

Annual Report 2004-2005

PARTICIPANTS

The URI ADVANCE program is finishing its second year in August 2005, under the direction of Lead PI Janett Trubatch, Vice Provost for Research, Outreach, and Graduate Studies, and the ADVANCE Leadership Team, who currently include:

- Joan Peckham, Professor of Computer Science, co-PI.
- Karen Wishner, Professor of Oceanography, co-PI.
- Lisa Harlow, Professor of Psychology, co-PI.
- Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Professor of Electrical Engineering
- Cathy Roheim, Professor of the Environment & Natural Resources Science
- Helen Mederer, Professor and Chair of Sociology
- Lynn Pasquerella, Associate Dean, Graduate School
- Judith Swift, Interim Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
- Nancy Neff, Scientific Research Grant Assistant

Harry Knickle, Professor of Chemical Engineering, and Kate Webster, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Psychology, resigned from the team, due to other commitments. Barbara Silver, Assistant Research Professor, Psychology, serves as Program Director. Additional office staff include Molly Hedrick, Psychology doctoral candidate, Amy Woodard, Physical Therapy master's candidate, and Laura Gostin, Communications Studies master's candidate.

The committee structure, including additional committee members, is shown below:

Evaluation Committee	<u>Lisa Harlow, coordinator</u> Lisa Bowleg Barb Silver Molly Hedrick Amy Woodard
Recruitment Committee	<u>Lynn Pasquerella, coordinator</u> Judith Swift Janett Trubatch Barb Silver
Faculty Development & Support Committee	<u>Joan Peckham, coordinator</u> Karen Wishner Faye Boudreaux-Bartels Cathy Roheim Lisa DiPippo Nancy Neff Molly Hedrick Laura Gostin

Work-Life-Family Committee	<u>Helen Mederer, coordinator</u> Laura Beauvais Lisa Bowleg Molly Hedrick Bobbi Koppel Barbara Sullivan Barb Silver
Climate Committee	<u>Barb Silver, chair</u> Janett Trubatch Helen Mederer Faye Boudreaux-Bartels Laura Beauvais Lynn Pasquerella Judith Swift Amy Woodard

Partnerships

An independent organizational change consulting firm, Pro-Change, Inc., based in Kingston, Rhode Island, is currently developing their analyses of the data collected within the ADVANCE Work Environment Survey. These data will be used to validate an attitude scale to statistically measure attitude change toward the inclusion of underrepresented groups as doctoral students and in the professorate of STEM departments. In the fall, Pro-Change will advise ADVANCE as to appropriate intervention strategies that integrate stage-of-change with cognitive, affective and behavioral processes that facilitate change. Information about stage change transitions along with numerical data collected in Year 5 will indicate whether and how successful the program has been in affecting institutional change.

We have continued to work with an outside organizational change consultant, Barbara Sloan of Sloan Dialogs, LLC, who has facilitated additional climate change workshops using the Appreciative Inquiry model, also described below.

We are currently exploring a partnership with Raytheon Corporation to establish initiatives that address pipeline issues, and to increase the numbers of STEM women in industry.

Collaborators

ADVANCE continues to collaborate with university colleges and the Provost's office. In addition, we have co-sponsored events with the Research Office, and retain a seat on the President's Commission on the Status of Women, through which many of our efforts are channeled. Our goal is to institutionalize many of our efforts through this collaboration.

SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITIES & FINDINGS

We have modified the headings and the wording of the fifth goal of the ADVANCE program. They now are:

1. Evaluation: To develop and share a comprehensive understanding of the status of women STEM faculty.
2. Recruitment: To increase the number of ranked women STEM faculty
3. Faculty Development and Support: To advance the careers of all women faculty, especially STEM faculty.
4. Work-Life-Family: To improve the available networks of support for all women faculty, especially STEM faculty

5. Climate Change: In collaboration with administrators and other university leaders, plan and implement organizational climate change efforts.

I. Evaluation

Evaluation Activities

Climate Survey.

As part of an NSF ADVANCE grant to the University of Rhode Island, we constructed an 11-page survey to assess academic work environment for faculty. The survey was adapted from other Advance surveys (e.g., University of Michigan, and Utah State University) with emphasis on assessing multiple aspects of the climate and focusing on the transtheoretical model of change (e.g., Prochaska, Norcross, & DiClemente, 1994; Prochaska, Prochaska, & Levesque, 2001).

We distributed the survey to approximately 700 faculty, including those from science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) and non-STEM disciplines. STEM disciplines included: all 6 departments from the College of Engineering (CoE); 7 College of the Environment & Life Sciences (CELS) departments; all faculty (about 60) from the Graduate School of Oceanography (GSO); and 7 College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) departments. Non-STEM disciplines included: the College of Business Administration (CBA); the college of Nursing (NUR); the College of Pharmacy (CPH); the Graduate School of Library Science (GSLIS); and 24 departments from the CAS that were not related to STEM areas.

Of the approximately 700 faculty who received a survey, 271 (39%) returned a completed survey. The survey assessed 15 major constructs (e.g., Demographics, Job/Tenure Issues, Climate, Career Attitudes, Interpersonal/Work Issues, Spouse/Partner Issues, Work and Gender Issues, Research Productivity, Teaching Contributions, Service Contributions, Resources Satisfaction, Recognition, Stage of Readiness to Advance Women, Self-Efficacy for Advancing Women, and Decisional Balance for Advancing Women) on which we conducted up to five sets of analyses.

Analysis Plan. First, we conducted descriptive statistics on the first 2 constructs (Demographics and Job/Tenure Issues). These consisted largely of percentages for categorical data describing the nature of our faculty and their job status.

Second, we conducted psychometric analyses that assessed factor structure and reliability for the next 10 major constructs. These analyses demonstrated that we are analyzing cohesive and reliable measures of work-life and climate issues.

Third, we assessed possible group differences for these same 10 major constructs, by gender, college, and discipline (STEM vs. Non-Stem). These analyses investigated whether there were significant differences between groups (i.e., gender; college; and discipline) on the 10 major constructs assessing work-life and climate issues.

Fourth, we constructed charts for some of the specific findings from most of the major constructs. These consisted of bar graphs that highlighted significant findings for specific items within the 10 major constructs.

Finally, we analyzed data from the last 3 constructs (i.e., Stage of Readiness to Advance Women, Self-Efficacy for Advancing Women, and Decisional Balance for Advancing Women) that were derived from the Transtheoretical Model. Findings are presented in the appropriate section, organized by construct.

Benchmark Data.

This report contains information reported during AY 2004-2005, with the percent change indicated from the original baseline report from July 2004. It should be noted that since last year, the Department of Biomedical Sciences within the College of Pharmacy has been added to the targeted ADVANCE departments and will be reported in this year's report. Data for this year's report was acquired through the colleges and/or departments reporting any changes from last year's baseline data.

Evaluation Findings

CLIMATE SURVEY FINDINGS

Each of the 15 major constructs in the survey is briefly described, below, with results from any descriptive and group difference statistics. For multiple item constructs, we present internal consistency reliability (i.e., coefficient alpha) where values greater than or equal to .0.70 are indicative of consistent and reliable constructs within this population.

1. Demographics

A total of 118 female and 144 male faculty members responded to our survey. Nine individuals did not identify their sex. 137 faculty members from science, technology and math (STEM) fields responded (35 females and 101 males) and 120 from Non-STEM fields responded (76 females and 40 males). No academic field was provided for 20 of the respondents. This response rate represents approximately 39% of the total URI faculty. The response rate for female faculty was approximately 41.5%, whereas the response rate was approximately 32% for males. Although slightly fewer women completed the survey than men, the proportion of women in the university is less than that for men. Thus, proportionately more women than men completed the survey, with the net result showing relatively equal numbers of women and men respondents.

