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1. Executive Summary

UC Davis is at the end of the second year of their NSF ADVANCE-IT grant, “UC Davis ADVANCE: Institutional Transformation to Build and Sustain a Diverse Community of Innovative STEM Scholars.” The project seeks to increase the recruitment, retention, and promotion of female STEM ladder-rank faculty, with an emphasis on Latinas.

This external evaluation report covers the period between September 2013 and April 2014 and incorporates both quantitative and qualitative data.

Significant strengths and accomplishments in Year 2 include:
- Evidence of strong support from the upper administration
- Launching of the CAMPOS Recruitment Initiative, development of the STEAD training, and pilot testing of the LAUNCH Mentoring Committees
- Release of the Recruitment Report from the Policies and Practices Committee
- Collection of baseline data to guide program development and assessment
- Dissemination and use of the COACHE findings to facilitate campus dialog among faculty and administrators
- Quality of internal evaluation work and integration of Internal Evaluators with the initiative teams to support evaluation efforts
- Development of an evaluation plan and underlying theory of change

The main challenges occurring in Year 2 included:
- Cross-initiative communication
- Messaging with respect to the CAMPOS Recruitment Initiative
- Long-term planning

The following recommendations (discussed in detail in the report) should be considered to further strengthen project activities and maximize effectiveness:
- Increase engagement with stakeholders
- Clarify roles and review Management Team staffing needs
- Increase and improve communication
  - Cross-initiative, cross-cultural, and initiative-specific
- Expedite social science research and use findings to inform programming
- Define the roles of the Advisory Boards and increase engagement with evaluation
- Work closely with the evaluators to plan for the 3rd Year NSF Site Visit
- Celebrate accomplishments

In conclusion, the UC Davis ADVANCE team has laid a solid foundation upon which to build, but much work lies ahead in Year 3. With successful implementation, UC Davis’ ADVANCE program has the potential for establishing itself as a national leader of institutional transformation strategies that incorporate both gender and cultural diversity, particularly with respect to Latina STEM faculty.
2. UC Davis ADVANCE Overview

UC Davis is completing the second year of its NSF ADVANCE-IT grant, for their project titled “UC Davis ADVANCE: Institutional Transformation to Build and Sustain a Diverse Community of Innovative STEM Scholars.” The project seeks to increase the recruitment, retention, and promotion of female STEM\(^1\) ladder-rank faculty, with an emphasis on Latinas.

The UC Davis ADVANCE grant consists of five initiatives:

1. **Center for the Advancement of Multicultural Perspectives on Science (CAMPOS) Initiative**
   Mission: Support discovery of knowledge by promoting women in science, especially Latina STEM scholars, through an inclusive environment that is diversity driven, mentorship grounded, and career success focused

2. **Inclusive Campus Climate Initiative**
   Mission: Develop and implement culturally-nuanced, evidence-based programs to (a) raise awareness of unconscious and institutional bias (with respect to culture, race/ethnicity, and gender) and (b) generate greater understanding of the ways in which STEM research communities can benefit from the contribution of diversity

3. **Mentorship and Networking Initiative**
   Mission: Provide information, guidance and networking opportunities for research and career success of women in STEM fields through both informal and formal programs

4. **Policies and Practices Review Initiative**
   Mission: Conduct a systematic review of policies and procedures that impact recruitment, retention and career progress of faculty and, when deemed necessary, propose changes to those policies and practices in order to eradicate implicit bias, promote diversity and eliminate inconsistency in implementation

5. **Social Sciences Research Initiative**
   Mission: Conduct integrated empirical studies and on-going data analyses that will:
   a. inform the program activities and interventions aimed at improving the recruitment and retention of Latina and other women STEM faculty at UC Davis
   b. examine the impact of those interventions on the career progress of Latina and other women STEM faculty
   c. accomplish a systematic study of the factors influencing the career paths of Latina scholars from faculty recruitment through mid-career

\(^1\) Unless otherwise noted, the term “STEM” refers to faculty in STEM and SBS.
3. Evaluation Objectives and Methods

3.1 Evaluation Period and Objectives

This evaluation covers the period between September 2013 and April 2014, encompassing the grant’s second year of funding.

Evaluation objectives for this annual report are primarily formative and include:

- Describing implementation activities, successes and challenges
- Monitoring the status of implementation progress toward program goals
- Providing formative feedback to facilitate project refinements
- Enhancing communication among the Leadership Team and other stakeholders
- Establishing baseline measures upon which the impact of program initiatives can be measured

3.2 Structure of Evaluation Responsibilities

Evaluation activities were undertaken by Internal and an External Evaluators.

Dr. Theresa Westover (Director, Center for Education and Evaluation Services) and Dr. Lisa Sullivan (Senior Evaluation Analyst, Center for Education and Evaluation Services) serve as the Internal Evaluators. Key internal evaluation efforts in Year 2 included:

- Helping to develop and provide feedback on the evaluation plan and program logic model
- Attending workshops, meetings (initiative meetings, team meetings, etc.), and other ADVANCE events to observe and share observations with the ADVANCE team and External Evaluator
- Designing, administering, and summarizing findings from ADVANCE event evaluation forms
- Designing, administering, and summarizing findings from surveys of program participants, the ADVANCE team, and other campus stakeholders
- Analyzing data on program participation
- Providing insights and observations to the ADVANCE team and External Evaluator to contribute to program evaluation

Dr. Mariko Chang is the project’s External Evaluator. Dr. Chang has contributed to the evaluation efforts in Year 2 in the following ways:

- Providing feedback on the evaluation plan and program logic model
- Providing feedback on internal evaluation efforts, including surveys and evaluation forms
- Summarizing institution-level baseline data from which program impacts can
be measured
- Conducting a site visit and interviewing key stakeholders to inform the annual evaluation
- Conducting an annual external evaluation to provide formative feedback that utilizes data collected by the Internal Evaluators, External Evaluator, and the project team

3.3 EVALUATION METHODS AND DATA

The evaluation incorporates both quantitative and qualitative data, derived from the following sources:

*Interviews and Focus Groups:* Dr. Chang conducted two site visits in Year 2: October 9, 2013 and March 19-21, 2014, to meet with the project team and other stakeholders. Interviews or focus groups were held with a total of 33 people during the March site visit (or by phone after the visit), representing the following stakeholders: Leadership Team (PI, Co-PIs, Faculty Director), Program Coordinator, Program Assistant, Initiative Co-Directors, Provost, Deans, and STEM women faculty, including a sample of Latina faculty.

*Observation:* During the March site visit, Dr. Chang observed the UC Davis ADVANCE Retreat. Meeting and event observations from the Internal Evaluators were also used to inform the evaluation.

*Event/Training Evaluations:* Evaluation findings from the system-wide Roundtable, “Workplace Climate: Assessments and Interventions to Improve Diversity Among STEM Faculty” (co-sponsored with UCOP ADVANCE PAID) and the Search Committee Trainings offered out of the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs were obtained and/or analyzed by the Internal Evaluators.

*Surveys:* The Internal Evaluators developed online surveys to collect formative feedback from stakeholders. Findings from the following online surveys were provided by the Internal Evaluators: the ADVANCE Women Faculty Reception Survey, ADVANCE Retreat Survey, ADVANCE STEM Chair Survey, ADVANCE Initiative Committee Member Survey. Summaries of these surveys are provided in the Appendices.

*COACHE Survey:* Findings from the UC Davis COACHE Survey of Faculty Job Satisfaction 2012-13 were provided to the External Evaluator.

*Applicant Pool, Interview, and Hire Data:* Data on representation in the faculty recruitment process by gender, race/ethnicity, and rank aggregated from 2008-2013 were provided by the ADVANCE team to the External Evaluator.
Program Documentation: Records of participation (attendance at events, etc.) were kept by the UC Davis ADVANCE team, analyzed by the Internal Evaluators, and findings made available to the External Evaluator.

Institutional Data: Department-level data on STEM/SBS faculty composition (such as the number of faculty by rank and sex) and other ADVANCE Indicators Toolkit data were provided by the UC Davis ADVANCE team.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 CAMPOS (Center for the Advancement of Multicultural Perspectives on Science) Initiative

The mission of the CAMPOS Initiative is to support discovery of knowledge by promoting women in science, especially Latina STEM scholars, through an inclusive environment that is diversity driven, mentorship grounded, and career success focused.

The program elements comprising the CAMPOS Initiative include:

1. Recruitment Initiative
2. Collaborative Research Space and Resources
3. Research Mentorship
4. Speaker Series

4.1.1 Recruitment Initiative

In Year 2, the CAMPOS Director (Dr. Mary Lou de Leon Siantz) and CAMPOS Committee Members launched the CAMPOS Recruitment Initiative, working with administrators and the ADVANCE Leadership Team to identify strategies for recruitment and hiring, developing a nomination and review process (vetted by campus counsel and consistent with the University of California Academic Advancement Criteria), engaging in external support and dissemination, and educating UC Davis stakeholders about the CAMPOS Initiative.

Recruitment efforts in Year 2 focused on asking Deans, Department Chairs, and Search Committees to identify potential CAMPOS Faculty Scholars as they rise through the search process and submit a nomination form to the CAMPOS Review Committee for consideration. The CAMPOS Committee is discussing whether to adopt additional strategies for recruitment as the CAMPOS initiative moves forward in Year 3.
Formative Feedback:
Interviews with campus stakeholders suggest there has been confusion regarding the CAMPOS Recruitment Initiative’s mission. Some stakeholders thought CAMPOS would be acting as a mini search committee and others thought that only Latina faculty could be hired under the initiative, for example:

“It’s been hard to get a good understanding of CAMPOS...I think faculty perceive it as a top-down initiative, an intervention...fears that their independence as a department is being trampled.”

“It was misunderstood at first. People thought the goal was to do a cluster hire of Latinas. There has been a bit of an evolution to the goals as originally stated. As it was first presented, the goals seemed impossible on the face of it, but [now] the criteria is more broad and this is a more sensible approach.”

“Cross-messages have been a problem. Is the message that the initiative will hire Latinas or is it that gender and ethnicity are not a criteria? I think different audiences may have heard different messages.”

“Messaging has been difficult. People thought the CAMPOS initiative was earmarked FTEs for Latinas in STEM.”

The CAMPOS Committee and ADVANCE Team is working to correct misimpressions and communicate the goals and purpose of the CAMPOS Initiative and specifically the CAMPOS Recruitment Initiative.

