into a larger institutional climate survey designed for students, faculty, and administrators. She included the data from the IDEAL portion of the survey into presentations she made across the campus, inviting team members to join her when possible.

c. Policies, practices implemented, in planning stages, etc.
Change projects from years 1 and 2 have started manifesting themselves in practices, only one of which has been systematized, with the other ones showing great potential for doing so.
• The campus climate survey, which began in spring 2010, was administered again in spring 2012, with a similar number of faculty respondents. The survey will be conducted every other year by the Office of Equity, Diversity, and Community Engagement.
• In addition to the examples of diversity and spousal hires described in section 1a, the College of NSM has experienced in recent search committee meetings, conversations related to diversifying faculty hires.
• The mentoring program developed by the year 2 change team resulted in the creation of mentoring guidelines that have been shared with the College of NSM. The year 3 change team from the College of Medicine and Life Sciences chose to address policies and practices of FMLA that relate to tenure and promotion.
• Unlike the unionized Main Campus, which requires work-load related issues to be bargained, the Health Science Campus can create policies such as the one submitted by the change team to create an automatic extension of the promotion “clock,” when taking FMLA leaves above a certain length. The Dean has agreed, in principle, to support this policy.
• In practice, the change team is currently working with the development officer from its college to attract a donor who will endow a fund to provide incentive
awards for researchers (and separately for educators) who best maintain productivity despite having taken leave (one award each per year).

d. Impact of the plenary on the institutional progress
The plenary provided an opportunity for many of UT’s senior leaders to become familiar with the IDEAL grant and to see the regional impact of the work that was being done by the change teams.

- Attendance at the first plenary by the Associate Vice President for Equity, Diversity, and Community Engagement, led to her becoming a strong supporter of and contributor to the change team projects each year.
- The Chair of Women and Gender Studies, who is now the Dean of Languages, Literature, and Social Sciences (LLSS), has led university efforts to obtain an NSF Advance Grant. As a result of attending the plenary sessions, and her ongoing relationships with the co-director and several of the change team members, she has included the work of the IDEAL change teams as a foundation for elements in the grant proposals.
- The Deans of Engineering; Medicine and Life Sciences; and NSM have all attended the plenary sessions and are working together to support the sustainability of the change team initiatives as well as other opportunities that arise, such as the workshop, To Tenure and Beyond, sponsored by Case Western scheduled for August.

2. Leadership Development Program

a. Leadership movement of participants over three years
Two-thirds of the IDEAL participants moved into positions with greater responsibility and authority during the three years of the grant.

Change team 1
- Tim Fisher – from professor in Environmental Sciences to professor and Department Chair of Environmental Sciences.
- Karen Bjorkman – from Department Chair of Physics and Astronomy to inaugural Dean of the College of NSM.
- Nancy Collins – See Forward to Professorship Workshop under Cyndee Gruden below.

Change team 2
- Maria Coleman – moved from professor of Chemical Engineering to professor and Co-Director, Institute for Sustainable Engineering Materials
- Brian Randolph – from professor and Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education to professor and Senior Associate Dean of undergraduate studies. Brian Randolph, Professor of Civil Engineering and Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies; was asked to take a leadership position in one of the five NCA-HLC criterion teams (early 2011) during preparations for the 2012 accreditation site visit. Joined steering committee meetings for the final year of preparations (2011-12).
- Isabel Escobar - Professor of Chemical Engineering and Interim Assistant Dean for Research Development and Outreach, was asked to serve as the Director for the Catharine S. Eberly Center for Women for AY2010-11, and was asked to co-chair the President’s Lecture Series on Diversity leading to the Women’s Empowerment Summit (in partnership with Patricia Hogue, Year 3 Change Team) in March 2012. Over 100 faculty, staff and community women attended.
• Cyndee Gruden - Associate Professor of Civil Engineering and Director of Civil Engineering Undergraduate Program organized a Forward to Professorship Workshop (in partnership with Isabel Escobar and Nancy Collins, Year 1 Change Team) for 24 underrepresented minority women assistant professors and post-docs in STEMM fields. Funding was obtained from George Washington University's NSF FORWARD-PAID grant for the August 2011 event.

Change Team 3

• Bina Joe – from professor of Physiology and Pharmacology to professor and Director, Center for Hypertension and Personalized Medicine
• Sheryl Milz – from interim to permanent Chair and Co-Director of the Northwest Ohio Consortium for Public Health
• Pat Hogue – see Isabel Escobar above

Co-Director

• Penny Poplin Gosetti – from Interim Vice Provost for Academic Innovation to Vice Provost for Assessment, Accreditation, and Program Review

b. Annual Change Projects

The leadership development opportunities provided by the annual change projects grew over the three years as the participants (particularly the Co-Director) gained a better understanding of the grant, processes associated with the grant, and the potential outcomes for the grant.

• Instituted a process for rotating the leadership of each meeting among change team leaders, which included preparing the meeting, sending out appropriate materials, facilitating the meeting and providing follow-up to the action items of the meeting.

• In addition to group interaction, members selected elements of the change project to address individually allowing them opportunities to meet with their Dean and other University leaders, communicate with faculty and staff in a leadership capacity, and apply principles learned from the IDEAL leadership development workshops.


Several promising practices have the potential to become promising practices in the future:

• Attention to spousal hires
• Attention to diversity hires
• Adjustment of FMLA policies to address tenure and promotion guidelines
• Mentoring for untenured faculty and faculty seeking promotion by senior faculty and faculty members of promotion and tenure committees

4. Foundations for Future Progress

Foundations have developed over that past three years that will contribute to the sustainability of the progress. In addition, suggestions have been made for structures that will strengthen the foundations for future progress.

• The Office of Equity, Diversity, and Community Engagement, as mentioned several times above, has been a strong supporter of the change team projects. This relationship has strengthened with a restructuring that involved the Associate Vice-President who oversees this office, assuming the directorship of the Eberly Center for Women.