The average age of male respondents was 53.22 and the average age of female respondents was 48.60. The average number of children for female faculty was .94 and the average number of children for male faculty was 1.43. Thus, women faculty are not having as many children as are men faculty.

The ethnic composition of our sample reflects 80.9% of respondents identifying as White or Caucasian, 5.1% Asian, 4.7% as multiracial, 2.2 as Native American, 2.2% as Hispanic, 2.2% as Black or African American, and 2.5% as other. Of the total number of respondents, 93.7% indicated that they are U.S. Citizens, whereas 6.3% reported that they are not U.S. Citizens. Thus, the total sample is fairly homogeneous with relatively few non-Caucasians and non-US citizens.

2. Job/Tenure Issues

Of the total respondents, 23.4% identified themselves as assistant professors (8.4% male, 16.4% female), 17.3% as Associate Professors (6.5% male, 11.8% female), and 51.3% as Full Professors (39% male, 13.9% female). Female respondents have been at URI an average of 11.95 years, whereas male respondents have been at URI an average of 19.96 years. The overall average number of years that faculty respondents have been at URI is 16.67.

Overall it took survey respondents an average of 4.79 years to receive tenure (M for females = 5.00, M for males = 4.77). There was no significant difference in the amount of time that it took male versus female faculty to reach tenure, $F(1,167)=.375, p>.05$). When asked if their department allowed them to stop the tenure clock, 31% of respondents said yes, 4% said no and 65% indicated that they did not know. This confusion over stopping the tenure clock was also seen within departments as some faculty in the same department responded that they were able to stop the clock and some said they were not able to stop the clock. Very few URI faculty respondents reported stopping the tenure clock. Only 12 respondents (4%) indicated that they have ever stopped the tenure clock. Of those respondents that have stopped the tenure clock, the most frequent reason cited was for childbirth or dependent care duties. Five percent of respondents indicated that they chose not to stop the tenure clock even though they were entitled to do so.

Qualitative comments related to not stopping the tenure clock centered around childbirth, adoption and maternity leave and the decision nonetheless not to stop the tenure clock even though it might have been an option. One respondent stated that she didn't know if she could stop the tenure clock for a family crisis. This suggests that there is not enough information regarding tenure clock stoppage; a few people mentioned that dean/colleagues mentioned that tenure clock stoppage was an option for child birth, but this information does not seem to be widely distributed as the majority of respondents indicated that they did not know whether or not they could stop the clock. Other reasons need to be publicized, e.g., family crisis.

In terms of perceived level of supportiveness if a faculty were to stop the tenure clock, 58.5% of female respondents

and 67% of male respondents indicated that their department would be either extremely or very supportive in facilitating this choice. There was no significant difference between perceived supportiveness of tenure clock stoppage between males and females ($F(1,91)=.67, p>.05$), although the mean supportiveness for females was slightly less than for males (mean females=3.71, males, 3.71). Of relevance here is discussion by Virginia Valian that small differences can add up over time to significant differences and/or inequities. Thus, tenure support should be examined more closely across gender groups to ensure equitable encouragement towards success.

3. Climate

This construct was measured by 4 multiple-item scales. Higher scores for the first 3 scales indicated a more positive climate. Higher scores for the fourth scale indicate greater discrimination and thus a more negative climate. The first scale, *Overall Work Environment*, consisted of 10 highly reliable items (i.e., coefficient alpha = .93). Faculty were asked to rate the nature of their work environment in 10 bipolar areas, e.g., from 1=Hostile to 5=Friendly, from 1=Disrespectful to 5=Respectful, and from 1=Sexist to 5=Non-Sexist. The second climate scale, *Gender Equity*, was assessed with 8 highly reliable items (i.e., coefficient alpha = .87) on a 5-point scale (from 1 to 5=Strongly agree). Sample items include: "There is equal access for both men and women to lab/research space," "The environment promotes adequate collegial opportunities for women," and "Sex discrimination is a big problem in my department." The latter item, which was negatively worded, was reverse-scored to be consistent with a high score indicating a positive (equitable) climate. The third Climate scale, *Department Leadership*, was measured by 13 very reliable items (i.e., coefficient alpha = .96). Faculty were asked to rate (from 1=Below Average, to 4=Superior) their department leader on such areas as "Maintains high academic standards," "Is an effective administrator," and "Creates a cooperative and supportive environment."

The fourth Climate scale assessed *Perceived Discrimination*. Respondents were asked to indicate job-related discrimination practices that they had personally either perceived or experienced at URI in the last 5 years. This included discrimination based on race or ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, physical disability, and religious affiliation across areas that affected their career including hiring, promotion, salary, resource allocations, access to administrative staff and graduate student or resident fellow assignments.

In terms of racial discrimination 3% of respondents indicated that they had perceived or experienced racial discrimination based on promotion and hiring decisions and 1% indicated racial discrimination based on salary, resource allocations, access to administrative staff, and graduate student or resident fellow assignments.

With respect to gender discrimination, in the past 5 years 5% of respondents indicated perceiving and/or experiencing gender discrimination based on hiring, 7.5% indicated discrimination based on promotion, 13% based on salary, 9% based on resource allocations, 5% based on access to administrative staff, and 4% based on graduate student or resident fellows.

Regarding discrimination related to sexual orientation, physical disability, and religious affiliations approximately 1% of respondents indicated perceived or experienced discrimination based on hiring, promotion, salary, resource allocations, access to administrative staff and graduate student or resident fellow assignments. Between 1 and 5% of respondents indicated other forms of discrimination across these areas that affect careers.

Qualitative comments indicated discrimination based on age, academic field (with some fields receiving more salary, space and equipment), mental health, weight, social class, level of education, professional rank (in terms of access to administrative staff) and childbirth. Other areas that this discrimination was found include in general conversation as well as in decisions regarding tenure, dual career partner placement, sabbatical leave, health care benefits, committee appointment, and carry-over funds between grants.

Respondents were also asked to indicate any instances of job related discrimination against others in the last two years based on race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, physical disability, and religious affiliation. 48% of respondents indicated that they had not perceived any job related discrimination against others in the past two years. Job related discrimination against others was perceived due to race/ethnicity in 10% of respondents; due to gender in 13% of the respondents, due to sexual orientation in 5% of respondents; due to physical disability in 4% of

respondents; and due to religious affiliation in 2% of the respondents.

As a measure of an overall discriminatory incident index, a sum of discriminatory incidents was computed based on the number of incidents personally perceived and experienced and whether or not discrimination was perceived against others. Approximately 66% of female respondents indicated experiencing or perceiving some form of discrimination, whereas only 31% of male respondents reported some form of discriminatory incident. Female faculty reported significantly more incidents of discrimination than did male faculty, $F(1,120) = 7.07, p < .05$. Female respondents reported, on average, 3.40 incidents of discrimination in the last 2-5 years. Male respondents indicated, on average, 1.84 incidents of discrimination in the last 2-5 years.

[Discuss group difference MANOVAs, etc for the Climate construct]

4. Career Attitudes

This construct was measured with 2 multiple-item scales. An 11-item scale assessed *Career Satisfaction*, with a reliability coefficient alpha of .83 indicating high internal consistency among these items. These items asked how satisfied (on a 1 to 5 scale with 5=very satisfied) faculty were with such areas as “Opportunity to collaborate with other faculty,” “Level of funding for my research or creative efforts,” and “Sense of being valued as a teacher by my students.” A 7-item scale measured *Career Level of Influence*, which had a reliability coefficient alpha of .81 also indicating high internal consistency. For these items we asked how much influence (from 1 to 5 with 5=tremendous influence) faculty felt they had regarding such issues as “Department curriculum decisions,” “Obtaining money for travel to professional meetings,” and “Determining who gets tenure.”

Analyses of group difference MANOVAs, etc., for the Career Attitudes construct are underway.