While many stakeholders welcomed the message that CAMPOS Faculty Scholars did not have to be Latinas (for example, criteria include having engaged in service with Hispanic Women/Latinas or other underrepresented minority populations in higher education), some were concerned that being an underrepresented minority faculty in and of itself was not sufficient criteria and that candidates must also demonstrate broader impacts to be considered:

“A lot of people in STEM, they want to be good scientists and good researchers and so they focus most of their time on that. And some do come with having mentored and volunteered to help URMs and such but that’s not their primary focus. I am concerned that Latinas will have to have met this additional criteria, that being a Latina scientist isn’t sufficient.”

Some stakeholders were concerned that expectations of CAMPOS Faculty Scholars were not yet fully defined and noted the importance of aligning expectations of CAMPOS Faculty Scholars with expectations for tenure and promotion. For example, one stakeholder explained:

“As of now, the responsibilities and benefits of being a CAMPOS Scholar are still fluid...We want to make sure that things they are doing will help them get tenure...Otherwise, we need to ... help them focus on the types of research and scholarship that will get them tenure.”
Evidence of Impact:
At the time of the March site visit, not all faculty search and hiring was complete for the 2013-14 academic year, but 4 nominations for CAMPOS Faculty Scholars had been received by that date and one CAMPOS Faculty Scholar had been hired. Based on conversations with interested Deans and departments, the director expects that by the end of the search process this academic year, the CAMPOS Committee will receive a total of 6-8 nominations and hopes that at least 4 CAMPOS Faculty Scholars will be hired.

Stakeholders are enthusiastic about the CAMPOS Faculty Scholars and the impact CAMPOS will have at UC Davis:
“CAMPOS is a paradigm shift for academic diversity at UC Davis.”

“Having more Latina faculty on campus will change the culture for faculty and for students.”

“[CAMPOS] has been a really successful example of how the program is structured to do more than talk about the importance of diversity and is actually doing something....The ADVANCE platform has given me the power to say to faculty this is really important, it’s about implementing diversity.”

“The ADVANCE program gives me a mechanism to further the principle that you can’t have excellence without diversity. You can use this program to truly take advantage of attracting top-notch diverse candidates and bringing them to the campus without a lot of resistance from faculty who at times may see this as peripheral to our activity. It becomes central to what we’re doing.”

Recommendations:
• Continue to deliver a consistent message with respect to the CAMPOS Recruitment Initiative. Messaging to Deans has been a priority; continue to address deans but expand messaging efforts to target Department Chairs and faculty.
• Discuss and appropriately vet any additional recruitment strategies that may be utilized in the future
• Discuss expectations of the CAMPOS Faculty Scholars and their alignment with expectations for tenure and promotion

4.1.2 Collaborative Research Space and Resources
Designated CAMPOS space has been established and is being utilized by the CAMPOS Committee.

To help provide opportunities for personal and research connections, with a focus
on attracting Latina faculty, regular CAMPOS “Cafecitos” (coffee breaks) have been initiated. Two Cafecitos took place in Spring semester 2014, with a total of 38 people attending one or both. In an interview, one Latina faculty member mentioned the Cafecitos in particular: “One thing I liked was the Cafecitos. Because I can identify with that. Also the tamales at Christmas, even though it ended up being cancelled; things that underrepresented minorities can identify with.”

4.1.3 Research Mentorship

This program element is under development

4.1.4 Speaker Series

This program element is under development

4.2 Inclusive Campus Climate Initiative

The Inclusive Campus Climate Initiative seeks to develop and implement culturally-nuanced, evidence-based programs to (a) raise awareness of unconscious and institutional bias (with respect to culture, race/ethnicity, and gender) and (b) generate greater understanding of the ways in which STEM research communities can benefit from the contribution of diversity.

The three program elements that support the Inclusive Climate Initiative are:
1. Strength Through Equity and Diversity (STEAD)
2. Distinguished Speaker Series
3. Annual Retreats

Baseline Data:
Custom questions from the COACHE Survey were designed specifically to measure issues of climate most relevant to the ADVANCE goals. Review of COACHE findings (not shown) indicate statistically significant gender and racial differences in climate for UC Davis faculty. For example, women were more likely than men to “agree” or “strongly agree” with the statement, “Some faculty have condescending attitudes toward women.” Similarly, women were more likely than men and faculty of color were more likely than white faculty to “strongly agree” with the statement, “Some faculty have condescending attitudes toward members of racial/ethnic minorities.” Other questions pertaining to equality of resources, preferential treatment in recruitment and promotion, receipt of career advice from colleagues, and being listened to when speaking reveal statistically significant gender and racial differences as well. These findings will provide valuable baseline data, can facilitate dialogue, and can be used to inform the development of program activities.
4.2.1 Strength Through Equity and Diversity (STEAD)

The goal of STEAD is to identify and change biased recruitment and hiring practices to be more inclusive, broaden applicant pools, and enhance the excellence and diversity of faculty job candidates.

In Year 2, the STEAD Committee attended a STRIDE workshop at the University of Michigan and met with STRIDE members in Fall 2013. The STEAD Committee is developing their own workshop, plans to do a run-through in June, and will be ready to implement their workshop for search committees in Fall 2014.

Formative Feedback:
The role of deans and chairs in supporting the search committee workshops will be critical for faculty buy-in. Although not unanimous, interview data indicate most deans were supportive of having mandatory training for faculty serving on search committees. In fact, one Dean supported extending the workshops beyond the search committee:

“[Workshops should not be] just for the search committees, but for the entire department...This is important because in as much as the search committee discusses and narrows down a field of candidates ... the next level of discussion takes place amongst a larger group of folks and if they’re not in tune with the same sort of issues it’s not going to be as effective. Training search committees is a great start. But inviting training at the departmental level is important....It becomes part of the culture.”

Baseline Data:
To help measure the impact of the search committee training, the UC Davis ADVANCE team acquired data on the gender and racial/ethnic composition of applicants, interviews, and hires 2008-2013, which will serve as baseline data. As shown in Figure 1, the percentage of women in applicant pools for tenured/tenure-track faculty positions was 25.2% in STEM. The percent of women interviewed and hired during this time period was slightly higher than the percent of applicants. The percent of underrepresented minorities (African Americans, Native Americans, and Hispanics) hired is slightly higher than their percent of the applicant pool. The percent of people of color (which includes Asians, Asian Americans, and

---

2 A total of 103 faculty searches occurred in the 2008-2013 time period. Data are aggregated across searches; the search is not the unit of analysis.
3 STEM includes the following: College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, College of Biological Sciences, College of Engineering, Division of Math and Physical Sciences, Division of Social Sciences. The Division of Social Sciences, however, includes both SBS and non-SBS departments: Anthropology, Communication, Economics, History, Linguistics, Military Science, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology.
underrepresented minorities) interviewed and hired is lower than their percent of the applicant pool. (Data by college/division is presented in Appendix A.)

When the data are disaggregated by rank, interesting differences emerge (Figure 2). Although the percent of women in the applicant pool at the Associate or Full Professor rank are larger than at the Assistant Professor rank, no women were hired at the Associate or Full Professor rank during the 2008-2013 baseline period. In contrast, at the Associate and Full Professor rank, the percent of underrepresented minorities and the percent of people of color hired are larger than their representation in the applicant pool.
Faculty Search Committee Member Workshops:
Prior to ADVANCE, the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs offered workshops for search committee chairs. In Year 2 of the ADVANCE grant, while STEAD was developing their training, these workshops were offered to search committee members and it was required that at least 3 members of each search committee attend.

Evaluation forms were designed and administered by the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. The Internal Evaluators analyzed the findings from the evaluation forms and provided a summary of findings to the External Evaluator (see Appendix B). As shown in Figure 3, the majority of participants “agreed” or “strongly agreed” they would apply what they learned in the session and that it was valuable. The majority (76%) of participants said “yes” when asked if they would recommend the session to colleagues (not shown).

![Figure 3. "This session was valuable; I will apply what I learned"
(N=109)](chart)

Although some stakeholders reported receiving negative reactions from faculty who had attended the workshops, interview data generally affirm that the workshops were favorably received and were valuable for educating faculty about implicit biases:

“I attended the implicit bias training. It was worthwhile and most people were pleased with it.”

“Many said it was worthwhile and many were surprised about what they learned about their own biases. They have been ambassadors to spread the word to their colleagues about the training.”
“Initially, when search committee training was required at the beginning of this year, I heard a lot of comments of frustration from faculty, not directed at the nature of the training, but simply in response to the fact that the UC has deployed all these training modules... and I think there is just faculty fatigue. However, what happened was that the feedback I started getting from faculty attending the workshop was extremely positive and that it really was worth it. There were things they could learn.”

Recommendations:
- Be sure to incorporate issues of racial/ethnic bias (and how they intersect with gender bias) in the STEAD workshops
- Work with stakeholders to require search committee members to attend the new STEAD workshops
- Consider requiring department chairs to attend the STEAD workshops since they are often responsible for guiding the discussion of candidates with the full faculty once the search committee has made its recommendations. The potential for disconnect from the search committee to the discussion of candidates by the department should be addressed.

4.2.2 Distinguished Speaker Series

No Distinguished Speakers were brought to campus by ADVANCE in Year 2, but the team is planning to bring in Mahzarin Banaji and Scott Page in Fall 2014.

4.2.3 Annual Retreats

In Year 2, UC Davis hosted a Roundtable on April 23, 2014, titled “Workplace Climate: Assessments and Interventions to Improve Diversity Among STEM Faculty.” The Roundtable was co-organized and co-sponsored with UCOP ADVANCE-PAID and was attended by approximately 120 people, of whom approximately 40 were from UC Davis.

Evidence of Impact:
The event was evaluated by the UCOP ADVANCE PAID team and findings shared with the Internal and External Evaluators. Findings (not shown) indicate that 62% of UC Davis participants found the presentations to be “very informative,” 35% reported the presentations were “somewhat informative” and the rest reported the presentations were “neutral” (7%) or “not very informative” (1%).
4.3 Mentoring and Networking Initiative

The Mentoring and Networking Initiative’s mission is to provide information, guidance, and networking opportunities for research and career success of women in STEM fields through both informal and formal programs with the following program elements:

1. Mentorship Program
2. Career Skills Workshops
3. Leadership Initiatives
4. Build Networks to Enhance Research Opportunities and Career Success

4.3.1 Mentorship Program

Both formal and informal mentoring program activities were launched in Year 2, including:

- Facilitating an institutional membership for UC Davis in the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity to provide faculty with access to resources such as the Faculty Success Program that offers external mentoring for faculty and particularly faculty from underrepresented groups.
- Establishing trial LAUNCH committees (modeled after the successful University of Michigan program) for two STEM faculty, with plans to organize 5 more in the Spring 2014 quarter for newly-arrived faculty.