• The Provost, who has supported the development and implementation of the IDEAL grant at UT (and the continuing efforts to obtain and ADVANCE grant), has recently
reorganized his office so that a greater emphasis is being placed on faculty development. The Vice Provost responsible for this area is creating a structure to support faculty development efforts such as the mentoring programs begun by years 2 and 3 change teams.

- The group of writers who have been working on the submission of ADVANCE grant proposals consists of two deans, two vice provosts, the director of the Center for Women, a college assistant Dean, and faculty members from the Colleges of Engineering and of NSM (three of which have been involved directly with the IDEAL grant). While not systematized, this group has worked diligently to develop funded initiatives that not only build on but sustain the work of the IDEAL teams.

- The year 3 change team has suggested the creation of an Advisory Committee for Faculty Development. The focus of this committee, which will meet twice per year, will be on faculty development strategies, not tactics.

5. Key Three Year Accomplishment

Three accomplishments from the three years of the IDEAL grant intertwine to become the key accomplishment.

- **Climate survey** – The climate survey that was conducted by the year 1 change team has provided not only a foundation for continued data collection, but, more importantly, a foundation for the use of data in determining new projects. The data collected from the 2010 administration for the survey served as a spring board for the year 2 change project. The data from the survey were fresh at the time the team was choosing its change project and the need for mentoring was clear across campus, but especially in engineering. The year 3 change team reviewed the data from the 2010 administration and, noting that the data were one year old and the respondent distribution was not a fair representation of the population being served by the grant, decided to conduct a focused conversation over lunch with College of Medicine and Life Science faculty either to confirm the data or to make adjustments based on the needs that emerged. Mentoring continued to be an expressed need in addition to concerns about the impact of FMLA leaves on tenure, promotion, and research activity.

- **Mentoring** – Mentoring initiatives became the focus for the years 2 and 3 change projects. Developed for the specific needs of their college faculties, Engineering’s mentoring connected untenured faculty and those seeking promotion to professor with senior-level mentors in long-term peer advising groups, while Medicine and Life Science’s mentoring connected its faculty with “alumni faculty” from the Advancement, Promotion, and Tenure committee in a speed mentoring format. The year 1 change team, which was comprised from A&S faculty (now College of NSM), did not benefit immediately from the climate survey for a change project; however, the College of Engineering has shared its mentoring guidelines as a precursor for the development of a mentoring program in the College of NSM.

- **Involvement of Deans from IDEAL colleges** – Through the change projects, attendance at the plenary sessions, and meetings with change team members, the deans from the IDEAL colleges are showing resource support for the change team projects as well as for addressing our transformation theme – creating a climate for successful retention, tenure, and promotion.
  - The Deans from the Colleges of Engineering and of Medicine and Life Sciences funded an additional change team member in years 3 and 4.
The Deans from the all three IDEAL colleges are partially funding the *To Tenure and Beyond* workshop sponsored by Case Western Reserve University in August, 2012.

The Dean from the College of Medicine and Life Sciences has provided verbal approval of a policy that addresses the promotion and tenure ramifications of using FMLA and has offered a permanent home for the year 3 change project on mentoring.

### 6. Sustainability Plans for Institutionalizing Activities

The current Provost is retiring effective July 1, 2012. A new Provost is being sought with an anticipated start date prior to the beginning of fall semester. The Chancellor of the Health Science Campus/Dean of the College of Medicine and Life Sciences has offered to brief the new Provost on the activities and outcomes of the IDEAL grant and discuss sustainability. Many sustainability practices have been mentioned earlier in the report. To summarize:

- **Campus Climate Survey** – Two-year cycles of administration, housed in the Office of Equity, Diversity, and Community Engagement.
- **Office of Equity, Diversity, and Community Engagement** – Addition of the Eberly Center for Women into the portfolio of the office’s Associate Vice President.
- **Faculty Development** – (a) Provost office reorganization places renewed emphasis on faculty development, (b) Create a strategically-focused Advisory Committee on Faculty Development.
- **Web Site** – Continued development of the UT-IDEAL Web site to provide links to important resources, campus climate findings and recommendations, and leadership development opportunities. [www.utoledo.edu/offices/chancellor/ideal/team.html](http://www.utoledo.edu/offices/chancellor/ideal/team.html)
- **Communication Among Deans** – Continued conversations among IDEAL deans on ways to fund and otherwise support IDEAL initiatives.

---
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**Institutional Transformation Theme** (as defined by the Co-director in the proposal):
Creating a climate for successful retention, tenure, and promotion. Identify climate and culture factors that contribute to low rates of retention and advancement for women and underrepresented minorities in engineering and the natural sciences and develop and implement transformation strategies to create a climate of support and success.

Year Three Change Project Description:
The focus of the year 3 change project was on the retention and promotion of women faculty in support of our theme by addressing mentoring along with incentives and policies related to FMLA authorized leaves. This year’s change project focused on the women basic science faculty in all departments of the College of Medicine and Life Sciences.

Four-part project with short-term, mid-term, and long-term aspects:
1. Short-term – institute monetary awards for women researchers and educators in COMLS who make outstanding progress that spans an FMLA-authorized leave, and systematize the tenure clock pause and letter from the Chancellor spelling out relevant rights (and indicating University support for those rights).
2. Mid-term – establish a promotion mentoring program offering speed-mentoring sessions to provide junior faculty with the chance to ask questions of members from the Appointment, Promotions, and Tenure (APT) committee.
3. Long-term – establish a grant assistance program that will help junior faculty obtain funding and maintain functioning labs during times of leave, such as FMLA.
4. Long-term – reduce any salary discrepancies between male and female faculty members in COMLS, whether due to differential starting salaries or differential raises over time.

Year Three Goals/Objectives of the Change Project:
1. To recognize female faculty for what they do, while minimizing negative side-effects of such things as FMLA-associated leaves, so that they remain and succeed at UT in COMLS.
2. To assist female basic science faculty with the promotion and tenure process.
3. To address compensation discrepancies within COMLS.