5. Interpersonal/Work Issues

This construct was assessed with 3 multiple-item scales. *Mentoring Satisfaction* was measured with 6 items, evincing very high internal consistency with a reliability coefficient alpha of .93. These 6 items asked how satisfied faculty were (from 1 to 5, with 5=very satisfied) on such mentoring they received such as: “[Mentor] Served as a role model,” “[Mentor] Advised about promotions,” and “[Mentor] Advised about finding resources.” *Collegiality* was measured with 12 highly reliable items (i.e., coefficient alpha = .89). Faculty were asked to rate items on a 5-point scale (ranging from 1 to 5=strongly agree), such as “My colleagues value my research interests,” “My colleagues expect me to represent ‘the point of view’ of my gender,” and “My colleagues solicit my opinion about important matters in the department.” Negatively worded items (e.g., ‘the point of view’ item) were reverse-scored such that a high score indicated greater collegiality for a faculty. A third 8-item measure of Interpersonal/Work Issues assessed *Career and Personal Life* with moderate reliability (i.e., coefficient alpha was .77). Faculty were asked to rate how often (from 1=Never to 5=Very Often) they had to balance concerns such as “Your work helped you to do a good job at home,” “You had more energy to do things with your family or other important people in your life because of your job,” and “You found enough time for your job as well as your family or personal life.” Higher scores on the 3 scales represented greater mentoring satisfaction, perceived collegiality, and balance between job and family.

Analyses of group difference MANOVAs, etc., for the Interpersonal/Work Issues construct are underway.

6. Spouse/Partner Issues

This construct was assessed with 2 single-item scales. The first, *Partner Career Assistance*, asked “How satisfied are you with the university’s help in attempting to find appropriate opportunities for your partner?” with response choices ranging from 1=Not At All Satisfied, to 5=Very Satisfied. The second item, *Partner Career Priority*, asked “Have you ever considered leaving the university to improve career opportunities for your partner?” with response choices ranging from 1=Never Considered, to 5=Highly Considered. Higher scores on these 2 scales suggest greater emphasis on partner’s opportunities, whether at a current or future job.

Analyses of group difference MANOVAs, etc., for the Interpersonal Spouse/Partner Issues construct are underway.

7. Work and Gender Issues

This construct was assessed with 4 single-item scales. The first, *Gender-Separate Roles*, asked “How much do you agree or disagree that it is much better for everyone involved if the man earns the money and the woman takes care of the home and children?” with response choices ranging from 1=Strongly Agree, to 4=Strongly Disagree. The second item, *Mother-Child Relationship*, asks “How much do you agree or disagree that a mother who works outside the home can have just as good a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work?” with response choices ranging from 1=Strongly Disagree, to 4=Strongly Agree. The third item, *Delay Having Children*, asked “Regardless of gender, did/will you consider delaying having children because of your appointment at the university?” The fourth item, *Not Have Children*, asked “Regardless of gender, did/are you considering not having children at all because of your appointment at the university?” The third and fourth items offered the same response choices ranging from 1=Very Much Considered, to 5=Not at All Considered.

Analyses of group difference MANOVAs, etc., for the Work and Gender Issues construct are underway.

8. Research Productivity

This construct was assessed with 2 single-item scales. The first, *Self-Rating*, asked “How would you rate your overall productivity compared to researchers in your area and at your rank nationwide?” The second item, *Departmental Rating*, asked “How do you think your department views your level of productivity, compared to the department average?” These two items provided response choices ranging from 1=Much Less Productive, to 5=Much More Productive, such that higher scores indicated greater self- and departmentally perceived ratings of an individual’s productivity.

Analyses of group difference MANOVAs, etc for the Research Productivity construct are underway.

9. Teaching Contributions

Description and analyses of group difference MANOVAs, etc for Teaching Contributions construct are underway.

10. Service Contributions

This construct was measured with 4 single item scales. The first, *Committee Membership*, asked “In a typical year, how many committees do you serve on? _____” The second item, *Committee Leadership*, asked “How many committees do you chair? _____” The third item, *Committee Volunteering*, asked “In the past 5 years, how many committees have you volunteered to serve on? _____” The fourth item, *Committee Requests*, asked “How many committees were you asked to serve on? _____” For each of these 4 items, participants were asked to fill in a number where higher values indicate greater service contributions.

Analyses of group difference MANOVAs, etc., for the Service Contributions construct are underway, as well as for the following:

11. Resource Satisfaction

12. Recognition

13. Stage of Readiness to Advance Women

14. Self-Efficacy for Advancing Women

15. Decisional Balance for Advancing Women

BENCHMARK FINDINGS

The following benchmarks are being tabulated and will be presented in the next interim report.

1. Number and Percent of Women Faculty in Science/ Engineering by Department
2. Number and Percent of Women in Tenure-Line Positions by Rank and Department
3. Promotion Outcomes in STEM Fields by Gender
4. Years in Rank in STEM Fields by Gender
5. Time at Institution and Attrition by Gender for STEM Faculty
6. Number of Women in STEM who are in Non-Tenure Track Positions
7. Number and Percent of Women Scientists and Engineers in Administrative Positions

Administrative leadership positions for the purpose of this evaluation were defined as department heads, deans, associate deans, assistant deans, vice provosts, and provosts/vice presidents. Additionally, this year's analysis included directors of academic programs and/or centers, given that many of these are not departments but are programs of study for graduate or undergraduate students. Furthermore, each position was disaggregated into those held by an individual possessing a Masters degree or Ph.D. in STEM fields. Of the 150 administrative positions identified, 49 were held by women (32.7%). There have been no changes since last year's report in the administration at the University level. At the department level, there has been a decrease in both the number of female department chairs at the University, and in the STEM departments. It should be noted that several departments have been added to the analysis this year creating a larger sample. However, it remains that the number of females has decreased from 16 chairs in the baseline year to 14 this year, and from 4 females in the STEM departments to only 3 females this year.

This is the first year of reporting the data regarding females who hold the position of Program or Center Director. Of the 21 positions identified, 9 were held by females (42.9%). When dissected by STEM discipline, 10 of the 21 director positions were identified as STEM and of these 6 positions were held by females (60%).

It should also be noted that for the purposes of this evaluation, a Masters degree or Ph.D. in a STEM field included all departments identified by the ADVANCE grant and in addition several departments identified as STEM due to the scientific background and experience required for their field. These included: Nursing, Nutrition and Food Science, Pharmacy, and Physical Therapy.

8. Number and Percent of Women STEM Faculty in Endowed/ Named Chairs

This data has not changed since last year. There is one woman with a STEM background (genetics) who is holding an endowed chair position in Women's Studies.

9. Number and Percent of Women STEM Faculty on Promotion and Tenure Committees

At the University of Rhode Island, promotion and tenure decisions are not made by committee. Instead, a process of peer evaluation occurs, offering all faculty the opportunity to review a candidate's file and submit letters of evaluation to the chair, who then writes a recommendation to the dean, as described below in the AAUP contract:

Article 15.7 Process of Department Peer Evaluation. Before preparing his/her written evaluations . . . the department chairperson shall consult with the department faculty by such procedure for peer evaluation as the faculty shall devise through annual department discussion and vote. Methods shall be at the discretion of the department, so long as each faculty member is given the right, without prejudice to any party involved, to abstain from participation . . . No method of department peer evaluation may deny any faculty member the right to submit a written evaluation of any or all faculty which shall be included in the material forwarded to the Dean with the chairperson's written evaluation.

Article 15.8.2 Inclusion of Department Evaluation. In writing his/her evaluations, the department shall give full consideration to all opinions and evaluations obtained by consultation with the department faculty . . .