Baseline Data:
Baseline data on mentorship were obtained from the COACHE Survey (findings not shown). Faculty reported being less satisfied with mentoring than the other topics covered by the survey, suggesting mentoring can be improved for all faculty at UC Davis. Within STEM as a whole, no gender differences in the mentoring benchmark were found. However, some gender differences in mentoring were observed across colleges, with women generally less satisfied with mentoring (although in 2 STEM colleges, women were more satisfied than men with mentoring). In addition, faculty of color and Associate Professors were generally less satisfied than their counterparts with mentoring.

Formative Feedback:
Interviews with Latina faculty emphasize the importance of mentoring, noting the value of having a mentor of the same gender and same race or ethnicity, but recognizing that other factors are important as well:

“While it’s important to have mentors within one’s own ethnicity and race, it’s much more important to have good mentors. I have received great mentoring from people who are white males.”

“It’s important to have mentoring from someone who has had similar experiences.”
Some stakeholders cautioned that mentor training is necessary for better understanding cultural differences and the biases we may have about what Latina faculty may need or want, for example:

“Not all Latinas are alike. The cultural experience of a Mexican-American are very different from an Argentinian-American, for example.”

“It’s important that when mentoring, people don’t make certain assumptions. For example, if a minority issue comes up, it doesn’t mean a minority is interested in addressing it just because they are a minority.”

Recommendations:

• Continue to engage with the Internal and External Evaluators to develop an evaluation plan for the mentoring initiatives
• Continue to use findings from the COACHE Survey to guide the development of mentorship program activities
• Work with the CAMPOS Initiative and utilize findings from the social science research initiatives to inform the development of mentoring programs, trainings, or resources that address the challenges faced by minority faculty generally and Latina faculty specifically
• Provide mentor training and resources to faculty (mentors and mentees) to support effective mentoring practices

4.3.2 Career Skills Workshops

The committee is working with the Office of Research to offer a workshop in Spring 2014, “Strategies for Planning, Developing and Writing Large Team Grants” and is planning additional workshops on grant writing for Fall 2014.

4.3.3 Leadership Initiatives

In Year 2, the UC Davis ADVANCE Scholar Award Program and Lecture Series was launched. The program and lecture series highlights and celebrates the contributions STEM women faculty at UC Davis have made to their fields through outstanding research activity and mentorship. Two ADVANCE Scholars will be chosen each year. Each scholar will give a lecture (widely advertised), which will be followed by a reception. A call for nominations was released in May.

Recommendation:

• The team should discuss the focus of the leadership initiatives; for example, is the focus is on administrative leadership opportunities and/or on the development of skills to be leaders in one’s discipline? The leadership initiatives should then be housed within the appropriate initiative(s).
4.3.4 Build Networks to Enhance Research Opportunities and Career Success

ADVANCE focused efforts in Year 2 on informal opportunities for faculty to build networks: (1) a Women Faculty Reception in February 2014, (2) agreeing to provide administrative support for the New Faculty Network (a faculty-initiated activity that predates the ADVANCE Program that provides Assistant Professors with peer mentorship and networking opportunities), and (3) starting an Associate Professor Network modeled after the New Faculty Network (initiated in the late Spring Semester).

All women faculty on campus were invited to attend a Women Faculty Reception in February 2014 and 117 women attended the event, which consisted of introductory remarks from the ADVANCE team, followed by time for unstructured conversation. The Reception was co-sponsored by the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs so all women faculty could be included to broaden networking opportunities and to encourage the institutionalization of the event.

The Internal Evaluators worked with the Mentorship and Networking Initiative Co-Directors to develop a post-event survey that was completed by 92 attendees (a 79% response rate). Survey results and findings were analyzed by the Internal Evaluators and provided to ADVANCE and the External Evaluator (see Appendix C).

According to the post-event survey, almost half of participants were at the rank of Professor, 17% were Associate Professors, and 28% were Assistant Professors (see Table 1). Faculty from STEM colleges were well-represented at the event, with 21% from the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, 13% from the Division of Social Sciences, 411% from the Division of Math and Physical Sciences, 11% from the College of Engineering, and 10% from the College of Biological Science. The majority of participants self-identified as White (non-Hispanic), whereas 9% self-identified as Hispanic/Latino, 9% as Asian, and 6% as African American/African. No participants self-identified as Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian or as American Indian/Alaska Native.

---

4 Not all departments in the Division of Social Sciences are STEM departments. The Division of Social Sciences includes: Anthropology, Communication, Economics, History, Linguistics, Military Science, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology.
### Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Women Faculty Reception Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>STEM only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^5)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>STEM only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;S: Math and Physical Sciences</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;S: Social Sciences</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;S: Humanities, Arts &amp; Cultural Studies</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^6)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>STEM only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/African</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\) Not reported due to small sample sizes

Within the STEM colleges only (about 66% of attendees), attendees were also more likely to be at the rank of Professor, to be from the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, and were more likely to be White/Caucasian, Non-Hispanic.

**Evidence of Impact:**

Three survey questions were designed to measure the impact of the event on the UC Davis ADVANCE goal to promote faculty advancement by building networks to enhance research opportunities and career success. Figures 4 and 5 provide findings for STEM women attendees and reveal that for most attendees, the event helped them build networks. More specifically, 81% reported that they met people at the event that they feel will expand their professional and social networks (Figure 4). Moreover, 70% of STEM women reported being “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the opportunity to expand their professional network and 60% reported were

---

\(^5\) Academic Federation Faculty, Administration, and Students
\(^6\) Graduate School of Management, School of Law, School of Nursing, School of Education, School of Veterinary Medicine
“satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the opportunity to learn about research across campus (Figure 5).

Figure 4. "Did you meet people at this event that you feel will expand your professional and social networks?" (N=58)

![Figure 4](image)

Figure 5. Self-Reported Impacts from Participants at the ADVANCE Women Faculty Reception

![Figure 5](image)

Survey responses indicate the event helped provide networking opportunities that are professionally beneficial. In response to the open-ended question, “What aspects of this event do you expect will be most helpful to your professional life” many attendees mentioned the opportunity to network, for example: “Networking for future professional advantages”
“Meeting people that will expand my professional and social network”

“Meet potential collaborators”

“1. Expanding potential research networks: Finding colleagues in other colleges that have similar research interests; 2. re-connecting with colleagues that strengthen collegial/friendship/support networks”

**4.4 Policies and Practices Review Initiative**

The Policies and Practices Review Initiative will conduct a systematic review of policies and procedures that impact recruitment, retention and career progress of faculty and, when deemed necessary, propose changes to those policies and practices in order to eradicate implicit bias, promote diversity and eliminate inconsistency in implementation.

The Committee plans to issue a series of four reports, each addressing one of the following areas:

- Recruitment (issued Spring 2014)
- Faculty Advancement and the Reward System (to be issued Fall 2014)
- Career Development (to be issued Spring 2015)
- Retention (to be issued Fall 2015)

Each report will be presented to the campus community for review and discussion and will be presented to the Davis Division of the Academic Senate for consideration, modification, dissemination and implementation and to obtain feedback from the system-wide UC Academic Senate when appropriate.

The Committee has drafted their first report on Recruitment that addresses pool composition, pool evaluation, and creating and sustaining an attractive campus climate. They also proposed recommendations specific to the language of the tenure clock extension in the APM and recommended that tenure clock extensions due to parental leave become automatic. A total of 22 recommendations have been made thus far, along with suggested processes for moving forward with each recommendation.

Recommendations:

- Continue with plans to seek cross-initiative communication and engagement of campus stakeholders in policy review and discussion
- Utilize institutional data (for example, data on recruitment and the required “Toolkit” Indicator data on hiring, promotion, and advancement) to inform planned reports and track changes over time
4.5 Social Sciences Research Initiative

The mission statement of the Social Sciences Research Initiative is to conduct integrated empirical studies and on-going data analyses that will:

- Inform the program activities and interventions aimed at improving the recruitment and retention of Latina and other women STEM faculty at UC Davis
- Examine the impact of those interventions on the career progress of Latina and other women STEM faculty
- Accomplish a systematic study of the factors influencing the career paths of Latina scholars from faculty recruitment through mid-career

Activities and research to support these goals consist of three integrated studies and on-going analyses of institution-level and other data:

- Three integrated research studies:
  1. Attracting Latino/a STEM scholars to the academy: A survey of career path perceptions among Latino/As in STEM
  2. Crossing a post-doctoral bridge to faculty positions: Career paths of Latina President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program Fellows
  3. Effects of a diverse research community on the early careers of diverse faculty
- On-going analysis of institutional and other data
  - COACHE survey
  - NSF indicators data
  - Other data as needs/opportunities arise

4.5.1 Three Integrated Research Studies

Studies #1 and #2 above (Attracting Latino/a STEM scholars to the academy and Crossing a post-doctoral bridge to faculty positions) are underway and Study #3 addresses the experiences of CAMPOS Faculty Scholars and will begin next year when the first cohort of CAMPOS Faculty Scholars is expected to arrive.

From the 12 interviews conducted thus far as part of the “Attracting Latino/a STEM scholars to the academy” study, the following preliminary findings/themes have emerged:

- First generation students with limited economic means
- Strong sense of familial obligations
- Importance of institutionalized programs for networking and visibility
- Persistence
Recommendations:

- The research studies are the primary vehicle for understanding the voices and experiences of Latina faculty and are being conducted by a strong team. The research plays a critical role in the development of program initiatives and should be completed as quickly as possible so findings can be used to guide the development and refinement of program activities and to support dialogue. Resources and personnel needs should be evaluated to ensure the researchers have the support for timely data collection and analyses.

- Ensure a mechanism is in place for communicating research findings to the ADVANCE team so the findings can inform programming.

4.5.2 On-Going Analysis of Institutional and Other Data

The team has been actively analyzing and disseminating findings from the COACHE Survey to the campus community. Each Dean has received a report of college-specific findings and two town hall meetings were scheduled for April to discuss findings with campus stakeholders. The COACHE data will be used as a vehicle for discussion and learning:

“Each school will get a sense of what they’re proud of and can also focus on areas where they’re less satisfied and why. We have to have honest discussions. Working with the data will provide the opportunity to open a dialogue.”