Year Three Specific Outcomes of Change Project:
1. Annual COMLS awards for female research and education (nonclinical) faculty.
2. Increased grant renewal rates for female faculty who have taken FMLA leaves.
3. Long-term – increase the number of female COMLS faculty promoted and tenured.
4. Long-term – eliminate salary discrepancies in COMLS.
5. Establish a process of periodic climate surveys.

Year Three Resources Needed to Accomplish Project:
1. Salary data over time for COMLS faculty.
2. Establish a foundation account for the award money (in process – working with a potential donor).
3. Small amount of time from webpage designer for IDEAL page and RSP page on grant/FMLA policies.

Year Three Implementation Plan for Change Project:
1. Working lunch with female instructors and assistant/associate nonclinical professors, to obtain their input in order to focus the change project to meet their needs.
2. Meet with Dr. Gold, Chancellor of Health Science Campus and Dean, COM, to establish
COM awards and develop an institutionalized Chancellor’s letter outlining support of rights associated with FMLA leave.

3. Determine former APT members and request their participation in a speed mentoring process. Offer speed mentoring to junior faculty.

4. Accumulate advice (positive and negative) from faculty members who have taken FMLA leave during the funding period of a research grant, keep abreast of relevant funding opportunities (e.g., http://nexus.od.nih.gov/all/2011/01/19/family-friendly-policies-apply-to-all-grants/), and establish a webpage collecting relevant advice and policies (from UT and the granting agencies) in one place.

5. Obtain faculty salaries in COMLS over time so that a study to determine possible causes of the salary discrepancies can be determined. Select one department in COMLS that is willing to work with the IDEAL team to begin addressing these discrepancies.

**Year Three Implementation Timeline for Change Project:**

1. Luncheon with junior faculty held on November 28, 2011
2. Meeting with Dr. Gold (Chancellor, and Dean of the COMLS) – held on January 23, 2012 – offer the award and institutionalized Chancellor’s letter in spring 2013, but with policies in place summer 2012.
   - The Dean of the COMLS has agreed, in principle, to support a policy for automatic extension of promotion “clock,” along with standardized letter from his office summarizing rights for those taking FMLA leaves above a certain minimum length. The Dean has agreed to provide incentive awards for researchers (and separately for educators) who best maintain productivity despite having taken leave (one award per year).
   - An extension of this initiative to the Main Campus will involve union negotiations; implementation on the Health Science Campus should be easier.
3. Survey sent by Faculty Affairs Office to faculty members who have taken FMLA, after approval by counsel in April 2012. Currently awaiting responses.
4. Determined former APT members’ ability to participate and held first annual speed mentoring on April 4, 2012.
   - Recruited “alumni” of APT committee, along with assistant dean for faculty affairs and a negotiations expert from the business school; these mentors advised nine junior faculty members. Immediate feedback was very positive, suggesting political support for this approach.
5. Established IDEAL Web-page hosted on the Chancellor’s page with a link from the Provost’s page. Links to family friendly policies for NIH and NSF have been included. The website went live early spring semester 2012; first major revision April 13, 2012.
6. Determined that faculty salaries data are not computerized and will need to be obtained manually from individual files. This long-term goal has been postponed until a later date.

**Year Three Evaluation Metrics for Change Project:**

1. Policies supporting FMLA award and institutionalized Chancellor’s support letter verbally approved by April 2012.
2. Websites in place for IDEAL project overall, and for grant maintenance during/after FMLA leave.
3. RSP database in place tracking funding renewal rates for faculty who took FMLA leave; expect renewal success rates to increase over subsequent 2-4 years.
4. Office of Diversity database in place tracking promotion, tenure, and salary data (2011 forward) for female faculty compared to male faculty; expect any differences to be within
statistical error by 2015.

Year Three Sustainability Plans for Institutionalizing Activities/Recommendations of Change Project
1. After award is established in COMLS, supported by endowment, work with Chancellor and Provost to offer similar awards/letters in other Colleges at UT.
2. Place the speed mentoring program under the COMLS Office of Diversity to continue offering the program and provide an administrative home.
3. The IDEAL change leaders will continue to work with COMLS chairs, dean, and finance person to address salary discrepancies.

6) Three-Year NSF Indicator Data for IDEAL Partner Universities
(Excerpted from Appendix 1, External Evaluation Report)

The following section provides NSF indicator data outcomes that were concurrent with the span of the IDEAL grant (2009-2012), specifically changes in faculty and leadership composition, by gender and URM status. To assess changes in faculty and leadership composition, comparisons were made between the pre-IDEAL period (from 2008-09 levels) and levels reported for the last year of the grant (2011-12). All data were provided to external evaluator Mary Wright by co-directors from participating campuses, for IDEAL units only. These comparisons are not meant to suggest causal claims about the effect of IDEAL; however, it is possible to note trends concurrent with the NSF grant’s tenure and to highlight distinctions made between “intervention constituencies” (i.e., primarily women, but also URM, to some extent) and “non-intervention constituencies” (i.e., men). Two limitations of this analysis should be noted here. First, there were some small fluctuations in units included in IDEAL between 2008-9 and the final year of the grant, which are explained in the Evaluation Report, therefore, comparisons are not made between identical units, but relatively similar clusters of departments. Second, UT data was not provided for leadership positions, and therefore, estimates gathered from university websites were utilized.

a) Faculty Composition in IDEAL Units, Pre- and Post-Grant

As seen in Figure 1, while the ratio of male to female S&E faculty is still nearly 4:1 at the six IDEAL campuses, 2009-12 saw an increase in the numbers of female (+14.5) and URM (+2.5) tenure-track faculty. From 2008-9 to 2011-12, the number of female faculty grew by 6.9%, while URM counts increased by 5.1%. In comparison, the number of male faculty declined by 7.6% during these same four years, while non-URM faculty went down by 5.3%.