Agreement between Rhode Island Board of Governors and University of
Rhode Island Chapter American Association of University Professors

10. Salary of STEM Faculty by Gender (controlling for department, rank, years in rank)

Salary data will not be reported this year, as a more thorough analysis of the data is being conducted in collaboration with the Office of the Assistant Provost for the next report as a comparison to the original baseline data reported in year 1.

11. Space Allocation of STEM Faculty by Gender: Baseline and Year 5

Currently, space utilization studies have been completed by the Office of Capital Projects and Facilities Planning for the College of Engineering (COE) and the College of the Environment & Life Sciences (CELS). These studies involved several factors for both colleges, including space inventory, allocation, utilization, quality and suitability. Initially all space was recorded according to square footage, type of space (laboratory, office, classroom), and department which possessed the space. The University Planner was then accompanied by the department chair through all of the spaces to analyze the suitability, quality, and utilization of each space. Upon further investigation, the utilization of each space was determined to be unnecessary and eliminated from further studies. Quality ratings were made on a 5-point scale, with 1 being very poor quality and 5 being highest quality. A score of 5 was given to the most newly constructed building on campus, and a score of 1 meant the space was virtually uninhabitable. Each space was examined for such things as water damage, paint, cleanliness, heat and air conditioning, etc. Suitability ratings looked at the current use of the space versus the function it was designed for. Suitability ratings were made on a 5-point scale, with 1 being a space that is not suitable for its current use and 5 being a space where the use and design matched. For offices, a faculty office in excess of the upper end of the University space standard (120-140 square feet for a faculty office) would be rated a 3 or 4 in suitability, depending on how much larger than 140 square feet it is.

Upon analysis of the space allocation in the COE, females appear to be given more square footage on average than males at each rank. However, the total number of spaces allocated to each gender is greatly biased thus altering the calculated average. In COE, there are a total of 7 spaces that were identified as occupied by females, as opposed to 93 occupied by males, due to the much higher number of male COE faculty, as well as the higher number of shared spaces for females.

The quality and suitability for each space within the departments was averaged by gender. The total average for the COE, showed no difference between quality and suitability of spaces for males and for females (average quality = 3.25, average suitability = 4.2). There were some differences between genders within each department; however there seemed to be no correlation between a higher suitability and a higher quality rating between genders. This indicates males and females appear to be receiving the same quality of space, with the same suitability, in the College of Engineering.

Data for the College of the Environment & Life Sciences should be completed by the end of August 2005 by the Office of Capital Projects and Facilities Planning. A similar analysis of the data will be reported in Year 3 for CELS. Future studies of the remaining colleges at URI, will be undertaken by the ADVANCE office in collaboration with the newly appointed Director of University Planning.

11. Start-up Packages of newly hired STEM Faculty by Gender

A survey was distributed to all STEM faculty hired during AY 2004-2005, to obtain information regarding start-up funding and space accommodations offered to the new faculty. A total of 23 surveys were sent out, with three returned to date.

II. Recruitment

Recruitment Activities

Recruitment Funding. With this fall's cadre of fellows, ADVANCE will have completed its Faculty Fellows program, and will focus on education and training search committees to search effectively with diversity in mind. In addition, we will be pursuing creative ways to encourage the hiring of women. Finally, we will continue to support all new female hires professionally and personally to ensure their successful adjustment at URI.

Search Committee Best Practices. ADVANCE has participated in the Affirmative Action Recruitment Workshops, giving information about appropriate interviewing strategies. Some of the handouts are included as **Attachment 1**.

COE Recruitment and Retention Plan. The Affirmative Action office has required each college to submit a 3-year Minority Recruitment and Retention Plan. ADVANCE has collaborated with the College of Engineering in constructing a model plan, and will be contacting other colleges to offer assistance in the construction and implementation of their plans.

Recruitment Findings

In academic years 2001-2003, women accounted for 29% of new STEM hires. Since the inception of ADVANCE, in academic years 2003-2005, women have accounted for 50% of new STEM hires. (This assumes that 3 of the 4 hires currently under negotiation are successful.) ADVANCE has contributed to the hiring of 7 faculty, with 4 more currently under negotiation. The mechanisms have included our Faculty Fellows Program, start-up contribution offers, and general assistance with the search process to ensure best recruitment practices. The fellows who have been hired include:

- Mayrai Gindy, Department of Civil Engineering (fall 2004)
- Yan Sun, Department of Computer and Electrical Engineering (fall 2004)
- Yana Reshetnyak, Department of Physics (fall 2004)
- Rebecca Brown, Department of Plant Sciences (spring 2005)
- Bethany Jenkins, Department of Cell & Molecular Biology (summer 2005)

Start-up contributions were given toward the hire of Ellen Flannery-Schroeder, Department of Psychology, in the fall 2004. The search committee in the Department of Natural Resources Science was given assistance in the hiring of Laura Myerson in fall 2004. Four candidates in the Graduate School of Oceanography have been made offers for a fall 2005 start date, one of whom is negotiating a dual career placement in a STEM field for her female partner.

III. Faculty Development

Faculty Development Activities

Incentive Fund.

The 9 awardees of the first ADVANCE Incentive Fund round are currently completing their final reports of their funded activities. These reports will be available on our website this summer. The committee conducted its second round of proposal evaluations this spring, again planning to award \$40,000 to the best candidates submitting proposals that promote the careers of women faculty in STEM. The Incentive Fund proposal committee remains the same as last year, including a member from each of the 4 colleges:

- Joan Peckham, CAS
- Karen Wishner, GSO
- Cathy Roheim, CELS
- Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, EGR

A proposal announcement was disseminated by email and by hard copy to the entire URI faculty in December 2004. The full announcement can be found on our website (www.uri.edu/advance). Review of proposals began in late February and awards were announced on March 21, 2005.

Topical Lunch Series. The highly successful topical lunch series continued through the second year. The lunches covered a variety of topics, and were facilitated by both speakers from URI and guest speakers. Full descriptions of each lunch topic can be found on our website (www.uri.edu/advance). Briefly, the topics included:

- ADVANCE One Year Later: Looking Back, Looking Ahead (Sept. 2004)
- Discussion of Virginia Valian's "Why So Slow" (Oct. 2004)
- Lunch with Virginia Valian, author of "Why So Slow: The Advancement of Women" (Nov. 2005)
- The Family-Friendly Workplace: A Conversation with Helen Mederer (Dec. 2005)
- Holiday Lunch Celebration with ADVANCE (Dec. 2004)
- Publishing a Paper - Secrets Revealed! (Feb. 2005)
- Dual Career Couples at URI - Navigating the System and Policy Update (March 2005)
- Women of Wisdom: Strategies for Senior Women Faculty (April 2005)

Career Workshops. This year, ADVANCE has collaborated with the URI Research Office in sponsoring a series of research workshops, which will continue in the future. They are geared toward junior faculty, and include a panel of experts and discussion. They have so far have included:

- Securing Funding (May 2005)
- Collaborative Proposals (May 2005)
- Grant-Funding Workshop (Dec. 2004)

The all-day "Grant-Funding" workshop included 3 separate sessions: Finding Funding, Writing Grants, and Preparing a Budget. The 2.5-hour "Securing Funding" workshop covered how to find the right sponsor, how to present an idea, how to write a proposal, and how it will be evaluated. Panelists included Peter August, Professor of Landscape Ecology and the Director of the URI Coastal Institute, Nancy Fey-Yensan, Associate Professor of Nutrition & Food Sciences, and Gail Scowcroft, Manager, Marine & Environmental Education. The "Collaborative Proposals" 2.5 hour workshop was held to help attendees learn how to initiate, fund and operate a collaborative research endeavor. Panelists included Phil Clark, Professor of Gerontology, Mark Wood, Associate Professor of Psychology, and David Rowley, Assistant Professor of Biomedical and Pharmaceutical Sciences. All have worked extensively on externally funded, multidisciplinary projects.

