

# Evaluation of the NSF ADVANCE Catalyst project at Murray State University

## Differences and Deficits Affecting Women STEM Faculty: Creating a Framework for Change at a Rural Public University

Prepared by Susan D. Wiediger, Ph.D., Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Fall 2016

This report is based on discussions and observations during a site visit on Friday, 16 September 2016, as well as documents provided before and during that visit or available via the internet. This report is a formative assessment in the early stages of the project.

### *Executive Summary*

Clear assignment of responsibility and good communications mean that the team is making timely progress on all aspects of the project. The timing of the award was particularly fortuitous. Receiving the funding information from the NSF in May allowed the team to put in a very productive summer and start the new academic year with plans and organization well underway. Several components have been accelerated (policy review, existing data analysis, peer mentor circles, survey) while others remain on the anticipated schedule (site visits, speakers) as suits the

more detailed information about programs of support at 18 ADVANCE institutions has been compiled. This review also contributes to Objective 2, although such a purpose was not explicitly included in that objective. There is a great deal of fuel for reflection in the information gathered. As a new department chair and as a member of the President's Commission on Diversity and Inclusion, Dr. Zhang is well positioned to bring forward for discussion information obtained from this review.

## 2. Analysis of Existing Data

The Murray State Office of Institutional Research and Office of Institutional Diversity, Equity, and Access are showing excellent cooperation and have already provided an initial set of data to Dr. Maeve McCarthy, who is the lead for this part of the project. The structure of MSU means that some departments fall into more than one analysis category – for example a primary difference between the STEM category and the JCSET category of departments is the addition of Agriculture and Psychology departments to the STEM group. The team is already reflecting on the data obtained so far, which focuses on percentages within the various groups. Future data sets are planned that will provide a finer grain of detail about hiring pools.

There may be challenges associated with figuring out how to get the information that could answer the questions sparked by the initial data and other grant initiatives (e.g., tracking individuals to determine retention in the tenure track).

## 3. Focus Group Interviews and Individual Interviews

Institutional Research Board (IRB) paperwork for the interview portion of the project has been completed. The team has moved away from focus groups due to concerns about whether focus groups would remove too many people from the

4. Survey

The IRB approval for the survey and discussions with the Cornell Survey Research Institute are well underway. Dr. Paula Waddill, who leads the survey work, has reviewed surveys used at other ADVANCE institutions. Using primarily questions that have also been used elsewhere strengthens the ability to compare the data obtained at MSU

Dr. McCarthy is currently in discussions with the first planned speaker, (Dr. Joan Herbers of Ohio State University) and the team about the most useful structure for her visit. There is good attention to the calendar to distribute the workshops to provide an ongoing awareness of the project topic.

### 3. Meetings at MSU

Each member of the research team has roles on campus that contribute to the dissemination of project findings. This will work synergistically with the planned meetings with outside speakers. The active participation on the team of Dr. Steve Cobb has been important to helping to keep the ADVANCE project in the awareness of higher administration.

*Objective 3:*  
Improve campus climate by establishing a sustainable mentoring program for women STEM faculty

Two activities contribute to this objective:

#### 1. Peer Mentoring Circles

This aspect of the project also benefited significantly from the early funding decision. Over the summer mentors were identified. Multiple training sessions were led by Dr. Christine Grant from North Carolina State University via Google Hangouts. Materials were prepared to advertise the mentoring circles. This positioned the team to be ready to implement the circles as the academic year began. There has already been a reception to initiate the program. The mentors are positive about the training and are thinking about how to address issues that may arise in the circles, such as confidentiality, power concerns, etc. Response has been strong enough that three circles will be formed and start to meet

*Other observations*

Changes to advisory board were made from that originally proposed due to NSF request. There is now an external and an internal advisory board rather than a single combined board. A meeting schedule has been set up that will provide the team with frequent interactions – more often than many projects, actually.

Changes to the project timeline are consistent with earlier than anticipated funding. Policy review and existing data moved earlier, as did survey development. Mentoring circles got a jump start on the academic year. Other things, such as site visits and speakers, were not accelerated, as it makes sense to carry out those components when more people are present.

MSU shows some positive trends in the data so far. Initial thoughts on the existing data show some positive trends that the team can build on in a supportive way – “Let’s find out what we have been doing and make sure to continue it and get better”.

The mentoring programs may build a network and sense of community among STEM departments that could overcome the physically dispersed nature of the departments on the MSU campus. Should it prove beneficial, the research team and the mentors are already considering how the program might be institutionalized.

Murray State University provides a good rural perspective to complement other ADVANCE projects. The team has good strengths and is working well together. Connections to and support from administration and the broader MSU community are present and being nourished.