Figure 1: Number of Pre-tenure and Tenured Faculty in IDEAL Units, Pre- and Post-Grant, by Gender and URM Status
By campus, half of participating universities demonstrated increases in the number of female tenure-track faculty in IDEAL units. Three campuses documented increases (CWRU: +13; CSU: +5.5; UA: +3), one showed no change (BGSU), and two campuses reported slight to moderate losses (UT: -1; KSU: -6). Three campuses showed increases in URM tenure-track faculty (UA: +4; CWRU: +3; UT: +1), while one showed essentially no change (CSU: -0.5), and two reported losses (KSU: -4, BGSU: -1).

By rank, Tables 1 & 2 (below) illustrate that growth was seen for women and URMs, but at different career points. For women, stronger gains were made in the tenured ranks, while for URMs, higher rates of increase can be found in the pre-tenure stage. (See Appendix 4 for non-tenure track data.)

**Pre-Tenure Faculty**

Over the time frame of the IDEAL grant, many campuses were experiencing hiring freezes. Therefore, it is not surprising that the number of female assistant professors decreased slightly (-8.5 FTE or -10.5% change) (Table 1). However, because of the sharp decrease in male faculty (-24 FTE or -13.5%), the overall proportion of female pre-tenure faculty grew somewhat, increasing from 31.3% to 32.0%. Growth in underrepresented faculty counts (7.1%) was also positive, compared to declines in the number of non-underrepresented faculty (-13.7%), resulting in an overall 1.2% increase in URM composition in the pre-tenure ranks.

Only two campuses (CWRU, UA) added female faculty in their IDEAL units (Table 1). However, two other IDEAL campuses (CSU, KSU) demonstrated gains in the proportion of women among pre-tenure faculty because of sharper declines in the composition of male junior professors. It is important to note that there is some correspondence between IDEAL activities and these trends. One of the campuses adding female faculty, UA, had key IDEAL initiatives focused on hiring practices and search committee interventions. While CWRU did not focus specifically on hiring, its Year 2 focus was on mentoring of new assistant professors. In contrast, BGSU, which also focused on pre-tenure hiring, reported losses in both absolute numbers and relative proportions of female faculty. However, it should be noted that BGSU hiring data for
faculty starting in 2012-13 showed an encouraging uptick, so it is possible that its intervention strategy has longer timeframe for results. (See Table 4 for BGSU new hire data.)

Table 1: Comparison of Pre-Tenure Faculty Composition, Pre-IDEAL (2008-9) and at Last Year of Grant (2011-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female % (No.)</th>
<th>Male % (No.)</th>
<th>Non-URM % (No.)</th>
<th>URM % (No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td>2008-9</td>
<td>50.0% (8)</td>
<td>50.0% (8)</td>
<td>87.5% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>25.0% (4)</td>
<td>75.0% (12)</td>
<td>93.8% (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Change in No. (Δ in No.)</td>
<td>-50.0% (-4)</td>
<td>50.0% (+4)</td>
<td>+7.1% (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diff. in % Composition</td>
<td>-25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>2008-9</td>
<td>39.5% (15)</td>
<td>60.5% (23)</td>
<td>97.4% (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>46.9% (11.5)</td>
<td>53.1% (13)</td>
<td>95.9% (23.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Change in No. (Δ in No.)</td>
<td>-23.3% (-3.5)</td>
<td>-43.5% (-10)</td>
<td>-36.5% (13.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diff. in % Composition</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU</td>
<td>2008-9</td>
<td>35.0% (21)</td>
<td>65.0% (39)</td>
<td>94.3% (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>44.3% (27)</td>
<td>55.7% (34)</td>
<td>90.2% (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Change in No. (Δ in No.)</td>
<td>28.6% (+6)</td>
<td>-12.8% (-5)</td>
<td>-3.50% (-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diff. in % Composition</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>2008-9</td>
<td>32.1% (17)</td>
<td>67.9% (36)</td>
<td>94.3% (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>44.1% (15)</td>
<td>55.9% (19)</td>
<td>94.1% (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Change in No. (Δ in No.)</td>
<td>-11.8% (-2)</td>
<td>-47.2% (-17)</td>
<td>-36.0% (-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diff. in % Composition</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>-12.0%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>2008-9</td>
<td>27.6% (8)</td>
<td>72.4% (21)</td>
<td>93.1% (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>22.0% (9)</td>
<td>78.0% (32)</td>
<td>95.1% (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Change in No. (Δ in No.)</td>
<td>+12.5% (+1)</td>
<td>52.4% (+11)</td>
<td>44.4% (+12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diff. in % Composition</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>2008-9</td>
<td>19.0% (12)</td>
<td>81.0% (51)</td>
<td>95.2% (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>12.0% (6)</td>
<td>88.0% (44)</td>
<td>94.0% (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Change in No. (Δ in No.)</td>
<td>-50.0% (-6)</td>
<td>-13.7% (-7)</td>
<td>-21.7% (-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diff. in % Composition</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>2008-9</td>
<td>31.3% (81)</td>
<td>68.7% (178)</td>
<td>94.6% (245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>32.0% (72.5)</td>
<td>68.0% (154)</td>
<td>93.4% (211.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Change in No. (Δ in No.)</td>
<td>-10.5% (-8.5)</td>
<td>-13.5% (-24)</td>
<td>-13.7% (-33.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diff. in % Composition</td>
<td>+0.7%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tenured Faculty
Trends were more favorable for women in the tenured faculty ranks. While counts of female faculty grew substantially (+23 FTE or 17.7%), numbers of male tenured faculty declined sharply (-44.5 FTE or -6.2%) (Table 2). Correspondingly, female representation in the tenured ranks grew from 15.3% to 18.5% over the three years of the IDEAL grant. Five out of six campuses showed growth in numbers of female tenured S&E faculty, and all saw increases in percentage composition of women in the tenured ranks.