“We are trying to figure out how to use the data to affect changes in our colleges, especially with respect to women.”

“I credit the discussion with ADVANCE in conjunction with the COACHE data with helping me realize the lack of women chairs in my college.”

Recommendation:

- Continue to facilitate campus dialog pertaining to the COACHE Survey findings with faculty and administrators and provide guidance as to how they can use the findings to improve climate and enhance equity.

4.6 Familiarity with and Participation in ADVANCE

4.6.1 STEM Department Chair Familiarity with ADVANCE

To provide baseline data regarding awareness of ADVANCE among STEM department chairs, a brief survey was designed by the Internal Evaluators (Appendix D). A link to the survey was sent to Department Chairs by STEM Deans in early May 2014, encouraging them to participate in the survey. Of the 73 STEM
Chairs, 66 responded (a 90% response rate). Of the Chairs who completed the survey 61% reported they are familiar with the ADVANCE Program at UC Davis.

Figure 6 reports the familiarity of STEM Chairs with the ADVANCE Program at UC Davis by college (% Unknown includes Chairs in that college who either did not complete the survey or who took the survey but did not identify which college they are in\(^7\)). Familiarity with ADVANCE was greatest in the Biological Sciences (where all chairs responded to the survey and reported they were familiar), but was also high in Engineering and in Math and Physical Sciences, where 67% of Chairs reported being familiar with ADVANCE.

Of the respondents who reported being familiar with ADVANCE, they were most familiar with the Inclusive Campus Climate/STEAD\(^8\) Initiative and the CAMPOS Initiative (see Figure 7). They were generally least familiar with the Research Initiatives and the Policies and Practices Review, which is understandable given that at the time of the survey these initiatives were either just beginning to disseminate recommendations (Policies and Practices) or were still collecting data (Research Initiative) and hence the “products” were less visible to STEM Chairs.

---

\(^7\) Of the 55 Chairs who completed the survey, 10 did not report their college.

\(^8\) In the initial version of the survey, an incorrect acronym was used for STEAD, which may have affected Chairs’ familiarity with the initiative.
Recommendation:
- Use findings from the STEM Chair Survey to guide outreach as appropriate

4.6.2 ADVANCE Event Participation

Data on ADVANCE Event Attendance was kept by the ADVANCE team and summarized by the Internal Evaluators into Table 2. Most participants at ADVANCE Events are women and most are from the College of Letters and Sciences and the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, consistent with women’s overall representation across STEM colleges. Within the STEM colleges, the majority of participants are at the rank of Professor, which is generally consistent with women’s representation by rank in these colleges as well. About 27% of attendees attended more than one event. Of the attendees, faculty from the College of Engineering were most likely to attend more than one event.

---

9 Events include: Women Faculty Reception, Cafecitos, Internal Retreat, Chancellor’s Dinners (endorsed but not sponsored by ADVANCE), Join the Discussion: Women and Leadership (Year 1), and Women Faculty Networking Reception (Year 1).
10 Women faculty representation across STEM colleges was obtained from Table 1a of the 2012-2013 Toolkit Indicators Data: of the http://ucd-advance.ucdavis.edu/sites/main/files/advance_indicators_2012-13_posted_1a.pdf
11 Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th># Attendees</th>
<th># Faculty Attendees by Rank (% of Total)</th>
<th># Women Attendees (% of Total)</th>
<th># Attended More than One (% of Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Agricultural &amp;</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Professor – 16 (38%) Assoc. Prof – 4 (10%)</td>
<td>42 (100%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst. Prof. – 15 (35%) Academic Fed. – 6 (14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Biological Sciences</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Professor – 13 (52%) Assoc. Prof. – 2 (8%)</td>
<td>22 (88%)</td>
<td>7 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst. Prof. – 3 (12%) Academic Fed. – 2 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Professor – 9 (43%) Assoc. Prof. – 6 (28%)</td>
<td>20 (95%)</td>
<td>13 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst. Prof. – 2 (10%) Academic Fed. – 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Letters &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Professor – 39 (44%) Assoc. Prof. – 25 (28%)</td>
<td>87 (98%)</td>
<td>26 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Includes: Humanities, Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst. Prof. – 11(12%) Academic Fed. – 8 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Studies; Mathematical &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences; Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professor – 1 (33%) Assoc. Prof. – 1 (33%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst. Prof. – 1 (33%) Academic Fed. – 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Professor – 0 (0%) Assoc. Prof. – 5 (62%)</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst. Prof. – 1 (12%) Academic Fed. – 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Professor – 3 (75%) Assoc. Prof. – 0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst. Prof. – 1 (25%) Academic Fed. – 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Professor – 11 (48%) Assoc. Prof. – 7 (30%)</td>
<td>22(98%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst. Prof. – 1 (4%) Academic Fed. – 2 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Professor – 7 (58%) Assoc. Prof. – 2 (16%)</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td>2 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst. Prof. – 1 (8%) Academic Fed. – 1 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total/% of Total</td>
<td>226 (84%)</td>
<td>Faculty: 219 (81%)</td>
<td>217 (81%)</td>
<td>73 (27%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Includes: Humanities, Arts & Cultural Studies; Mathematical & Physical Sciences; Social Sciences.
Recommendations:
- Continue to track participation with the ADVANCE program to assess how well the program is reaching stakeholders across departments, colleges, and ranks, with particular attention to STEM women faculty. Additional analyses comparing the percent of women in each STEM unit who participate may provide useful feedback.
- Use program participation data to target outreach activities as necessary and appropriate

4.7 Other Findings

1. Communication
- Cross-initiative communication should be increased. In interviews with the External Evaluator and in the ADVANCE Retreat Survey (Appendix E), initiative committee members expressed the desire to know more about what is happening with other initiatives and to have more frequent opportunities to work on cross-initiative planning and collaboration. Moreover, survey results from the ADVANCE Initiative Committee Member Survey (Appendix F) reveal cross-initiative communication can be strengthened. For example, 75% of initiative committee members would like more support from the ADVANCE leadership team for “communicating with other initiatives and committee members” and 62% would like more support for “providing updates about the activities of the other initiatives.” Feedback from initiative teams suggest focusing on a particular topic (for example, recruitment or mentoring, that touches on several initiatives) may be an effective strategy for increasing communication across initiatives.
- The website can be better utilized to enhance team communication and better engage campus stakeholders
- Cross-cultural communication and cultural sensitivity should continue to be addressed
- The messaging with respect to the CAMPOS Initiative should be consistent and clearly communicated to the campus community

2. Management Team
- Staffing needs for a program of this size are greater than what can be carried by the team as currently structured. The only full-time staff person is the Program Assistant who is carrying a very heavy workload and as the program initiatives ramp up, the workload will increase.
- Responsibilities of the ADVANCE team members could benefit from further clarification. Initiative committee members are sometimes unsure who is responsible for what tasks and whom to go to with different types of requests.
3. Engagement with Internal Evaluators and Development of Timelines
   - The Initiative Committees have increased engagement with the Internal Evaluators in Year 2, better enabling the Internal Evaluators to provide the internal assessment critical to program development
   - The Internal Evaluators have worked with the initiative committees to establish timelines for activities related to program goals; however not all of the initiative committees have developed their timeline

4. Experiences of Latina Faculty
   As part of the March site visit, the External Evaluator conducted interviews with a sample of Latina faculty to better understand their experiences as UC Davis faculty. The theme that stood out most strongly from the interviews was that Latina faculty were engaging in high levels of service which they felt was not visible and/or not rewarded by the university:

   “Many students find me. Committees find me. It’s difficult because there are so few racial and ethnic minorities on campus. So many undergraduates come and talk to me. They find me on the internet and ask questions. African-Americans, Latinas, Asians, Native Americans, and white students. It’s not just Latina students… In my department it’s all about the grant money, so this type of work is not on the radar.”

   “I do a lot of pro bono work with undergrads from underrepresented minority groups and also from poorer socioeconomic backgrounds. I don’t think this type of service is visible or rewarded.”

   “Probably because of my own background and my interest in promoting students from underrepresented groups, service has dominated a lot of my time. I say yes because I want to do it, I know I devote too much time to service, which is a problem with respect to promotion.”

   “The service demand on us is high. The burden of service falls on us first because there are so few women and we get called upon to serve on committees. Then additional service because we are underrepresented minorities as well.”

5. Commitment from UC Davis leadership
   - Stakeholders emphasized the commitment of university leadership to the ADVANCE Program
5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The UC Davis ADVANCE Team has made meaningful progress in Year 2. Key program initiatives were launched and detailed planning for launching additional initiatives took place. The Initiative Committees report they have gained momentum as a group and have accomplished several of their established goals (Appendix E). Administrators and the ADVANCE team are very excited about the initiatives and their transformative potential.

Significant strengths and accomplishments in Year 2 include:

- Evidence of strong support from the upper administration for the goals of ADVANCE
- Launching of the CAMPOS Recruitment Initiative, development of the STEAD training, and pilot testing of the LAUNCH Mentoring Committees
- Release of the Recruitment Report from the Policies and Practices Committee
- Collection of baseline data (i.e., COACHE data, Faculty Search and Hiring Process data) to guide program development and assessment
- Dissemination and use of the COACHE findings to facilitate campus dialog among faculty and administrators
- Quality of internal evaluation work and integration of Internal Evaluators with the initiative teams to support evaluation efforts
- Development of an evaluation plan and underlying theory of change

The main challenges occurring in Year 2 included:

- Cross-initiative communication
  Initiatives are eager to better communicate with other initiatives. The monthly initiative co-director meetings were designed to facilitate cross-initiative communication but they have not been well-attended.

- Messaging with respect to the CAMPOS Recruitment Initiative
  While there is much excitement about the CAMPOS Initiative, there has been confusion by campus stakeholders regarding the CAMPOS Recruitment Initiative's mission. The team has been working hard to correct misinformation and provide accurate information.

