UCI NSF ADVANCE REPORT

IN RESPONSE TO THE NSF SITE VISIT TEAM (2004)
Judy Stepan-Norris, Ph.d.

We appreciate the commentary and suggestions offered in the "Summary of the Report of the NSF Site Visit Team (SVT)." After carefully considering the report, we have prepared a response that outlines (1) what we consider to be the crucial components of the UCI ADVANCE effort, (2) the internal assessments we have completed up to this point, (3) additional internal assessments that we have planned, and (4) plans for an external evaluation. We hope that this report satisfies the concerns raised by the SVT.

At the end of three years of operation, the SVT expected to find more evidence that "key interventions would be established, that significant progress would be made toward understanding crucial policies in need of change, that assessment processes would be in place, that broad campus understanding of the ADVANCE program would be achieved, and that plans would be formulated for dissemination of good practices and continuation of programs past the funding period." Although these factors are inextricably intertwined, we address them in turn, and refer back to earlier information in order to avoid repetition.

Before we begin, we would like to draw attention to a key feature that sets UCI's ADVANCE Program apart from others: it seeks to improve gender equity across the entire university, rather than just in particular schools or academic programs. For example, while other ADVANCE Programs focus on the hard sciences, the UCI program, with the help of generous funding from the UCI administration, has established a presence in every school on campus. As such, we are able to address the more general gender equity concerns of women on campus, but it also means that our workload is higher and our resources are spread thinner.

1) Crucial components of the UCI ADVANCE Program

The Establishment of Key Interventions

The UCI ADVANCE program has initiated three major sets of interventions: the establishment of Equity Advisors (EAs) in all schools on campus to deal with recruitment and separations using a one-on-one format; a set of workshops to raise consciousness of gender discrimination issues and to teach strategies to overcome some common problems; and a mentoring program. Each of these interventions has evolved in response to feedback as described below.

Intervention 1: Equity Advisors

As described on the NSF ADVANCE website, "An Equity Advisor is a senior faculty member, appointed as Faculty Assistant to the Dean in their respective schools, who participates in faculty recruiting by approving search strategies and raising awareness of Best Practices. Additionally, they organize faculty development programs, with both formal and informal mentoring, as well as address individual issues raised by women faculty."

During year one of the program, we appointed one Equity Advisor for each school included in the NSF proposal, and the UCI administration added funding for two additional EAs (one in the School of the Arts and the other in Humanities). As mentioned above, this put a representative of the NSF ADVANCE Program in each school on campus. Equity Advisors met periodically to discuss their experiences and progress in their schools. During the first year, they met 2 to 3 times a month, and in later years, they have had one monthly meeting of the full committee, and the Director has had monthly meetings with each Equity Advisor. Equity Advisors also attended numerous awareness workshops on various gender equity issues (including workshops on mentoring, Guerilla Girls, gender differences and biases, negotiations, grant writing, and an OEOD presentation on sexual harassment). The complete package of Equity Advisor training materials will be put on the website in order to enhance dissemination efforts. Early on, the program solicited Dr. Virginia Valian, author of *Why So Slow?* And Principal Investigator of the Hunter College ADVACNE Program to conduct an informal external review of the Equity Advisor system. Dr. Valian suggested that the EA workload was too high. This recommendation to reduce the EA workload was consistent with the discussions we heard at the ADVANCE meetings with Equity Advisors. Many of the Equity Advisors complained that they couldn't complete all of their assigned tasks due to a lack of time. At this point, we decided to appoint an additional EA to most schools. Three schools didn't receive an additional Equity Advisor: Humanities, Arts, and GSM. The first two were the schools originally omitted from grant coverage due to the perception of better gender relations there. The Graduate School of Management didn't receive an additional EA because besides the current Equity Advisor, the ADVANCE Program had a consultant (Dr. Judy Rosener) and former Equity Advisor (Professor Mary Gilley) who now acts as Associate Dean, both of whom expressed willingness to help with ADVANCE efforts in the school. The additions to the other schools seem to have rectified the problems. The Equity Advisors have reported that they now have more time to meet individually with faculty members and search committees. In addition, the mentoring programs, which were stalled in some schools due to inadequate attention, are now on track.