However, it is difficult to make a link between IDEAL interventions and these gains across all universities, given that the primary emphasis of most campuses’ initiatives was hiring and new faculty mentoring.

Increases in the number of URM faculty were small (+1.5 FTE or +4.3%), but favorable in comparison to declines seen in non-underrepresented faculty (-23 FTE or -2.8%). URM composition in the tenured faculty ranks grew slightly from 2008-12, from 4.1% to 4.4%.

Table 2: Comparison of Tenured Faculty Composition, Pre-IDEAL (2008-9) and at Last Year of Grant (2011-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female % (No.)</th>
<th>Male % (No.)</th>
<th>Non-URM% (No.)</th>
<th>URM% (No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BGSU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-9</td>
<td>14.1% (12)</td>
<td>85.9% (73)</td>
<td>92.9% (79)</td>
<td>7.1% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>21.1% (16)</td>
<td>78.9% (60)</td>
<td>92.1% (70)</td>
<td>7.9% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change in No. (Δ in No.)</td>
<td>+33.3% (+4)</td>
<td>-17.8% (-13)</td>
<td>-11.4% (-9)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. in % Composition</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-9</td>
<td>17.1% (21)</td>
<td>82.9% (102)</td>
<td>91.9% (113)</td>
<td>8.1% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>22.5% (30)</td>
<td>77.5% (103.5)</td>
<td>92.9% (124)</td>
<td>7.1% (9.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change in No. (Δ in No.)</td>
<td>+42.9% (+9)</td>
<td>+1.5% (+1.5)</td>
<td>+9.7% (+11)</td>
<td>-5.0% (-0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. in % Composition</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CWRU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-9</td>
<td>14.6% (31)</td>
<td>85.4% (181)</td>
<td>97.6% (207)</td>
<td>2.4% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>17.3% (38)</td>
<td>82.7% (182)</td>
<td>98.0% (215)</td>
<td>2.0% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change in No. (Δ in No.)</td>
<td>+22.6% (+7)</td>
<td>+0.6% (+1)</td>
<td>+3.9% (+8)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. in % Composition</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KSU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-9</td>
<td>18.0% (31)</td>
<td>82.0% (141)</td>
<td>95.3% (164)</td>
<td>4.7% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>18.6% (27)</td>
<td>81.4% (118)</td>
<td>96.6% (140)</td>
<td>3.4% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change in No. (Δ in No.)</td>
<td>-12.9% (-4)</td>
<td>-16.3% (-23)</td>
<td>-14.6% (-24)</td>
<td>-37.5% (-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. in % Composition</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-9</td>
<td>15.3% (20)</td>
<td>84.7% (111)</td>
<td>98.5% (129)</td>
<td>1.5% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>18.2% (22)</td>
<td>81.8% (99)</td>
<td>95.0% (115)</td>
<td>5.0% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change in No. (Δ in No.)</td>
<td>10.0% (+2)</td>
<td>-10.8% (-12)</td>
<td>-10.9% (-14)</td>
<td>+200.0% (+4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Leadership Composition, Pre- and Post-Grant

Table 3 displays the composition of leadership positions at the six IDEAL campuses, before and during the last year of the grant. For women, there were positive increases in the number of full professors (an increase of 10.9%), endowed chairs (33.3%) and department chairs in IDEAL units (77.8%). In schools and colleges in which IDEAL units were located, the number of associate deans more than doubled. All of these positions also showed small increases in female faculty’s representation, ranging from a 1.0% (full professors) to 7.9% (associate deans) difference in percentage composition, comparing 2008-9 and 2011-12 proportions by position. However, for high-level administrative positions – deans, presidents, provosts, and vice/associate/deputy provosts – there were no changes or small losses in both numbers and percentage composition. Given the “grassroots” nature of the IDEAL grant projects, it is not surprising that most changes were located at the department level.

For URM, there is a more complex picture, with gains in counts of full professors (50.0%), and movement from zero positions to one for endowed chairs and deans, losses in associate deans (-40%), and no/little change for department chairs, president, and provostial positions (Table 3). Differences in URM leadership composition in these positions showed similar directional increases or decreases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dif. in % Composition</th>
<th>2.9%</th>
<th>-2.9%</th>
<th>-3.5%</th>
<th>3.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dif. in % Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT 2008-9</td>
<td>11.8% (15)</td>
<td>88.2% (112)</td>
<td>96.9% (123)</td>
<td>3.1% (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>15.0% (20)</td>
<td>85.0% (113)</td>
<td>96.2% (128)</td>
<td>3.8% (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change in No. (∆ in No.)</td>
<td>+33.3% (+5)</td>
<td>+0.9% (+1)</td>
<td>4.1% (+5)</td>
<td>25.0% (+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. in % Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL 2008-9</td>
<td>15.3% (130)</td>
<td>84.7% (720)</td>
<td>95.9% (815)</td>
<td>4.1% (35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>18.5% (153)</td>
<td>81.5% (675.5)</td>
<td>95.6% (792)</td>
<td>4.4% (36.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change in No. (∆ in No.)</td>
<td>+17.7% (+23)</td>
<td>-6.2% (-44.5)</td>
<td>-2.8% (-23)</td>
<td>+4.3% (+1.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. in % Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Comparison of Leadership Composition, Pre-IDEAL (2008-9) and at Last Year of Grant (2011-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>URM</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Change in No. (∆ in No.)</td>
<td>Diff. in % Composition</td>
<td>2008-9</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>% Change in No. (∆ in No.)</td>
<td>Diff. in % Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td>11.6% (5)</td>
<td>14.7% (5)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
<td>15.0% (10)</td>
<td>66.7% (+4)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>4.5% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU</td>
<td>13.5% (21)</td>
<td>13.8% (22)</td>
<td>4.8% (+1)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.3% (2)</td>
<td>1.9% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>9.9% (7)</td>
<td>9.6% (7)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>2.8% (2)</td>
<td>2.7% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>14.9% (7)</td>
<td>10.4% (7)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
<td>2.1% (1)</td>
<td>6.0% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>7.0% (4)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.8% (1)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL %</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>1.0%*</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deans</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>50.0% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>50.0% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>50.0% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tot. (No.)</strong></td>
<td>25.0% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Deans</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td>33.3% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU</td>
<td>50.0% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>20.0% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>33.3% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>16.7% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot. % (No.)</td>
<td>26.9% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University President</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td>100.0% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU</td>
<td>100.0% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot. % (No.)</td>
<td>33.3% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Provost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>100.0% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>100.0% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>50.0% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot. % (No.)</td>
<td>42.9% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Univ. Vice, Associate, and Deputy Provosts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>66.7% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU</td>
<td>100.0% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>50.0% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>25.0% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>80.0% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot. % (No.)</td>
<td>60.0% (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
*Data were not reported for University of Toledo’s leadership composition in 2011-12. For full professors and endowed chairs, change is computed using figures received from the other five IDEAL campuses.