- Long-term planning
  Some initiatives have not yet developed a working timeline of their activities. Developing a timeline for each initiative will help facilitate ongoing evaluation activities and coordination of cross-initiative activities.
Based on the strengths and challenges identified above, the following recommendations (grouped thematically) should be considered to further strengthen project activities and maximize effectiveness:

Engagement with Stakeholders
- Increase engagement with other campus groups with similar goals and interests, such as the Hispanic/Latino ladder faculty group
- Continue to facilitate opportunities for Latina faculty (and other underrepresented minority faculty) to network and strengthen their sense of community
- Messaging to Deans has been a priority; continue to communicate regularly with Deans but expand messaging efforts to target Department Chairs and faculty

Management Team
- Clarify the roles and corresponding responsibilities for the management team, including which individuals or groups are responsible for different types of decision-making and communicate these to stakeholders
- Review staffing needs. Additional assistance for administrative tasks and/or event planning may be needed, especially as program demands are increasing due to the increasing program activities.

Communication
- Increase opportunities for initiative teams to interact and collaborate to prevent siloing of activities and to provide opportunities to strategically align activities
- Continue to clarify the CAMPOS initiative to campus stakeholders. Work as a team to develop and vet a set of talking points to ensure consistent messaging and inclusive messaging that is welcoming to all Latina groups
- Consider bringing a speaker(s) to campus who can address cross-cultural communication and cultural sensitivity from a research perspective to help build capacity for institutional transformation

Social Science Research
- The social science research studies play a critical role in the development of program initiatives and should be completed as quickly as possible so that findings can be used to guide the development and refinement of program activities and to support dialogue.
- Ensure a mechanism is in place for communicating research findings to the ADVANCE team so that the findings can inform programming

Evaluation and Assessment
- Ensure each initiative has a working timeline of activities to guide program evaluation and cross-initiative coordination
- Schedule recurring monthly meetings with the evaluators and the
Management Team
- Discuss the roles of the Internal and External Advisory Boards and how to best utilize them moving forward
- To help assess impacts of activities on STEM faculty and units specifically:
  - Compare participation data with the distribution of women faculty by rank and unit (using the Toolkit Indicators data) and use findings to target outreach
  - Disaggregate the Division of Social Sciences into STEM and non-STEM departments when collecting data on participation and impacts (when possible)

NSF 3rd Year Site Visit
- Work closely with the Internal and External Evaluators to plan for the 3rd Year Site Visit by NSF in January 2015. The team might consider a retreat focused on preparation for the site visit during Fall 2014.

Celebrate Accomplishments
- Much has been accomplished and many people have worked very hard to launch initiatives. Celebrate the accomplishments to date and recognize the roles that people have played to help launch and build the program.

In conclusion, the UC Davis ADVANCE team has laid a solid foundation upon which to build, but much work lies ahead in Year 3. Remaining program initiatives should be launched as quickly as possible so that their impacts can be evaluated to prepare for the 3rd Year NSF Site Visit and to facilitate the eventual institutionalization of successful initiatives. The team has gained the momentum to make this happen and is enthusiastic about the work they are doing.

UC Davis’ ADVANCE program has the potential for establishing itself as a national leader of institutional transformation strategies that incorporate both gender and cultural diversity, particularly with respect to Latina STEM faculty. Key findings (research and programmatic) and best practices that arise from the findings are likely to provide models for other institutions.
Appendix A:

Representation in the Faculty Recruitment Process by Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and Rank, 2008-2013
Data gathered from evaluations of five different faculty search committee trainings were compiled to create the following summary charts. The evaluations included nine questions about different components of the trainings such as the organization, the content and the perceived value of the information. A total of 114 evaluations were collected from attendees. Separate data for each of the five faculty training sessions is also available however it should be noted that the ratings were fairly consistent across the five sessions.

Attendees were asked to rate whether or not they believed the objectives of the trainings were met. The majority of faculty (77%) responded that they “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that the objectives of the session were met. Responses are displayed in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Objectives of the Trainings Were Met (N=112)

Attendees were also asked in the post-training evaluations to rate the value of the session and whether they felt they would use the information that was presented. The majority of attendees (71%) responded that they either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that the session was valuable and that they would apply what they had learned. These responses are displayed in Figure 2.
Attendees were asked to rate the organization of the content and sequence of information provided in the trainings. The majority (71%) of faculty “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that the content and sequence of the session they attended was well organized (Figure 3).

When attendees were asked about the handouts provided at the session, a smaller percentage (54%) “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that the handouts were useful (Figure 4).
When faculty members were asked how they would share the information they had learned at the session with their campus colleagues, most (42%) said that they would share the information at departmental or faculty meetings. Another 32% said they would share the materials they had received with colleagues and refer them to the Academic Affairs website. Another 26% said they would share the information in some other way.

When asked if they would recommend the search committee training session to colleagues, 76% of the faculty attendees answered yes and 24% answered no.
One of the goals of the UC Davis ADVANCE grant is to increase networking among women faculty on campus as a way to improve campus climate and increase connections/collaborations among women faculty. The ADVANCE leadership team, along with university administration, recognizes this as an important aspect of developing an inclusive and diverse campus climate. With this in mind, the Mentorship and Networking Initiative worked together with the ADVANCE leadership team to host a Women Faculty Reception on Monday, February 10th, 2014. All women faculty on campus (1198 individuals) were invited to attend the event, which was primarily designed to give women a chance to network, and meet new faculty and colleagues from other colleges on campus. One hundred and seventy-two women RSVP’d for the event and one hundred and seventeen women attended the reception, which was held at the Mondavi Center. The event included introductory and informational remarks from ADVANCE leadership, including Chancellor Linda Katehi, Provost Maureen Stanton, Co-Director Kimberly Shauman, and Program Coordinator Denneal Jamison McClung. The remaining time was open to allow women to talk, connect, and meet new colleagues. A post-event survey was developed by the internal evaluation team in collaboration with the Mentorship and Networking Initiative co-directors and the ADVANCE leadership team. Of the 117 attendees who were sent the post-event survey, 92 individuals responded (a 79% response rate).

Respondents were asked to identify their position or role within their department. This information allowed the evaluation team to determine if attendees’ responses varied by the position they held (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Full Professor). Of the 92 respondents, only 8 did not provide this information. Almost half (45%) of the attendees were Full Professors, 28% were Assistant Professors, 17% were Associate Professors, and 8% were members of the Academic Federation (lecturers, adjunct faculty). A small percentage of attendees were administrators and students. Given that there were very few attendees who identified as students or administration, these roles were not included when data was broken down by position. This information is displayed in Figure 1 below.
Attendees were also asked to identify the college in which they worked. The largest percentage of attendees was from the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (21%). Other attendees were fairly evenly divided among the Colleges across campus with the smallest percentage of attendees coming from the Graduate School of Management (1%), the School of Law (2%), and the School of Nursing (1%) (Figure 2).

Figure 1. Positions held by attendees (N=84)
Attendees were asked to provide their ethnicity and the majority (77%) self-identified as White. The remaining attendees self-identified as 9% Hispanic, 9% Asian, and 5% African American (Figure 3).
In addition to gathering demographic information from attendees, the survey also asked nine questions to gain feedback about the event (Survey, Appendix A). The first question asked attendees how they had learned about the event. The majority (84%) of women who attended had heard about the event from the ADVANCE invitation which was sent out via e-mail. Only a small number (16%) heard about the event from a colleague or friend.

Attendees were also asked if they attended the event with a colleague. The majority (70%) of attendees responded that they did not attend with a colleague. This item was cross-tabulated to see if there was a difference in responses depending on position held (Figure 4). It appears that fewer Associate Professors attended with a colleague or friend when compared to Full Professors and Assistant Professors however fewer Associate Professors attended overall.
When asked why they had attended the event, the majority (73%) of women said that they “wanted to meet other women faculty.” Forty-two percent of women attendees responded that they were “interested in learning more about ADVANCE,” and thirty-eight percent responded that they thought “it just sounded fun and interesting.” It should be noted that respondents were able to select more than one option in this item so totals may not add up to 100%. This item was also cross-tabulated with position and there were no statistically significant differences in the reasons different faculty members attended (Figure 5).

Figure 5. Why were you interested in attending this event? (N=92)*

*Percent of all who answered this item who were in faculty position.
When asked to rate their satisfaction with different elements of the event, overall the majority of attendees responded that they were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with all of the identified aspects. Specifically, 84% of attendees were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the organization of the event. Sixty-nine percent responded that they were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the opportunity to expand their professional network.” When asked to rate their satisfaction with the “opportunity to learn about research across campus,” 37% of respondents selected “neutral,” which was a larger percentage than the other categories (Figure 6). When this question was cross-tabulated with position held, there were no notable differences for the above ratings.

Figure 6. How satisfied were you with the following aspects of the event (N=91)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to learn about research across campus</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to expand my professional network</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of the event</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bars do not add up to 100% because attendees could select more than one option.

Answers to the above item were broken down by position to get a clearer picture of how different faculty members viewed the event. The results showed that full professors were the most ‘dissatisfied’ (N=4) and ‘neutral’ (N=14) with the opportunity to learn about research across campus (Figure 7), and the opportunity to expand my professional network (Figure 8), ‘dissatisfied’ (N=2) and ‘neutral’ (N=13). Given that no attendees responded that they were dissatisfied with the organization of the event, this item was not broken down by faculty position. It should be noted that there were more full professors in attendance than the other faculty positions so the percentages above give a better overall picture of how the event was perceived across faculty rank.
When asked if they had met people at the reception that they felt would expand their professional network, 76% of the women attendees responded “yes,” and 24% responded “no.” This item was cross-tabulated with position and there were no notable differences in responses based on position. As a follow-up question attendees were asked to identify which aspect of the event they expected would be the most helpful to their professional life. Of the 92 survey respondents, 55 added a comment to this section. Responses were coded by themes and four main themes
emerged: Networking/Meeting Colleagues, Gaining Information/Research Updates, Collaboration and Learning about Wider Campus Community, and Meeting with Administration/Chancellor. More than half of the attendees (70%) said that the opportunity for networking was the most helpful to them professionally. Responses are displayed in Figure 9. Verbatim responses to this open ended item are in Appendix B.

Figure 9. What aspects of this event do you expect will be most helpful to you professionally? (N=55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking/Meeting fellow researchers, faculty</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Research Updates/ADVANCE</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/Campus Community</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Chancellor/Admin</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendees were asked to identify how likely they were to attend future ADVANCE events at UC Davis and the majority responded that they were “likely” (33%) or “very likely” (47%). Figure 10 displays the entire range of responses for this item by percentage.
Attendees were also asked to identify topics they would like to see addressed in future UC Davis ADVANCE events. A list of potential items was developed, and more than one category could be selected. Figure 11 shows the percentage of attendees who selected each topic.
This item was also broken down by faculty position and there were several areas of agreement across ranks, for example both Professors (59%) and Assistant Professors (35%) identified ‘Meeting Writing Deadlines’ as an important topic (Figure 12).