ADVANCE also sponsored 2 independently run workshops, each running for 2 to 2.5 hours and offering refreshments. The Negotiations Workshop in September 2004 was facilitated by faculty members who have experience in negotiations training: Donna Meyer, Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, and Laura Beauvais. The workshop focused on negotiations for women. It followed a panel format, with role plays and discussion.

The Mentoring Workshop was also very well attended and included women and men faculty from the STEM disciplines. It was facilitated by Bette Erickson, from the Instructional Development Program at URI, and included a panel of six: three experienced mentors, and three new faculty mentees. Following the panel presentation, the audience participated in small group discussions over specific mentoring scenarios. The workshop ended with the participants generating a best practices list for mentors. More information for both workshops can be found on our website.

Workshops planned for the 2005-2006 academic year include Post-Award Grant Management at URI, and a Teacher Training workshop for STEM faculty. Also, the Negotiations workshop will likely be repeated, due to popular demand. Finally, a formal Mentor Training Program is being developed for fall 2005.

Faculty Development Findings

Incentive Fund.

Nine proposals were received, and 7 were awarded funding, for a total of \$40,000. All were awarded to female assistant professors, two of whom are ADVANCE fellows. One other was a collaboration with a senior male professor. The range of awards was from \$2,300 to \$9,000. As in Year 1, funding was requested primarily for summer re-contracting, graduate student assistance, travel funds, software and equipment. Monies were awarded to:

1. Araceli Medina Bonifant, Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics. Title: *Dynamics of Self-Maps of Complex Projective Spaces*
2. Rebecca Nelson Brown, Assistant Professor, Department of Plant Sciences. Title: *Successful Networking as a Tool for Success - A Proposal*
3. Mayrai Gindy, Assistant Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering. Title: *Integration of GIS and Infrastructure Sensing Technologies for Bridge Condition Assessment and Management - A Developmental Study*
4. Donna Meyer, Assistant Professor, Mechanical Engineering and Applied Mechanics. Title: *Development of a Proposal for Research on Biosensors for Detection of Contaminants in Rhode Island Waters*
5. Yana Reshetnyak, Assistant Professor, Department of Physics. Title: *Design and Construction of the Spectrograph Imager for Protein Folding Studies*
6. Carol Thornber, Assistant Professor, Department of Biological Sciences, and Scott Nixon, Professor, Graduate School of Oceanography. Title: *Measuring the Contribution of Natural and Anthropogenic Nitrogen to Macroalgal Blooms in Narragansett Bay Using a Stable Isotope Bioassay*
7. Mirang Yoon, Assistant Professor, Department of Physics. Title: *Quantification of the Effect of Strain on the Stability of Nanoscale Facets*

Topical Lunch Series

All lunches were well-received and well-attended, with between 18 and 30 attendees per lunch, with the exception of the Valian book discussion. Attendees were primarily new women science faculty, but also included graduate students in STEM, senior faculty and members of the ADVANCE Leadership Team.

Workshops

There were 16-20 attendees at each workshop, primarily consisting of assistant professors and graduate students. For the research workshops, on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being poor and 5 being excellent, on average attendees rated the workshops **4.29**. Specific evaluations included:

- Was the workshop a helpful match to your research and grant funding needs? **4.21**
- Was the material relevant to you and your work and will it be useful? **4.14**
- How would you rate the panelists in their knowledge, preparedness and presentation? **4.71**

Positive representative comments included:

- “As I am in the beginning stages of learning the grant writing process, there were great tips and information.”
- “I am a newcomer to the whole grant writing game and this was very helpful as a primer for me.”
- “Good/excellent tips on what to do/not to do.”
- “I intend to more regularly check the granting agency websites and work on developing relationships here in RI.”
- Definitely would recommend. I think the 3 co-leaders of the workshop provided a diverse yet complementary overview of the topic.”
- “Good speaker diversity. Speakers were very enthusiastic and presentations were well planned and informative.”
- “Motivational!”

Suggestions for improvement included:

- Much of the information was advice I’d heard before. More emphasis on how to get the smaller grants and how to find others to collaborate with would be useful to those of us starting out.”
- “Give some special workshop for graduate students.”
- “Might have been a bit better if the 3 panelists had more of a discussion amongst themselves bouncing ideas around.”
- “Provide outlines from each presentation. Make the slides available online.”
- “More examples of outreach projects.”

IV. Work-Life-Family

Work-Life-Family Activities

Philosophical Framework. The ADVANCE Work-Life-Family Committee is currently constructing a philosophical framework, which will frame all future policy development and implementation efforts. It will be completed this summer and will be available on our website.

Family Leave Policy. The Family Leave Policy for faculty that was revised last year by ADVANCE in collaboration with the President's Commission on the Status of Women (PCOSW) was approved by the Rhode Island Board of Governors in January 2005. It is available on our website (www.uri.edu/advance). Although the 6 weeks of paid parental leave was included, various other aspects of the policy were not included in the AAUP contract in their entirety, and we will be working on revising that for the next set of contract negotiations. The policy as written by ADVANCE is being disseminated to all faculty in pamphlet form this summer.

Dual Career Policy. The Dual Career subcommittee consisted of:

- Barb Silver, ADVANCE
- Molly Hedrick, ADVANCE and PCOSW
- Helen Mederer, ADVANCE and PCOSW
- Lisa Bowleg, Psychology
- Bobbi Koppel, Career Services
- Barbara Sullivan, Graduate School of Oceanography
- Roxanne Gomes, Affirmative Action
- Laura Kenerson, Human Resources
- Laura Gostin, ADVANCE

The Dual Career Subcommittee divided into 2 groups, a Research Group and a Policy Group. Using data on best practices at other universities, ADVANCE climate survey results, and dual-career interviews conducted by ADVANCE, the Research Group developed a set of general recommendations that guided the policy development. Preliminary results of this research were present at the Association for Women in Psychology National Conference in February. After receiving input from an informal meeting with several Deans, ADVANCE, Human Resources, and Affirmative Action, the Policy Group developed a draft policy that is inclusive of both faculty and staff. This draft eliminated features requiring expenditure of funds, but clearly stipulates ongoing and future efforts that will require funding. This was presented to the Council of Deans in April. It was agreed there that it was a good first step toward the creation of an effective policy. This draft has been endorsed by AAUP, HR, and AA, and will be presented next to the President's Committee, the PCOSW, and then the Faculty Senate. Following this, the draft will go to the President for approval. We anticipate these events happening this summer. The draft can be found as **Attachment 2**.

Work-Life-Family Virtual Office. A website is currently being developed that will serve as an integrated resource for all issues and questions related to the balance of work and life/family. The hope is to transform this virtual office into a physical space, perhaps taking over the space ADVANCE presently occupies when the grant ends.

Work-Life-Family Findings

Family Leave Policy. The first person to use the new policy was a male Psychology Assistant Professor. Anecdotally, there are an unusually high number of pregnancies currently in STEM departments, and conversation about use of family leave and work-family balance is more apparent and more relaxed. For example, while only 4 years ago there were only 2 female Engineering faculty, there are now 8, 3 of whom are pregnant and thriving professionally. ADVANCE will be developing a measure to assess the use and perceptions about the new policy in Year 3.

Dual Career Interviews. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 14 faculty and chairs regarding dual career issues. Results are currently being compiled and integrated with the Academic Work Environment Survey findings on dual career issues. Preliminary interview results can be found in a PowerPoint presentation on our website under the Work-Life Support link.

V. Climate Change

Climate Change Activities

On November 5, 2004 Virginia Valian visited URI. She met with chairs and deans of the 4 STEM colleges, the President and Provost for a 2-hour breakfast presentation. Following this, Valian met with a group of graduate students, and then spoke during an ADVANCE Topical Lunch. She gave a keynote address in the afternoon to the general university public. Approximately 80 people attended. Prior to this presentation, some preliminary Academic Work Environment Survey results were presented by ADVANCE.