**Estimates for University of Toledo department chair, deans, associate deans, provost, vice-provosts/associate vice provosts/assistant provosts and president were made through information available on university webpages.

7) Project Evaluation – External Evaluation Report Executive Summary

(See Appendix 1 for full report)

Prepared by Dr. Mary Wright, Associate Research Scientist and Assistant Director, Evaluation Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, University of Michigan

This report documents the final summative external evaluation of the three-year Institutions Developing Excellence in Academic Leadership (IDEAL) program, a NSF ADVANCE PAID grant. This three-year grant involves a collaboration between six northern Ohio universities, each with the goal of seeding institutional transformation: Case Western Reserve University (CWRU; the lead site), Bowling Green State University (BGSU), Cleveland State University (CSU), Kent State University (KSU), University of Akron (UA), and the University of Toledo (UT). The full Final External Evaluation Report is attached at Appendix 1. A summary of key findings from this report follows.
1) **Changes in the representation of women and URM faculty**: Comparing pre-grant IDEAL faculty levels (2008-9) with the FTE counts during the final year of IDEAL (2011-12), numbers of female and Underrepresented Minority (URM) faculty grew, while comparable numbers of male and non-URM faculty declined. By campus, half of the IDEAL universities demonstrated increases in the number of female tenure-track faculty, while one showed no change and two campuses reported slight to moderate losses. (All campuses were experiencing hiring freezes or a general reduction in hiring from pre-recession levels, which may have limited potential movement in the tenure-track ranks.) Across campuses, stronger gains for women were made in the tenured ranks, while for URMs, higher rates of increase can be found in the pre-tenure stage.

2) **Changes in the representations of women and URM leadership**: Comparing pre-grant levels with the final year of IDEAL, there were positive increases in the number of female full professors, endowed chairs, department chairs, and associate deans in IDEAL units. However, for high-level administrative positions – deans, presidents, provosts, and vice/associate/deputy provosts – there were small losses or no change in representation. Given the “grassroots” nature of the IDEAL grant projects, it is not surprising that most changes were located at the department level. For URM leadership, there is a more complex picture, with gains seen at the level of full professor but limited movement at other ranks.

3) **Institutional goal achievement and internal evaluation process at the six IDEAL campuses**: Following metrics established in the evaluation MOUs, primary IDEAL grant goals were reached for five of six campuses. (For the sixth campus, key evaluation data were not reported, making goal achievement difficult to ascertain.) Key outcomes reported include changes in faculty hiring processes or outcomes (BGSU, UA), modified composition of college-level service committees (CSU), modified composition of department-level service committees (CSU), and evidence of effective mentoring programs (CWRU). Campuses that utilized direct measures of outcomes (e.g., changes in search plans, composition of new hires or campus committees, or climate survey indicators) as key metrics present a powerful picture of institutional changes made on campus during the grant’s tenure. Program evaluation data (e.g., participation counts and immediate satisfaction/reported learning) were less evenly documented.

4) **Outcomes associated with change leaders’ personal and professional development**: According to focus group discussions conducted at the 2012 campus visits, IDEAL was effective at creating “a regional learning community of academic leaders in northern Ohio that is informed about the factors responsible for the underrepresentation of women and minority groups in academic S&E and committed to transforming institutional cultures in S&E disciplines,” as well as “an intra-institutional community of change agents at the campus” (Objectives 1 and 2). Additionally, most change team leaders described a multitude of other powerful impacts on their personal and professional development, which they put into practice in their roles as faculty, search committee members, and chairs.

5) **Program evaluation**: Plenary Conferences were well-attended and highly evaluated, with high post-event ratings for both change team leaders and high-level administrators. (In both years, attendees included nearly all IDEAL participants from the six participating universities, and a third to nearly half of the administrative leadership from these institutions.) At the 2012 campus visit discussions, longer-term reflection on these events suggested that they were valued by both high-level administrators and change team leaders for information sharing and building connections across...
universities. Many change team leaders and administrators named Plenary Conferences as one of the most valuable components of IDEAL, for promoting visibility of the grant and for effective sharing of best practices. This feedback signals achievement of Objective 3: “To assemble the senior academic leadership of partner universities to disseminate best practices from ADVANCE institutions, exchange regional institutional research, policies and practices, and evaluate change initiatives.” (See Appendix 1A and 1B for full plenary evaluation reports)

Leadership development sessions also received high evaluations, with ratings of most dimensions situated between three and four on a four-point scale (where 1=poor and 4=excellent). In particular, attendees reported that the meetings helped them feel part of a regional learning community of academic leaders (Objective 1). In discussions, although most faculty reported learning from the sessions, some participants (particularly those in the health sciences) noted that they found it very difficult to travel for a day and suggested more online meetings or shorter events. Another suggestion, arising in written post-event feedback and multiple campus discussions, was to embed more faculty interaction and discussion throughout the program.