Figure 12: Identified topics of interest by faculty position (N=46)*

*Percents represent the number of individuals in this faculty position who checked this item.

Respondents could also write in a topic for this item and ten of the respondents wrote in a response. The responses were varied and included the following examples:

- “challenges to communication with colleagues and supervising faculty”
- “how to convince older white male colleagues that diversity in hiring matters”
- “resolving work-related conflicts with male colleagues”
- “specific issues facing women of color”

Attendees were asked via an open-ended item to provide their ideas about how they would improve future ADVANCE events at UC Davis. Forty attendees responded to this item and their open ended responses were coded for themes. Ten attendees responded that they thought there should be fewer speeches and more time for networking. Another nine attendees suggested that
there be some structure in place to facilitate networking at events. Eight of the responses focused on including Non-STEM faculty women in ADVANCE events (Figure 13). Please see Appendix C for verbatim responses to this item.

Figure 13. Ideas to improve UC Davis ADVANCE events (N=40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great job / Continue</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus events on targeted skills/challenges for URM</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize humanities faculty / Non-STEM Faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure to facilitate networking with new people</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer Speeches / More Networking</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, event attendees were overall pleased to have an opportunity to gather together and network. Many took the time to make specific suggestions for future events, including having more of them and increasing opportunities for networking. Given the fact that only about 1% of all UCD female faculty attended the event, it is difficult to claim these responses are representative of all women faculty. However, it is clear that there is interest on campus among women in these types of events and in the networking and mentorship supports under development by ADVANCE.
Appendix A
Women Faculty Reception Post-Event Survey

1. How did you learn about this event?
   - [ ] UC Davis ADVANCE Invitation
   - [ ] Heard about it from a friend/colleague
   - [ ] Other (please specify)

2. Did you attend this event with a colleague or friend?
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Yes, I brought a colleague with me.
   - [ ] Yes, a colleague invited me to attend with them.

3. Why were you interested in attending this event?
   - [ ] I wanted to meet other women faculty.
   - [ ] It just sounded fun and interesting.
   - [ ] I was interested in learning more about ADVANCE.
   - [ ] Other (please specify)

4. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of the event:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organization of the event</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity to expand my professional network</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity to learn about research across campus</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Did you meet people at this event that you feel will expand your professional and social networks at UC Davis?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

6. What aspects of this event do you expect will be most helpful to you in your professional life?
   - [ ]

---
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7. How likely are you to attend future UC Davis ADVANCE events?

- Very Unlikely
- Unlikely
- Undecided
- Likely
- Very Likely

8. Check all topics you would like to see addressed in UC Davis ADVANCE events:

- developing leadership skills
- mentorship
- obtaining grant funding
- negotiation (e.g., for salary, resources, etc.)
- teaching strategies and resources
- work-life balance
- laboratory management
- obtaining patents
- meeting writing deadlines

Other (please specify):

9. Please share your ideas for ways to improve UC Davis ADVANCE events:


10. Because ADVANCE is committed to supporting faculty diversity, we would appreciate it if you would provide us with some information about you so we can track how successful we are in bringing together diverse groups from across campus. Please identify your UC Davis affiliation below:

- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Academic Federation Faculty
- Administration
- Staff
- University Affiliate (ex. Consultant/Program participant)
- Postdoc/Professional Researcher
- Student
- Other (please specify)

11. Please identify the college in which you are employed or study:

- College of Agriculture & Environmental Sciences
- College of Biological Science
- College of Engineering
- L&S: Division of Math & Physical Sciences
- L&S: Division of Social Sciences
- L&S: Division of Humanities, Arts & Cultural Studies
- Graduate School of Management
- School of Education
- School of Law
- School of Medicine
- School of Nursing
- School of Veterinary Science
- Other (please specify)

12. Please identify your gender:

- Male
- Female
13. Please check the ethnic/racial group(s) below that best describes you:

- African American/African
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Hispanic/Latino
- Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian
- White/Caucasian, non-Hispanic

Other (please specify)
Appendix B

Verbatim responses to: “What aspects of this event do you expect will be most helpful to your professional life?”

- Understanding the relationship of my college in relation to the structure of the university as a whole.
- Simply an awareness of new faculty, names to faces, is incredibly valuable. This greatly improves the ease to reach out to other women professionally or personally.
- Meet with Dean of Ag and discussed new programs
- Opportunity to provide input via tablets and markers
- Networking for future professional advantages
- There were very few physicians
- Probably nothing
- Connections to others on campus
- Meeting and being inspired by other female faculty
- Probably none
- Reconnecting with other women faculty I have met in meetings/committees/etc.
- Randomly meeting faculty I would not have met otherwise
- Having time to talk with colleagues I rarely see
- Touch base with other female faculty I rarely get to see
- Mentorship program for junior women faculty members
- More time to meet and converse would be useful
- Learning about programs; networking
- The opportunity to network. Actually I got to meet people I had only previously corresponded with
- Meeting new people
- Learn about women in research areas across campus
• Meeting faculty
• Meeting senior faculty who have gone through the tenure process
• Meeting members of the administration of UCD.
• Ability to interact with women from other parts of the Schools and Colleges
• Networking
• Both the chance to network and hearing about the initiatives
• Reconnected with some faculty that I already knew but do not see very often
• None
• Meeting a new colleague in our department!
• Bridges science and humanities
• Hearing about CAMPOS
• Expand my social networks at UC Davis
• Talking to women from other departments and learning more about ADVANCE. It is also motivational.
• Just seeing the large group of women supporting each other was enough!
• A chance to make new contacts, and reconnect with people I've met at other events on campus
• Keeping in touch with senior colleagues
• Meeting Chancellor Katehi
• Networking
• Meeting other faculty
• Meet potential collaborators
• Not sure yet
• It was great to hear about women who have been recognized for their work (Mau Stanton's comments).

• It would have been better if the people mentioned had been in attendance. Maybe in the future make sure you have them there if they are going to be mentioned. It gave the impression that those doing well don't take time to interact with their female colleagues and that there were more important things to do in order to be successful. Mau even said, "she is probably off writing a paper".

• Better networking. Would have loved for it to be a little bit longer

• Having an opportunity to meet other women who work on campus

• Meeting other women faculty

• Meeting people that will expand my professional & social network

• 1. expanding potential research networks: Finding colleagues in other colleges that have similar research interests; 2. re-connecting with colleagues that strengthen collegial/friendship/support networks.

• Networking for cross-disciplinary research efforts

• Cross university research opportunities, integration into broader campus community

• Personal contacts

• Networking, gaining new info about what's going on with STEM

• Opportunity to cross paths with researchers I would otherwise meet

• Updates from faculty I know and meeting some faculty I did not know

• Meeting women who are decision makers in their programs, departments, fields

• Information
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Verbatim Responses to: “Please share your ideas for ways to improve UC Davis ADVANCE events.”

- As a member of a non-STEM discipline, I felt that the event was not relevant to my experiences as a woman faculty member. I also feel as though this event could have provided a good opportunity to open up networking among women of color, but this did not happen. Finally, while the issue of creating gender diversity was addressed at length, the issue of increasing racial and ethnic diversity was not. The two issues are related, and not addressing the latter issue alienates those who are both women and people of color.

- Maybe areas to gather by type of interest?

- More inclusion of social sciences professors.

- The venue and the food were wonderful. Better than the previous Friday’s The Power of Red event (the food especially). Because there were two set ups with food and drinks, people tended to stay in one area instead of “mingling.”

- More arts and humanities faculty who can speak and elevate the importance of the arts and humanities on our campus. We feel like servants to the agenda of growing the university. What I am hearing is not an endorsement of excellence as we define it in the humanities. I think some of the issues are different for faculty in the sciences and humanities, but it would be great to figure out some of the commonalities, as well. I think this event did a terrific job of making everyone feel welcome!

- I am a lecturer. This event was more for people on their way to tenure track. I thought it might be interesting.

- It was great. Wine and food always welcome. Again, the informal mingling time is useful.

- A greater emphasis on networking, rather than formal presentation, would be helpful. Of course the first time, it’s necessary to frame the program. But in future, networking could be a larger fraction of meeting time.

- It would be helpful if we knew who was new- perhaps a different color border on the nametag? so we could make sure to go talk to them.

- Fewer long speeches...more interactive time.

- Greater focus on issues impacting women of color.

- Give us a heads up if there more to the meeting than a mixer/reception.

- Define the acronym STEM.

- Target the key issues or challenging faced by the women faculty and URMs about publishing work in high impact journals, increase the presence or impact of their work or contributions
I think that there are plenty of other groups doing grant info, teaching info, writing, patents. I think that Advance should focus on new things it can bring to the table like targeted leadership skills, mentorship, negotiation and balance.

- Less podium talking and more opportunities to meet faculty and build network, specifically with a semi-organized ice-breaker or speed-networking events. Although informal mingling is nice, it ends up that people talk to other people they already know. While it is nice to talk to friends and colleagues, these events would be more useful if they helped us meet other faculty and promoted interactions between senior and junior colleagues.

- I think the 'pep rally' talks could disappear and no one would miss them. I mean calling us 'gals' is a bit insulting for professional accomplished women. I also think it would be more balanced if time were spent introducing new women faculty over 'whoohooing' over accolades for a few folks. The former might jump-start their networking groups; the latter might just reinforce what we all feel 'yes, these are the expectations in our new incentive-based budget/academic environment.

- Please reach out to HARCS faculty.

- I liked all the statistics Stanton gave. The other speeches could have been a bit shorter. Some structure could have been set up to facilitate/encourage people to talk to each other. (Like putting blue/red/green dots on nametags and saying find someone else w/ a blue dot, etc.) maybe color code name tags by department -- I had several awkward and pointless conversations with women whose fields were too different from mine to connect much.

- Rotating between large groups like this and smaller groups (e.g., college based).

- Have them more often, and maybe include group discussions on specific issues

- Facilitate people meeting each other; mostly people talked to others they knew, and it was hard to break into "cliques."

- More time for socialization, less speeches.

- Put a sign on the outside of the entrance.