ADVANCE is considering a 3-tier plan to reach all constituencies in promoting effective climate change. These include the faculty level, the department chair level, and the college administration level.

1. Department climate workshops. These have occurred in 10 STEM departments to date, including 4 follow-up sessions. They are mapped out in **Attachment 3**. During these 3-hour workshops, as described in a previous report, faculty explore ways to promote an excellent working environment in their departments, and develop an action plan. Goals that departments have identified have included:
 - Plan for people to get together to decrease isolation
 - Increase communication and collaboration within the department
 - Create a positive and constructive review process
 - Encourage active recognition
 - Connect with the rest of the university by bringing in outside speakers
 - Protect junior faculty from department politics
 - Celebrate how well we do with the resources we have
 - Communicate with the administration better

During follow-up workshops, departments meet for 1.5 hours to review the goals set in the first session and to develop action plans with specific steps, responsible persons, and timelines. A sample summary and action plan worksheet can be found as **Attachment 4**.

2. Leadership Training for Chairs. ADVANCE believes that leadership training workshops can be a valuable mechanism for improving the effectiveness and satisfaction of chairs at URI, who often complain of isolation and lack of training for assuming the role of chair. ADVANCE is partnering with the Provost's office in designing monthly leadership workshops for chairs and emerging leaders. Modeled after the University of Washington workshop series, chairs will gather for 1.5 hours monthly to discuss a topic identified by the chairs in an initial orientation meeting in the fall 2005. Topics may include:
 - Working with your college dean
 - Diversity and excellence: recruitment and retention of faculty
 - Dual career hires, family leave, and tenure clock extensions
 - Mentoring faculty through their careers
 - Building consensus among your faculty
 - Communication: what they didn't teach you in chair school
 - Development and your department
 - Search committees and recruitment
 - Department cultural change
 - Getting to "win-win" with faculty and administrators
 - Facilitating transitions in faculty careers

3. College Diversity Committees. Due to challenges in the College of Engineering that directly related to work climate, the college created a Diversity Committee in 2000. This committee oversees diversity efforts in the college, including promoting a diverse student and faculty population, study student retention profiles, and awarding funding to those who propose initiatives that promote diversity in COE. ADVANCE is working with the COE to define an expanded role for the committee that includes the promotion of:

- effective mentoring of junior faculty

- collaborations with junior faculty
- social & professional networking
- inclusion of diversity language in mission statements, websites, etc.
- effective education for search committees to ensure that best practices are used
- data collection and climate assessment
- effective implementation of the COE Minority Recruitment and Retention Plan
- awareness about activities/information that relate to diversity
- using the committee as a resource by faculty members or students who have concerns regarding a diversity or climate issue.

Following implementation of this plan, ADVANCE will use the COE Diversity Committee model and offer assistance to other STEM colleges in establishing their own committees.

4. **Advisory Council.** The Advisory Council is being compiled and is scheduled to meet at the end of the summer. It's purpose is to advise ADVANCE about sustainability, and how our initiatives can have a broader impact at URI and around Rhode Island. It is to be comprised of faculty and administrators from URI, as well as influential people from Rhode Island who can offer connections to government, industry, educational, and financial resources.

Climate Change Findings

Recent climate workshops have been evaluated as favorably as the initial workshops last year. Departments have developed action plans and are at various stages of implementation. Overall evaluations will occur in Year 3. Several other departments have requested workshops, providing evidence that the initial resistance encountered has been replaced due to the positive reports by workshop attendees.

TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

No additional information at this time.

OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

ADVANCE is currently investigating a partnership with Raytheon to develop initiatives that reach women in other institutions, in industry, and girls in school.

PUBLICATIONS AND PRODUCTS

Conference Presentations:

Hedrick, M., & B. Silver. *Dual career couples at URI*. Association for Women in Psychology, Tampa, FL. March 2005.

Silver, B., & Mauriello, L. *Climate change at URI*. Association for Women in Psychology, March 2005.

Wishner, K, Silver, B., Boudreaux-Bartels, F., Harlow, L. Knickle H., Mederer, H., Peckham, J, Roheim, C., Trubatch, J., and Webster, K. (2004) *Strategies for success of women faculty in science: The ADVANCE program at the University of Rhode Island*, EOS Trans. AGU, 85 (47), Fall Meet. Suppl., Abstract ED23B-0094.

CONTRIBUTIONS

No additional information at this time.



A Diverse Faculty – Who Cares?

***Diversifying science & engineering faculty to include
more women & minorities will:***

Improve Faculty Retention

- *Improved working climate with a more diverse faculty, less isolation*
- *Faculty attrition is very expensive*

Attract and Retain Students

- *Role modeling & mentoring for women & minority students*
- *Varied teaching methods to reach a variety of learners*

Improve Ability for Outside Funding

- *Contributing to “broader impact” and diversity requirements of funding agencies*

Improve Competition with Other Universities and Industry

- *Leading universities and corporations have proactive hiring policies for women/minorities*
- *Offer URI as a “great place to work”*

Expand Areas of Research

- *New questions, new methodologies, new perspectives*
- *Better connection with the “customer” base*

Increase Productivity

- *Heterogeneous teams offer improved problem-solving, creativity, & innovation*

More Effectively Utilize a Changing Workforce

- *Opportunity cost of ignoring the increasing pool of highly qualified women & minorities*



Hiring Women & Minorities

A Few Tips

- Diversify the search committee. Members should represent a variety of backgrounds, and should include women/minorities. At least one member should have taken the URI Affirmative Action Search Workshop.
- Generate the hiring pool, don't just tap it: Misperception that because applicant pool has few women and/or minorities, that they don't exist - creative recruiting methods are needed.
- Reduce salience of gender/ethnicity: 25-30% pool should be women/minority; otherwise gender/race characteristics become more salient than qualifications.
- Offer work/life information: Information about work-family policies must be proactively presented – people will often not ask (see *bias avoidance* below). Represent department/area and URI as a supportive, family-friendly place to work.
- Let candidate speak with similar others: Provide opportunity for candidate to speak with similar others outside search committee – i.e., if a woman candidate, set up casual lunch with group of women in similar positions.
- Use wider/multiple criteria to gauge excellence. Those with different backgrounds, non-traditional career paths, etc., may offer different strengths not traditionally valued, and be aware that the same qualifications and experience are often judged differently depending on race/gender.
- Build in formal checkpoints. Regularly through the search process, check to insure evaluation biases are not taking place.
- Open & honest contract negotiation. Consider providing all candidates with a list of things possible to negotiate for in a job contract. Women and minorities often have less mentoring at previous career stages and may be at a disadvantage here.

In addition to the AAEO Office, you may contact ADVANCE for more information about best practices in recruiting:

874-9422 or advance1@etal.uri.edu

Psychological processes that can impact

interview performance and evaluation

Gender schemas

Implicit, socialized ideas about what roles and behaviors are appropriate for a given person based on their gender (or minority status) may cause unfair evaluations

Examples:

- “she’s leaving work to take care of her kids; he’s leaving work to go to another meeting”
- Identical resumes will be rated more positively when a man’s name is attached than a woman’s
- “she’s quiet because she has nothing to say; he’s quiet because he’s thinking.”

Stereotype threat

If a performance stereotype becomes salient to an interviewee, her/his performance may unconsciously conform to that stereotype.

Examples:

- girls will perform better on math tests when taking test with other girls than with both genders
- African Americans will perform worse on aptitude test when told it measures verbal ability
- White “high math achievers” will perform worse on math test when taking it with Asian students

Related: **self-fulfilling prophecy**, in which an interviewee who is unsure about her/his ability to perform well (for example in a nontraditional area), may unconsciously sabotage her/his own behavior. Doesn’t necessarily have to do with stereotypes.