Leadership coaches were compensated for meeting with change teams twice per year, but frequency and actualization of the role varied widely across the six campuses. For example, on some campuses, coaches were faculty members, at others they were external consultants; in some cases, coaches facilitated key programs (retreats and seminars), while in one case, the coach worked with change team members on their own personal and professional development (i.e., personal coaching). While most feedback about coaches was quite positive, some faculty members did not perceive the coach as playing a valuable role in IDEAL, although they acknowledged that it was helpful to be accountable to someone in the project team (e.g., the project director). Not surprisingly, coaches perceived to be most successful had a greater frequency and depth of interaction with their change team leaders. Generally, coaches also indicated that it would be helpful to structure more coaching interactions into future change team initiatives.

Other structural supports that were named as valuable to change teams were IDEAL leadership, graduate assistants (provided by change teams or by the graduate school on one campus), efforts to foster continuity between change teams (a repeating member or via email sharing), and provision of faculty stipends.

6) **Institutionalization:** Although the specific nature of institutionalization efforts varied by campus, there were indicators of durable outcomes from all universities’ IDEAL projects. These included institutionalization of climate surveys (BGSU, KSU, UA, UT), faculty development positions or offices (CSU, CWRU), mentoring programs (CWRU), IDEAL-designed search committee workshops (UA), and IDEAL participation in presidential or provostial university-wide initiatives (KSU, UA). In a limited number of cases, it was unclear if certain initiatives would be sustained after IDEAL’s end. Admittedly, this is a short-term
assessment gained from conversations during my visit, and other initiatives may be sustained in the longer term.

In sum, the NSF IDEAL Grant has achieved the key objectives set forth in the original proposal to National Science Foundation.

8) Publications and Products

a. Dissemination activities - IDEAL Web Presence

The website for the IDEAL project (www.case.edu/provost/ideal/), fully operational by November 2009, provides information about the major components and objectives of the grant, as well as information about the six partner institutions, faculty change leaders and leadership development activities. The site serves an important function for change leaders with a private page where participants can login to retrieve agendas, pre-readings, shared documents and requested resources. All reports to NSF are linked on the website (NSF IDEAL Year 2 Report, August 2011 www.case.edu/provost/ideal/doc/IDEAL_Y2_annual_report.pdf and NSF IDEAL Year 1 Report, August 2010 www.case.edu/provost/ideal/doc/IDEAL_Year_One_Report_2010.pdf)

The website also provides a link to the NSF-ADVANCE Institutional Transformation grant ACES (www.cwru.edu/admin/aces/) which continues as CWRU as ACES+. The ACES+ website contains current information and archived materials from the five year grant which the IDEAL project is based upon. The IDEAL website is hosted by the Office of the Provost. Of the six partner schools five have created websites to disseminate information about the IDEAL grant activities on their campus, BGSU, CWRU, CSU, UA, and KSU.

The Bowling Green State University website (www.bgsu.edu/offices/provost/ideal/index.html) provides information about IDEAL, the BGSU change project, readings and resources as well as their climate survey results (See appendices 2A – 2F). Also included is a password protected BGSU/IDEAL blog for faculty.

The Cleveland State University website (www.csuohio.edu/engineering/IDEAL/) provides information about IDEAL in general and the CSU change project specifically. They also feature downloadable reading material about women and minorities in STEM.

The Kent State University website (www.kent.edu/fpdc/ideal/index.cfm) provides extensive information about IDEAL and the KSU change project providing links to a Chair Handbook, www.kent.edu/fpdc/learning-and-teaching/ideal/handbook.cfm, Resources and Events (see Appendix 5 for examples.)

The University of Akron IDEAL website (www.uakron.edu/itl/IDEAL/) highlights their overall theme of developing best hiring practices and work-life balance resources while providing general information about IDEAL. Contents include links to IDEAL for each partner institution (if available), information on best practices for search committees, all annual reports and plenary posters, and extensive data on faculty and student compositions by gender. Also included is a one-time analysis of STEM faculty salaries.
by gender, rank and years of service. A listserve has also been constructed (new-stemm@lists.uakron.edu) that targets STEM future faculty. The listserve is moderated by a year-three IDEAL team member. Other IDEAL institutions were invited to populate the listserve and to permit easy notification of open positions to potential URM faculty candidates.

b. Dissemination activities – News Stories and Brochures
IDEAL partner institutions were charged with generating a broader interest in their change project activities and were able to secure an editorial and feature articles in two regional newspapers, as well as two stories in internal campus news vehicles. The articles are linked on the IDEAL home page as “IDEAL in the News”.

An IDEAL brochure describing objectives, implementation and year one activities was printed and mailed to all faculty in the IDEAL departments at CWRU, KSU, and UT, and distributed at meetings and displayed in various leadership offices at all of the partner schools. A total of 2,500 pieces are in distribution. The PDF version can be downloaded at www.case.edu/provost/ideal/. A final report brochure is in development for distribution at the IDEAL Plenary Conference in 2012 and to partner institutions. A pdf version will be provided on the IDEAL website.

BGSU created a handout Strategies for Creating a Fair Recruiting Process (physics.bgsu.edu/~layden/IDEAL/Strategies%20for%20A%20Fair%20Recruiting%20Process.pdf) to accompany their Faculty Recruitment PowerPoint presentation (physics.bgsu.edu/~layden/IDEAL/ideal_bgsu_faculty_search.pdf) both of which are available on their website.

KSU developed a Climate Survey Results brochure in conjunction with the visit of Bernice Sandler linked on their website at www.kent.edu/ideal/events/sandler.cfm, flyers for campus wide events and proposal recommending a Presidential Commision on Women (see Appendix 5C.)