- Keep on, you are doing great. I wish there was a better way to address unconscious bias (rampant as far as I can tell). There is also a phenomenon happening in a lot of asst prof searches in which some very experienced people apply. We are then comparing postdocs who have had their Ph.D. for 2 years or so (a lot of women in this category) to people who have been out for a decade and run large research programs elsewhere. I have noticed the latter are often male. Then our young women candidates end up second and we hire the male. I would love to see the campus and ADVANCE tackle this too.

- Longer time for interaction = sub-sections for topics of interest.

- A little more effort to mingle - maybe not an ice breaker...that is too contrived...it was a good move to have the women who were new raise their hand. People came up to me after that even though I had already met some people.
• Less speech making.

• Continue holding activities campus wide (Sacramento & Davis).

• Please rearrange the space . . . . those of us who arrived a little late couldn't squeeze past the podium and walls into the audience's floor space, and couldn't catch the Chancellor's talk because of the echo (backwards) in the speaker system.

• Maybe have nametags with a little more information so that it's easier to find things to talk about.
• Keep it social, with talks from key people (Stanton, etc.)

• More focus/acknowledgement on the small but important accomplishments of younger (all) faculty, such getting a paper published, getting a merit or promotion, etc...

• Verbally include academic federation/lecturers when saying faculty: "assistant professors, associate professors, and professors."

• There was a bit too much talking at the beginning and not enough focus on introducing people; it felt a bit crowded.

• Involve female professors in committees of interest for advance program, offer them some (partial) release from their standard duties as incentive, this will bring them together during discussions.

• A little less time spent by the chancellor (or more focused, on-point talking, not off the top of her head). Her long speech cut considerably into the networking time and was not particularly useful or informative.
Appendix D:
Summary of 2014 ADVANCE Retreat Survey Results

Prepared by ADVANCE Internal Evaluators

Question 1: Which of the following aspects of the 2014 ADVANCE retreat did you find most valuable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearing updates from each of the initiatives about what they are doing.</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about the internal and external evaluation.</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building activities and coming together as a group.</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2: I wish we had more time at the retreat to: (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work on cross-initiative planning and collaboration.</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meet in small groups for focused discussions.</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>share our ideas about future ADVANCE activities.</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 3: What are your recommendations for the organization, timing and content of future ADVANCE meetings (check all that apply).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We should have monthly co-director meetings.</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should have monthly cross-initiative meetings (multiple initiatives coming together with a specific focus).</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should have frequent initiative meetings, as necessary, and a yearly retreat.</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should have biannual retreats.</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should have monthly meetings with the Chancellor and Administration.</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other responses:**

- **answered question**: 15
- **skipped question**: 6
1. Monthly meetings with Chancellor and Admin are important to remain focused with the mission/vision. Cross initiative meetings also important. Co-directors meetings important for communication.
2. Cross-initiative meetings every 2-3 months and an annual retreat.
3. I don't think we need to meet every month with co-directors but certainly more frequently than we do now.
4. 3 to 4 cross-initiative meetings per year; bi-monthly initiative meetings
5. Every other month: co-directors one month, cross-initiative focus the next.
6. We need to communicate better with each other and with the rest of campus and with the broader community.
7. Quarterly co-director meetings
**Question 4:** Our initiative could use more support from ADVANCE with the following: (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicating with other initiatives and committee members.</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting our ideas in to action.</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing resources and tools to accomplish our goals.</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking progress we make on our established goals and outcomes.</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting ADVANCE activities and information on the website.</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 17
skipped question 4

**Comments:**
Supportive behind the scenes management.
We have a lot of support.
Question 5: I would like more information about: (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCE programs at other Universities</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research related to our ADVANCE Program goals</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional/Administrative activities related to ADVANCE</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to work with existing campus organizations</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 14
skipped question: 7

Comments: What the goals of each initiative are, and how they are being met.
Question 6: What do you think the role of our Internal Advisory Board should be as we move forward?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

1. Provide more written feedback and directions to initiative leadership
2. To consult with as necessary related to specific programs (design and implementation); as primary contacts for dissemination of information about programs.
3. Help insure our programs are successfully carried out throughout the colleges
4. Feedback on whether the activities planned under different initiatives are effective in achieving our goals & milestones.
5. Helping initiatives stay on track
6. Organizing one-hour monthly meetings for all program participants to update folks on current developments -- a sort of monthly news briefing
7. Checking that we are on track to meet our goals. Checking that the various initiatives are doing useful work.
8. To keep us on task and to help us plan for attaining our goals.
9. Evaluate the progress, identify collectively collaborative opportunities and suggest the connectivity
10. Moving forward and supporting the transformation action steps to sustain the mission of the program
11. No clue!
12. To keep the initiatives on track and realistic
13. 1) learn about all the activities that different initiatives are doing, 2) evaluate how best to combine and streamline the activities and 3) look forward to how to institutionalize activities that are being tested and initiated within Advance.
Question 7: What do you think the role of the External Advisory Board should be as we move forward?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
1. Helping us figure out what is working and what is not working so that we direct our energies effectively and strategically.
2. Advise on possible avenues to explore, or not, based on experiences elsewhere.
3. To give us outside perspective of how we are progressing towards our goals.
4. Advice and suggestions for future progress and feedback on how we are stacking up in comparison to other programs.
5. To review the implementation steps that have occurred to date and provide recommendations to strengthen the program.
6. I would like the external advisory board to give us their institutional perspective on what we are doing.
7. To provide a broader perspective and generate ideas based on what has been successful elsewhere.
8. To bring advice about what has and hasn't worked in other Advance initiatives to make sure we are not re-exploring already tested ideas.
9. We need to have this group more engaged, visible and active. We need to bring them to campus twice a year for feedback moving forward.
10. To consult with us about specific programs.
11. Make us aware of other known challenges/issues that our ADVANCE program is not and should be addressing.
12. Be our link to NSF; help us stay on track.

Please provide any other recommendations or feedback below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It is a great group. Increased communications and collaborations will be great for achieving the ADVANCE goals.
2. Really need to communicate across initiatives so we are not working at cross purposes. Important to understand how the initiatives are working together to support each other and not remain in silos.
3. It is really time for the initiatives to work together. I think some of the plans are misplaced between the groups. For example I think leadership activities should be in CAMPOS and not mentoring since they are so Latina specific.

4. Need to use the website more as a communication tool of what we are doing and create a resource database. I heard about reports and data analyses that seemed far along but that I have never seen - we should all know what the research is showing.

5. Need to focus on bringing in more experts to assist in fully appreciating implicit bias and organizational culture bias.

6. Develop a more formal relationship with the Academic Senate so we can have more rapid consultation before putting changes into practice.

7. Would recommend pulling together data on progress and timelines and evaluations and just providing as a handout with very brief description. Use the time together as an opportunity for discussion.

8. An opportunity for women STEM faculty from different colleges/depts to share their experience and learn from each other.


10. Great event
Appendix E:

ADVANCE Initiative Committee Member Survey
Prepared by Advance Internal Evaluators, May 2014

In May of 2014, a survey was sent to faculty serving as committee members on one of the five UC Davis ADVANCE Initiatives. The ADVANCE Initiatives are: the Inclusive Campus Climate Committee, the Policies and Practices Review Committee, the Mentorship and Networking Committee, the Center for Advancement of Multicultural Perspectives on Science (CAMPOS), and the Research Initiatives. The goal of the survey was to gather formative data about how the committee felt their group was making progress towards established goals and the supports provided or needed to be effective. The survey was sent to all twenty-five of the ADVANCE Initiative Committee Members. Eighteen of the 25 committee members completed the survey. This is a fairly high response rate of 72%, especially given the extremely busy nature of university faculty members lives (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Survey Responses (N=18)

![Survey Responses Chart]

The first question on the survey asked committee members to rate their agreement with a series of statements about the nature and quality of the work their committee was doing. The respondents all either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” with the three statements. One committee member did “disagree” with the statement “I feel that my time working as a committee member has been well spent.” Responses to this item are displayed in Figure 2.
Figure 2. Committee Members Ratings of Their Initiative’s Work (N=18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The work our group is doing is going to make a difference to the overall outcomes of the ADVANCE grant.</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work the ADVANCE initiatives are doing will have a long term impact on UC Davis policies, practices, and campus climate.</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my time working as a committee member has been well spent.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When given the option to add a comment, one committee member wrote, “*I am concerned because I feel like some committees are working hard, but other committees are not doing useful work.*”

The next item on the survey asked committee members to identify the most useful supports they had received from the ADVANCE leadership team. The majority of committee members (56%) selected the statement “Providing a big picture overview of ADVANCE activities.” The next most commonly selected item (50%) was, “Providing scheduling assistance for our initiative’s meetings and events.” The item with the fewest selections was, “Keeping us on track to meet ADVANCE program reporting requirements.” Committee members were able to select more than one statement in this item (Figure 3).
Figure 3. Committee Members Ratings of Useful Supports from ADVANCE (N=16)

Two committee members added comments to the open-ended response section on this item:

- Managing the specific committee activities.
- My committee’s leaders have been committed and supportive, but it is less clear to me if there is a good level of support from other nominal project leaders.

Committee members were asked to select different types of additional support they would like to receive from the ADVANCE leadership team. Six statements were listed on this item, along with an “other” text box to write in additional suggestions. The majority of committee members (75%) selected the statement, “Communicating with other initiatives and committee members.” The other item that was selected most frequently (62%) was, “Providing updates about the activities of the other initiatives.” The other statements were selected by less than 38% of the respondents (Figure 4).
One committee member provided the following comment on this item “I have heard not only from our committee but also from other committee chairs that the support from project leaders is lacking. If chairs have to do all the work to put the ideas into action, it is not clear to me what the project leaders are for.”

When asked what types of additional information they would like to receive on the ADVANCE Program, committee members selected two items most frequently (71%). These were receiving information regarding, “ADVANCE programs at other Universities,” and “Institutional/Administrative activities related to ADVANCE.” Respondents were able to select more than one statement in this item. Responses to this item are displayed in Figure 5.
Committee members were asked to rate their agreement with statements related to the quality of the work their initiative was doing, the time required to participate, and their desire to be more involved. All committee members who responded to the survey either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” with the statements related to how well their group works together, how organized their committee is, and how effective the group is in accomplishing established goals. The most varied responses came to the item, “Participating on this committee is very time intensive” with 61% of respondents either “strongly agreeing” or “agreeing” and another 33% “disagreeing.” The majority of respondents (72%) disagreed with the statement, “I would like to take on more responsibility on this committee.” Responses to this item are displayed in Figure 6.