Confirmation bias

Expectations about an interviewee’s performance may cause the evaluator to engage in behaviors that actually elicit those behaviors.

Examples:

- Job candidates will be rated more negatively in an interview by *blind* evaluator when the interviewer has predetermined negative judgment of candidate

Bias avoidance

In order to avoid discriminatory evaluations, interviewees may avoid asking important questions or presenting information, for example about family leave policies, etc.

Examples:

- “babies by stealth” – not telling an interviewer if pregnant, or not taking available family leave
- working 16-hour days to manage both work and home responsibilities

Fundamental attribution error

We are more likely to attribute a person’s behavior to an internal characteristic of the person rather than to outside situational factors.

Examples:

- “he is underperforming because he’s unqualified, not because the interviewer looks disinterested.”
- “she’s late because she’s irresponsible, not because she got stuck at another meeting.”

Attachment 2

DRAFT

Dual Career Program Policy

The University of Rhode Island is committed to building and maintaining a diverse faculty and staff and a family friendly environment. We recognize the importance of supporting dual career partners in attracting and retaining a quality workforce, and of its long-range economic benefit to the University. The University community also recognizes the ways in which dual career partners can enrich the campus culture. Because dual-career partnerships often involve employment needs or opportunities across units, University-level policy is required. Through the Dual Career Partner Program the University of Rhode Island aims to employ and retain highly qualified individuals who make a unique contribution to the overall diversity and family friendly climate at the University. At the same time, we recognize the need to continuously evaluate the impact of the dual career program to maintain balance with the overall goals of diversity in the University.

The Dual Career Policy at the University of Rhode Island is not intended to supercede Affirmative Action, Board of Governors, University policy, or collective bargaining agreement provisions. This policy was initially designed to meet the needs of academic partners. It is nonetheless the intent of this policy to recognize and assist a wide range of university partners. This policy represents an initial attempt to offer as many options as possible for as many employees as possible. Ongoing policy development specific to faculty and staff should continue.

The following guidelines are recommended as a **first step** in an ongoing process of developing a policy that effectively addresses dual career needs at URI for both new and existing employees. As resources become more available, the policy will be re-examined with the intention of including more hiring options.

General Considerations:

To qualify as a dual career partner, applicants must meet the “domestic partner” criteria as defined by state law and referred to in collective bargaining agreements.

Dual Career Program General Guidelines

1. **Advertising.** URI will add a notice of the dual career hiring policy to job advertisements stating that the University of Rhode Island is an EO/AA employer considerate of dual career partners.
2. **Providing Information.** It is against the law for search committees to inquire potential hires about their marital status, but they should provide information regarding the Dual Career Program to all potential hires. All candidates in a job search as well as current University employees have a right to inquire about opportunities and procedures for partner hires. Equal Opportunity policy dictates that such inquiries will not influence hiring or promotion decisions.
3. **Responding to a Request for Academic Positions.** When any candidate or existing employee inquires about employment opportunities for open positions or potential new academic positions at URI for a partner, the following steps should be taken:
 - a. Chair of his or her unit will request a copy of the partner’s curriculum vitae and other relevant materials.
 - b. This information will then be forwarded to the appropriate administrator and department in which the accompanying partner is seeking employment, as well as the Vice Provost’s office. In many cases, this may require coordinating between two or more departments, and the Vice Provost or Human Resources may serve as the coordinator.
 - c. These administrators will collaborate in identifying an appropriate facilitator who will assist the partner in the job search, and ensure that all possible avenues are being explored for the partner.

- d. Requesting departments should contact the Director of Affirmative Action as soon as possible in this process to discuss the feasibility of a specific Dual Career Partner request/waiver (see #5 below) before submitting the paperwork, which includes the Dual Career Partner Program Request form, the vita of the individual under consideration, additional supporting documentation (per search committee leader), and a Request to Fill form.
 - e. An accompanying partner, like any other candidate, must be systematically reviewed by the hiring department. If that department believes the accompanying partner has appropriate credentials and has skills that are compatible with the department's needs and mission (e.g., if a forthcoming position is expected or if a new position is in line with planned program expansion), they may request that the accompanying partner be considered for a search waiver or other placement alternatives (as describe in #6 below).
 - f. The appropriate Dean or Director must sign the Dual Career Partner Hire Request form. The Director of Affirmative Action will forward a recommendation to the Provost, who is responsible for the final review. Various options for placing partners are listed under Guideline #6.
4. Responding to a Request for Non-Academic Positions within the University. Partners of candidates who have received tentative job offers may seek the services of Career Services, Human Resources, the Dean of the candidate's college, the Unit Director and/or Affirmative Action in searching for appropriate employment opportunities on campus. These representatives will be responsible for assisting the partner in identifying, applying for, and interviewing for appropriate campus employment. The following steps should be taken:
- a. The unit head/chair of the initial hires department/unit will request a copy of the partner's curriculum vitae and other relevant materials.
 - b. The unit head/chair will collaborate with Career Services, Human Resources, the Dean of the candidate's college, the Unit Director and/or Affirmative Action in identifying possible avenues for the partner.
 - c. The unit head/chair will collaborate in identifying an appropriate facilitator who will assist the partner in the job search, and ensure that all possible avenues are being explored for the partner.
 - d. An accompanying partner, like any other candidate, must be systematically reviewed by the hiring unit. If that unit believes the accompanying partner has appropriate credentials and has skills that are compatible with the unit's needs and mission, and/or if the partner meets published deadlines for application, they may request that the accompanying partner be considered for an interview or other placement alternatives (as describe in #6 below).
5. Temporary Search Waiver Request. University Policy requires a national or regional search for faculty and professional staff appointments. The URI Dual Career Partner Program is designed for appointments that meet institutional priorities and that require rapid University action. In some cases, the Director of Affirmative Action may grant temporary search waivers upon request based upon the criteria listed below. For staff postings, only external posting waivers may be granted as the University must comply with internal posting requirements as well as with requirements of union contracts. Decisions on request for waivers of search under this policy are made by the Provost in consultation with the Director of Affirmative Action.

Criteria for a waiver of search: Whether or not the request for a waiver of search is granted depends upon the extent to which the hiring of the individual proposed would contribute to the academic excellence, overall productivity, or progress toward the goal of gender equity and diversity of the particular unit and overall university climate.

Additional criteria for evaluating these requests include:

- Does the rationale given for requesting a waiver of search strongly align with the stated guidelines

- and goals of the URI Affirmative Action Office?
- Do the qualifications of the individual proposed satisfy a critical University need?
- Would the hiring of the individual proposed have a strong, positive impact on the University's Strategic Plan and institutional goals?
- Is there consensus within the hiring department/unit for the requested appointment?
- Have department/college/university funds been identified to support the position over time?
- Is there a strong likelihood of future success (e.g., job excellence, promotion and tenure)?

6. Placement Alternatives: Other placement alternatives include the following:

Placement Alternatives for Academic and Non-Academic Partners

- Expedited application for open position. A partner of a finalist in a University search may request an interview for another open University position as long as they meet the published qualifications and as long as the application deadline is met. If a search committee chair receives such a request, Affirmative Action must be contacted.
- Split position. In order to meet the needs of several departments/units, split positions can also be considered. The Vice Provost and/or Human Resources will coordinate these efforts.
- Off-campus employment. Partners of candidates who have received tentative job offers may seek the services of Career Services, Human Resources, the Dean of the candidate's college, and/or Affirmative Action in searching for appropriate employment opportunities off campus. These representatives will be responsible for utilizing their formal and informal contacts to assist the partner in identifying, applying for, and interviewing for appropriate off-campus employment. A designated facilitator should be appointed in these cases, as well, and should be responsible for ensuring the best possible communication between University and community connections.