UA has created a PowerPoint slide/poster to promote the university to potential faculty candidates. Current faculty will be asked to show this slide/poster at professional conferences to showcase our Achieving Distinction faculty hiring initiative as well as our commitment to inclusive excellence through diverse hiring. The slide is included in Appendix 6A.

c. Panels and Presentations

- On March 22, 2011 Diana Bilimoria and Amanda Shaffer presented information about NSF ADVANCE, IDEAL and issues of diversity, equity and inclusion in academic STEM for the Women’s Program Initiative 2010-11 Brown Bag Seminar Series, University of Toledo Health Science Campus.
- On March 22, 2011 Diana Bilimoria and Amanda Shaffer gave an interactive presentation on Mentoring and Career Development at the University of Toledo for College of Engineering women faculty and women faculty in STEMM fields from throughout the institution at the level of full professor.
- On April 14, 2011 Lynn Singer and Amanda Shaffer were on the Faculty Development and Leadership panel at Cleveland State University. The topic of
the panel was “Life Events and the Academic Career”. Dr. Singer and Ms. Shaffer presented information about the best practices at CWRU and other ADVANCE schools.

- On April 26, 2011 Diana Bilimoria presented information at a Faculty Development and Leadership session at Cleveland State University. The topic was “Creating Inclusive and Productive Academic Environments”.

**ADVANCE-related publications (2009 – present)**

**Monograph**

**Referred Journal Articles:**


**Book Chapters:**
Bilimoria, Diana, Liang, Xiangfen, Carter, Shani & Turrell, Jeffrey. (Accepted). Faculty at Early, Middle, and Late Career Stages: Gender Effects. In Ronald Burke, Susan Vinnicombe, Lynda Moore, & Stacey Blake Beard (Eds), Handbook of Research on Promoting Women’s Careers, Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishers.


**Non-refereed Journal Article**
Bilimoria, Diana & Buch, Kim. (2010). The Search is On: Engendering Faculty Diversity through More Effective Search and Recruitment, Change, July/August.

**ADVANCE-related Presentations and Posters (2009 to present)**

**Referred Conference Presentations/Symposia**
Leibnitz, Gretal, Bilimoria, Diana, Carpenter, Jenna, Fouad, Nadya, Khare, Manorama, & Singh, Romila. (June 2012). Stemming Corporate and Academic Tides: Climate and Cultural Impacts and Promising Practices for Recruiting, Retaining and Advancing Women in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM), Paper at WEPAN Conference, Columbus, OH.

Shaffer, Amanda, Bilimoria, Diana & Singer, Lynn T. (June 2012). Institutions Developing Excellence in Academic Leadership: Regional Cooperation, Regional Progress, Paper at WEPAN Conference, Columbus, OH.

Bilimoria, Diana & Lord, Linley (Co-Chairs) (August 2011). Individual and Organizational Strategies to Increase the Workforce Participation of Women in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM), Showcase Symposium presented at the Academy of Management Conference, San Antonio, TX.

**Other Presentations and Posters**


Bilimoria, Diana, Singer, Lynn T. & Shaffer, Amanda. (November 2010). Institutions Developing Excellence in Academic Leadership, Poster at the 15th International Conference on Women Engineers and Scientists (ICWES), Adelaide, Australia.


Bilimoria, Diana & Liang, Xiangfen. The Outcomes of 19 Institutional Transformation Efforts to Advance Gender Equity. (November 2010). Presentation at NSF ADVANCE PI Meeting, NSF, Washington, D.C.


Bilimoria, Diana & Liang, Xiangfen. The Outcomes of Institutional Transformation Efforts to Advance Gender Equity. (October 2010). Presentation at the Leadership, Equality and
Diversity (LEAD) Symposium on Women in Science and Medicine, Dartmouth College School of Medicine, Hanover, New Hampshire.

Bilimoria, Diana & Liang, Xiangfen. (September 2010). Gender Equity and Institutional Transformation: Advancing Change in Academic Science and Engineering, Presentation at NSF ADVANCE Internal Committee Meeting, NSF, Washington, D.C.

Bilimoria, Diana. (September 2010). Good Places to Do Science: Improving Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in Academic S&E Departments, Society for Neuroscience’s IWiN Department Chair Meeting, Washington, D.C.

Bilimoria, Diana & Liang, Xiangfen. (June 2010). Changes in STEM Women Faculty Numbers, Presentation at Midwest Regional NSF ADVANCE PI Meeting, Purdue, Indiana.

Bilimoria, Diana & Liang, Xiangfen. (June 2010). The Outcomes of Institutional Transformation Efforts to ADVANCE Gender, Presentation at NSF 2010 Joint Annual Meeting (JAM), Washington, D.C.

Bilimoria, Diana, Hopkins, Margaret M. & O’Neil, Deborah A. (June 2010). Culture Change through Diversity Initiatives in Universities, Presentation at 2010 Workplace Diversity: Practice and Research Conference, George Mason University, Washington, D.C.

Bilimoria, Diana. (April 2010). Good Places to Do Science: Improving Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in Academic S&E Departments, Society for Neuroscience’s IWiN Department Chair Training to Increase Women in Neuroscience, Washington, D.C.


d. Dissemination at 2011 Plenary Conference.

The Plenary Conference brought together Presidents, Provosts, Academic Deans, Diversity Officers and Co-Directors, Change Leader teams from years one and two and other key administrators from the six partner institutions. The external evaluator Mary Wright, the Advisory Board members, (W. A. "Bud" Baeslack III, Provost and Executive Vice President, CWRU, Byron C. Clayton, Vice President, NorTech, Melissa Cardenas, Director, Academic Quality Assurance, Ohio Board of Regents (OBOR) and Abigail Stewart, Professor of Psychology and Women's Studies, University of Michigan) and the team coaches also attended the proceedings. The plenary featured a morning keynote by Brenda Manuel, JD, Assistant Administrator for Diversity and Equal Opportunity, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and a luncheon keynote by Eric D. Fingerhut, JD, Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. The agenda, overall attendance and evaluation report are provided in Appendix 1B.