One of the main foci of EAs has been to interact with the recruitment committees in their schools in order to sensitize them to issues that might cause bias against hiring women. The ADVANCE website has essential and recommended reading for recruitment committee chairs and members, the most important of which is "Best Practices for Achieving Diversity in Faculty Recruitment," a copy of which was distributed to each recruitment committee member. Equity Advisors also personally met with most recruitment committee chairs, and discussed the particulars of the search, the availability of women applicants and other underrepresented groups in the various search areas, and

how to maximize the chances for an unbiased selection procedure. Our experience is that this interaction has been valuable in getting more women on recruitment committees. We plan to obtain data on the gender balance of search committees prior to the EAs involvement, and compare them to the numbers of men and women who have served on these committees since the Equity Advisors have been involved.

In anticipation of institutionalizing this interaction, the campus has initiated a form, AP-82, which must be completed before every recruitment committee proceeds with its work. AP-82 requires the following information about the search: specific area of search, names of the chair of the committee along with names of all committee members, a copy of the advertisement, where the ad will be placed, and selection criteria. Before approving each search, Equity Advisors consider the availability of women in the potential pool, the diversity of the committee membership, the content of the advertisement (departments are encouraged to include information about UCI's Career Partner Program, UCI's commitment to diversity, and the fact that the campus has an NSF ADVANCE grant), and the placement of ads (Best Practices recommends that besides general distribution, advertisements are placed in publications that target women and minority audiences). The form is to be signed by the Department Chair, Dean, and Academic Affairs office, and requires the signed approval of an Equity Advisor from that school. This is a powerful tool that will expose any plans for biased searches, and makes departments accountable for establishing diverse committees.

The appointment of the Equity Advisors is arguably the most important innovation of the UCI ADVANCE program. In discussions with the Executive Vice Chancellor about FTE allocation and in anticipation of institutionalizing the EA system, we arrived at a proposal to place an EA on the UCI Academic Planning Committee, which oversees the Dean's requests for FTE. Placing an Equity Advisor on this important committee is a first step towards institutionalizing the input of Equity Advisors on campus.

Intervention 2: UCI ADVANCE Workshops

The ADVANCE program has held a series of workshops, some oriented exclusively toward the EAs, and others aimed at the campus community. Equity Advisors were required to attend the set of workshops that trained them in their duties and sensitized them toward the array of gender inequities and biases that they might encounter, and possible remedies for them. A summary of these training materials will be included on the website and the complete set will be available for those interested in implementing a similar program. The "Readings" button that currently appears on the website is representative of the readings the EA did.

Since the initiation of the ADVANCE Program, we have offered 60 events. Those workshops aimed primarily at the UCI community are listed in Appendix 1.

Intervention 3: The Mentoring Programs

Because mentoring has been found to be an important component of advancement and retention, the ADVANCE Program has established two types of mentoring programs: Strategic Planning Program (SPP) and one-on-one mentoring. Schools have selected a model based on the best fit for their needs. In addition, all schools have provided informal mentoring since the beginning of the program.

Schools that choose to follow the SPP model have had operational mentoring programs in effect for over a year. The Strategic Planning Program attempts to advance junior women faculty members by offering them periodic information and assessments on their individual performance. The program assembles a team of senior faculty members to meet once each 6 months with every Assistant Professor (this component of the program is voluntary). The panel also reviews Assistant Professors' C.V.'s and their short- and long-term goals. This is a time for Assistant Professors to assess their own progress and to receive independent advice on their career trajectories. Twelve assistant professors in the College of Medicine have received this type of mentoring review in the past one and a half years, and ICS has held two strategic planning panels in the last year. Assistant Professors have provided positive feedback in both schools. The faculty members who have been responsible for implementing the SPP programs in the College of Medicine have begun to assist and advise other schools that are setting up SPP mentoring programs. Several schools have already initiated modifications to their SPP's. The Schools of Biological Sciences and Engineering organize their mentoring programs by department; The Graduate School of Management plans to customize the process for new junior hires and for those closer to tenure review. Social Ecology will organize various panels to meet in early summer. Panel members are given materials to help them prepare for meetings.

After consultation with faculty members, the Equity Advisors in some schools decided that the SPP model was not appropriate for implementation there. These Equity Advisors did considerable research to come up with individual mentoring models that would be better fits. Schools using the individual mentoring models have just begun their formal mentoring programs this fall.

The One-on-one mentoring format is being used in the Schools of Arts, Physical Sciences, Humanities, and Social Sciences. In Arts, Equity Advisors have met individually with junior and senior women faculty members. All Assistant Professors in the School of Physical Sciences have met with a mentor once a month. In Humanities, field-specific mentors have been assigned, and networking receptions held, with good turnouts. And in Social Sciences, separate annual orientation meetings are held for untenured and tenured faculty members. The Social Science Equity Advisors have also developed an Orientation Handbook for new faculty members. Workshops in grant writing and promotional strategies are to begin soon. All Assistant Professors will be appointed a mentor who has training from the ADVANCE Program.