Figure 6. Committee Members Ratings of Their Initiative’s Work (N=18)

Initiative committee members were asked to identify what they felt their initiative’s biggest successes were over the past year. The majority (56%) of committee members said that “We have gained momentum as a group,” was their biggest success. Respondents could only select one of the statements for this item (Figure 7). When given the option to comment, one member wrote, “Our first goal has taken months to develop, so I did not check the ‘accomplished goals’ bullet because what we are trying to do is hard and takes time.”
When asked to identify what the biggest challenge had been for their initiative over the past year, the majority of committee members selected, “Finding time to meet as a group.” The other item that was selected by 35% of the committee members was, “Establishing a clear plan.” Three respondents included comments for this item and the specific responses were:

- None
- We are faculty, this is always a problem.
- Once we got focused, it went well.
The final item on the survey asked committee members to provide any additional feedback or recommendations. The specific comments for this item are listed below. Several provided positive feedback. One of the comments was feedback regarding the consistency and quality of communication between leadership and initiative members. Another comment questioned the leadership qualities of individuals taking leadership roles on initiatives.

Recommendations and Feedback:

- *Push the legal limits for hiring to obtain more gender and other URMs.*
- *Our team works very well together and this has been a great experience meeting other like-minded faculty in related fields.*
- *I am concerned because I have seen that some of the personnel who are nominally slated to provide leadership and support do not seem to be providing either of these in an effective way. I have heard this echoed by others, including by a chair of a committee other than the one I am in. We need to have effective people for this initiative to work.*
- *Communication from leadership team to initiative members and directors is not always timely or consistent.*
- *This is a wonderful program. Keep it up!*  

**Summary**

Overall, committee members responded that the work their group is doing is valuable and that the goals of the ADVANCE project are important. Survey respondents noted that the ADVANCE leadership team had provided useful supports to their initiative in terms of providing information about the ADVANCE Program and providing assistance with scheduling meetings and events. Committee members’ responses also highlighted a need for additional support in communicating effectively with other initiatives and getting more frequent and regular updates about the work other initiatives are doing. The survey ratings of the management and leadership of the initiatives was positive, with committee members agreeing that their group works well together, is run effectively, and that the work has a clear direction. Overall, committee members responded that their group had experienced success in gaining momentum over the past year. The primary challenge that was identified was finding time to meet as a group.
Appendix F:

ADVANCE STEM Chair Survey Summary

*Prepared by ADVANCE Internal Evaluators, May 2014*

In early May, a brief survey was sent to all ADVANCE STEM Department Chairs as part of the internal evaluation activities to gauge how familiar the Chairs were with ADVANCE Program activities and initiatives. The goal of the survey was to gather baseline data on the reach of the ADVANCE Program and initiatives across STEM colleges. The survey was sent via STEM College Deans to all of their Department Chairs. The Deans sent the survey link to 73 STEM Chairs and 66 Chairs responded (90% response rate). The initial question asked if Chairs were familiar with the ADVANCE Program. If Chairs responded “no” to this item they skipped ahead to general questions about the ADVANCE program. If Chairs answered “yes” they were directed to additional items related to their experiences and interactions with ADVANCE. Survey responses are summarized below.

Chairs were asked to identify the College they were working in and fifty-five of the sixty-six Chairs provided this information. The list of STEM colleges and respondents by college is listed in Table 1. The number of chairs who responded by college was calculated using a list of chairs provided by the ADVANCE Program. Chairs were also asked to identify their department; however given that there is only one Chair for each department, this information is not included in the survey summary to insure confidentiality for the survey respondents.

Table 1. Number and Percentage of Respondents by STEM College (N=55)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Agricultural &amp; Environmental Sciences</th>
<th>Biological Sciences</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Math &amp; Physical Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>School of Veterinary Medicine</th>
<th>School of Medicine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the sixty-six STEM Chairs who completed the survey, 40 (61%) responded that they were familiar with the ADVANCE Program at UC Davis and 26 (39%) responded that they were not familiar with the program (Figure 1).
The number and percentage of Chairs responding “yes” to the question, *Are your familiar with the ADVANCE Program at UC Davis?* by College is displayed in Table 2. This table does not include all “yes” responses as 10 of the Chairs that answered “yes” did not include their college affiliation in the survey. The College of Biological Sciences, Engineering, and Math and Physical Sciences had 100% of Chairs responding that they were familiar with ADVANCE. The percentage of the Chairs responding that they were familiar with the ADVANCE Program was lowest in the School of Medicine (12%) and the Division of Social Sciences (37%) in the College of Letters and Sciences. The School of Medicine is located on its own campus in Sacramento, so it is not surprising that there was less knowledge of the program within this school.

Table 2. Familiarity with ADVANCE by College (N=40) (% of Chairs in College who Responded “yes”)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Agricultural &amp; Environmental Sciences</th>
<th>Biological Sciences</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Math &amp; Physical Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>School of Veterinary Medicine</th>
<th>School of Medicine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Accuracy of percentages may be impacted by Chairs who did not provide their college affiliation.
If the respondent was not familiar with the ADVANCE Program a skip pattern was employed to direct them to a later point in the survey, skipping the questions about the specific ADVANCE initiatives. The rationale for including skip logic was that if the Chair did not know what the ADVANCE Program was, they should not be asked more detailed questions about the various initiative activities. There is the potential that they knew about one of the initiatives but did not know that it was part of the ADVANCE Program, thus under estimating the true reach of ADVANCE. However, several of the ADVANCE initiatives are similar to pre-existing programs provided by other UCD offices or at the department level (such as search committee training on unconscious bias, new faculty mentoring, etc.) which would introduce some ambiguity in interpreting the initiative familiarity responses.

Chairs were asked if they had any interactions with the ADVANCE Program and 62% responded yes, and 38% responded that they had not had direct interactions with ADVANCE. Eleven Chairs skipped this item. Respondents were asked to briefly describe their interactions with the ADVANCE Program in an open-ended item. Fifteen Chairs wrote in responses to this item and several exemplars are listed below. All responses to this item can be found in Appendix A.

- I nominated a faculty candidate for a CAMPOS scholar.
- I have received e-mail information and have attended a reception about the program.
- Just casual descriptions from current players.
- Workshops and meetings on campus related to the program.

The survey asked these STEM Chairs to rate their familiarity with each of the ADVANCE Initiatives. The ratings for each of the initiatives are displayed in Figure 2. Overall, the Chairs had some familiarity with all of the initiatives. The Inclusive Campus Climate Initiative received the largest percentage of Chairs responding that they had either “had direct contact with this initiative” or that they “know a lot about this initiative.” (It is important to note that the initial version of the survey used an incorrect acronym for this initiative, which may have resulted in an underestimate of Chairs’ familiarity with the initiative.) Over 60% of the Chairs responded that they either, “have heard about this initiative but I don’t know much about it,” or “I do not know about this initiative” when asked about the Research Initiatives, the Policies and Practices Review Initiative, and the CAMPOS Initiative
Figure 2. Please rate your familiarity with the following ADVANCE initiatives (N=33)*

*In the survey link, the STEAD committee was incorrectly labeled the STRIDE committee so data for this item may not be completely accurate.

Among the STEM Chairs who responded that they knew about ADVANCE, when asked if any of their department faculty were working on one of the ADVANCE Initiatives, half (50%) of the Chairs responded “yes” and half (50%) responded “no.”

All respondents were asked if they would like to learn more about the ADVANCE Program at UC Davis. Fifty-four of the Chairs responded and 17 (24%) skipped this item. The majority (87%) of Chairs who responded answered “yes” to this question. Six of the Chairs wrote in a comment in the comment box for this item. The responses are listed below:

- I don’t know what it is.
- Don’t know.
- How is it connected to social sciences?
- More about the programs I don’t know about.
- The website provides excellent details and we have go-to experts for advice at all times.
- My chair-ship ends in two months.
The final item on the survey asked Chairs to provide any other feedback or recommendations regarding the ADVANCE Program. Four Chairs wrote in a suggestion. Responses are listed below:

- *We probably need to know more about this again. Many initiatives on the Davis campus don’t reach the Sacramento campus.*
- *It would be very helpful to have a clear policy with regard to what is being promised for CAMPOS scholars. The initial information was that there would be some start up money but that is no longer the case. I believe that makes it hard on the departments.*
- *We need more explicit information on programs to facilitate recruiting faculty that will increase diversity.*
- *I hope the program will focus on tangible results in hiring minority faculty in STEM.*

**STEM Chair Survey Summary**

The response rate from the STEM College Chairs was very high. This is due in part to the ADVANCE Faculty Co-Director reaching out to enlist the help of the STEM Deans in sending the survey to their Chairs. The information from the survey provides valuable feedback about STEM Chairs’ overall knowledge and interactions with the ADVANCE at this point in the program. Although the majority (61%) of STEM Chairs was familiar with the ADVANCE Program, there was also a fairly large proportion of STEM Chairs (39%) who were not familiar with the program. This suggests room for growth in awareness by providing more opportunities to communicate with and educate Chairs about the program goals and activities.

STEM Chairs’ familiarity and interactions with ADVANCE initiatives varied. As would be expected, Chairs were least familiar with the Research Initiatives because the research projects are the most ‘internal’ component of the ADVANCE grant. Similarly, the Policies and Practices Review Initiative has spent the majority of their time during this past year focused on reviewing current policies and practices that directly impact hiring, retention, and promotion of under-represented minority women in STEM Colleges and are only now beginning to disseminate the results of their activities and actively seek feedback from the campus community. As all of the initiatives expand their programs and communication, awareness across campus will no doubt increase.
Appendix A

Please briefly describe your interactions with the ADVANCE Program. (N=15)

- I am a member of the STEAD committee.
- Nominated a faculty candidate for CAMPOS scholar.
- Attended presentation, CAMPOS candidate.
- I nominated a faculty candidate as a CAMPOS scholar.
- Gatherings.
- Member of the RSAB.
- I have received e-mail information and have attended a reception about the program.
- Just casual descriptions from current players.
- Department member serves on committee. VP regularly reports on it.
- Launch committee for new junior faculty member.
- I am on the mentoring committee.
- LAUNCH Program.
- Attended workshops, etc.
- Hiring of minority junior faculty in our college.
- Workshops and meetings on campus related to the program.