Additional Placement Alternatives for Academic Partners

- Shared appointment. Faculty partners in the same academic discipline may ask to be considered for a shared appointment. In such cases, the concerned department must determine whether both individuals have appropriate credentials and have the potential to become tenured members of the department. The dean and chair will negotiate the terms arrangements on an individual basis.
- Soft money appointment. Eligible partners may be hired as soft money positions, postdoctoral positions, or other short-term internal payroll positions. These appointments are fully eligible to apply for any tenure-line or more permanent positions that become available.
- Visiting Professor Position. In some situations, a temporary (usually not to exceed one year) Visiting Professor Position may be created in order to either meet the needs of a particular department or offer a specialty area to a department that would otherwise be unavailable. During this temporary Professorship, the academic partner is encouraged to apply for other open job opportunities within and outside the University.
- Lectureships & per course instruction. If no position can be identified, partners who teach may ask to be hired on a per-course basis, or for a lectureship. *It must be emphasized that these options should be considered a temporary, stop-gap measure, and efforts should continue to be made to locate a more permanent option.*

7. While the University of Rhode Island recognizes the value of promoting opportunities for dual career partners, and has established these policies to help secure this value, **IT CANNOT GUARANTEE EMPLOYMENT TO ANYONE SIMPLY ON THE BASIS OF THIS POLICY.**

Dual Career Program Policy

Phased Policy Development

The initial policy is submitted as a **first step** in creating policies and programs that support URI employees. We recognize that phased implementation is reasonable given current budgetary constraints, and suggest that the next phase address the following:

- Funding Request. A Dual Career Funding Pool is available to “seed” or phase in appointments, which are eventually supported through department/unit based budgets. The possibility of “seed” positions depends on availability of funding resources and the match between a specific partner and departmental current or future needs. Funding may be requested for one to three years. A favored model is multi-year assistance where the share of funding is divided between both partners’ departments/units, and the Funding Pool through the Provost’s office, with funding provided by the pool decreasing as the base budget from the hiring department/unit increases.
- Support for soft money positions. The availability of hard money support for soft money researchers should be explored in greater detail. This support would be generated from overhead return. A formal system for providing bridge funding, match funding, and/or base funding, as well as equitable compensation for teaching, should be developed in order to make soft money positions attractive for dual career partners.
- Shared and split appointments. Specific policy guidelines are to be developed in collaboration with Human Resources and Affirmative Action for both faculty and staff.
- Career services “Adults in Transition” representative. Funding will be requested for an additional Career Services representative to assist alumni, dual career partners, and other existing faculty and staff in locating employment outside the University
- Regional network. Funding will be requested to join a regional Academic Career Network and/or the development of an Eastern Regional Network.
- Work-Life Resource Center or representative. The ultimate goal is to create a position and eventually an entire office that deals with a wide range of issues related to family services and work/life balance, and that will serve as a clearinghouse or a bridge to existing services offered campus-wide. This person or office would work closely with Human Resources, or be affiliated with that office. Services would include but would not be limited to: dual career placement, work/life policy information, child and elder care resources, personal and professional educational and support programs/workshops, health and wellbeing, community links, and data collection and employee needs assessments.
- Lectureship/per course instructor pay. Options will be explored for improving the pay and offering some benefits to these employees.
- Policy expansion. Ongoing efforts should be coordinated to meet the needs of the greatest number of faculty and staff. Further policies should be developed to best address the ultimate goal of a University-Wide Dual Career Policy.



Electrical & Computer Engineering Department Workshops

First Meeting Summary: May 13, 2004

1. **Identify Key Elements of a Great Working Environment in ELE and begin planning for future change :**
 - Resources and Support
 - ❑ Initial vision statement: *Identifying adequate resources and support for faculty*
 - ❑ Implementation ideas: call alumni directly, proposals to companies to support grad students, ELE Advisory Board from industry, newsletter, dept. "event/alumni dinner, industry-supported research center & "named" awards, collaborate with administration
 - Improved Communication
 - ❑ Initial vision statement: *Establishing a good social and working environment through increased communication*
 - ❑ Implementation ideas: department meeting to establish a long-term planning committee and determine responsibilities of that committee
 - Social Interaction
 - ❑ Initial vision statement: *Maintaining collegiality and friendliness through increased social interaction*
 - ❑ Implementation ideas: after hours gatherings, monthly departmental lunch
2. **Contextualize Workshop Within ADVANCE Program Goals:** *to promote a working environment where all faculty, in particular women and underrepresented groups, can thrive*

Second Meeting Summary: October 20, 2004

1. Vision Statements:

- Resources & Support: *We are a department that manages existing resources brilliantly and pursues innovative fundraising activities to initiate and sustain excellence in research and teaching, benefiting both non-tenured and tenured faculty*
- Communication & Collegiality: *This department believes it is important to maintain friendliness and collegiality, and to promote communication and collaboration both professionally and socially with all faculty.*

2. Building an Action Plan – see attached worksheets.

Follow-up Steps

1. **Department meet to review action plans:**
 - a. Any progress to date?
 - b. Change or add items?
 - c. Identify priorities, lead people, timelines, and assessment criteria for each
2. **Schedule brief check-in meeting with ADVANCE team:**
 - d. to be sure initiatives don't evaporate
 - e. to identify new areas of concern or accomplishment

Key Elements of a Great Working Environment in

Electrical & Computer Engineering from May 2004 workshop

- Maintaining friendliness and collegiality in the department
- Active support from the chair and the dean for recognition of research, teaching/service
- Representation of department to outside to secure resources for faculty development
- Free lunch, monthly meetings, communication
- Future plan, especially for retiring faculty
- Independence, fund raising, state-funded RAs
- Amateur radio - mentoring
- Administration (above dept. level) who are leaders and resource providers – not micro managers
- Good support/reward structure
- Strong graduate program/technical support personnel
- Good social/work environment

Feedback from October 2004 Follow-up workshop	
Most Valued Aspect	Wishes for ELE
Opportunity to brainstorm with colleagues about important topics Compelling vision statement Getting outside department – no interruptions! Seeing our own handwriting from earlier work Knowing others share same concerns Identified details regarding how to move forward Process is not judgmental; facilitative only	Do it! Implement it!

Electrical Engineering Action Plan Worksheets

We are a department that manages existing resources brilliantly and pursues innovative fundraising activities to initiate and sustain excellence in research and teaching, benefiting both non-tenured and tenured faculty.

Task Name	Who	Resources required	Timeline Checkpoints
-----------	-----	--------------------	----------------------

Major Task Collaborate with college development officer & Dean so they can represent needs/capabilities to others

Activity

Activity

Activity

Activity

Activity

Major Task Celebrate how well we do with the resources we have

Activity

Activity

Activity

Major Task Communicate with administration better (Godi Fisher)

Activity In-state tuition for RAs

Activity generate talking points on benefits to dept, college, university

Activity

Activity

Major Task

Activity

Activity

Activity

This department believes it is important to maintain friendliness and collegiality, and to promote communication and collaboration both professionally and socially with all faculty.

	Task Name	Who	Resources required	Timeline Checkpoints
Major Task	Continue with existing social interactions and create new ones			
Activity	holidays, Alton Jones			
Activity	Reinstitute formal lunches			
Activity	Chair reschedule classes			
Activity	brownbag lunches			
Activity	cycle of senior faculty to host events at homes			
Major Task	Share information about professional activities			
Activity	listserve, webpage, etc.			
Activity				
Activity				
Major Task	Include junior faculty in activities			
Activity	appoint senior faculty as social mentors			
Activity	make proactive efforts to invite jr. faculty to lunch (sr. faculty groups alternate)			
Activity	everyone ID one way each can mentor new faculty (is not just chair's responsibility)			
Activity	offer computer engineering help in mentoring jr. faculty			
Activity				
Major Task				
Activity				
Activity				
Activity				

Attachment 4