Identifying and Understanding Crucial Policies in Need of Change

Our data analysis and experience with the Equity Advisors have provided important information about the types of gender inequities that persist on the UCI campus. The first Faculty Survey (our baseline survey) discovered that although men and women faculty members are fairly satisfied with their jobs and the environment at UCI, women are slightly (and significantly) more dissatisfied in general, more dissatisfied with their job security and their salaries, and are more likely than men to have experienced disparaging remarks. The Chairs' Survey found that men are more likely to self-propose acceleration and promotions and that departments with higher proportions of women have higher teaching loads.

We have determined that these issues deserve special attention: women faculty members' concern with their job security, their dissatisfaction with their salaries, and the differential between men and women's self-promotion in the step system. The differential teaching loads in departments with higher and lower proportions of women faculty members is a complex issue that requires more investigation. We discuss each of these issues in turn below.

Job Security

Concerns about job security are directly related to fears about the tenure review process. The UCI ADVANCE Program takes the advancement of junior women faculty members as one of our primary foci. Our mentoring program is explicitly concerned with professional development of junior faculty members in both group and one-on-one formats (see the section above for a more complete description of the mentoring programs). We have also offered several workshops that help junior faculty members prepare for successful careers. (See Appendix 1 for a list of all general focus workshops offered at UCI.)

Salaries

Even before the NSF ADVANCE Program came to UCI, the Executive Vice Chancellor's Office reported yearly salary residuals by gender and school. The analysis uses the model recommended by the American Association of University Professors to identify women and minority faculty members who appear to be underpaid, and whose salary therefore requires close scrutiny. The salary residual analysis shows a continuing salary inequity between men and women: 143 women faculty members are paid (an approximate mean of $8,619 and median of $7500) below what was predicted and 67 were paid (an approximate mean of $10,111 and median of $7,500) above what was predicted. When looking by steps within ranks, we see that of the 19 comparable categories, in 9 steps, men had an average salary that was higher than the average women's salary, in 6 steps, women had higher salaries than their male counterparts, and in 4 they were roughly equivalent.

UCI has devised an initiative to deal with one specific inequity that is associated with lower salaries: faculty loyalty. Faculty members who have been with the institution longer, and who have not sought outside offers, generally have lower salaries than faculty

members who arrived later or who have sought outside offers. To counteract these market forces, UCI has undertaken a 3-year salary initiative. With a successful merit review, each individual faculty member's salary will be compared with those in their rank and step within their school. If their new salary is not as high as the midpoint of salaries paid in that step (calculated with the highest three and lowest three removed), they will be awarded a salary equal to that midpoint. Although this initiative is not specifically aimed at removing gender inequities, it should serve to improve them. This is because first, we expect that the loyalty penalty may be more likely to affect women than men, and second, if women are disproportionately receiving unjustified lower salaries for any reason, this initiative should serve to bring their salaries closer to equity.

We plan to assess the effectiveness of this three-year initiative by examining the change in the wage gap in the last academic year (the first year of its implementation). If we find a reduction of gender inequality, we will ask the UCI administration to consider extending this initiative past its three-year commitment.

Equity Advisors are also working with the Deans to identify individual women in the school who have salaries drastically lower than what was predicted. Equity Advisors consult with Deans and Department Chairs in order to initiate Equity Reviews for these individuals. An Equity Review is an existing UCI procedure that allows an individual faculty member to submit a case that requests a higher salary due to a series of cumulative mistakes in their previous reviews that undervalued their record. If successful, the faculty member's salary and rank are adjusted upward.

Self-Promotion

The issue of self-promotion is one that may be addressed in a mentoring format or in workshops. We have already offered several workshops directly related to this issue: "Negotiating Resources: Learn to Ask for What you Want" offered by UCI Professor Lisa Barron, and "Strategic Performance" offered by a team from Harvard. We solicited feedback from faculty members who attended these workshops. As described in detail below, we are in the process of analyzing the attendees' feedback.

The ADVANCE Program also edited and updated the UCI Survival Handbook, which currently appears on the UCI Academic Personnel website. This handbook guides faculty members though the web of requirements necessary for advancement at UCI.

Teaching Loads

Understanding teaching loads is a complicated matter. There are many ways to count teaching effort, and in a university that reports to legislators about their contributions to teaching, departments, schools and campuses have seriously considered how to best represent their contributions. Also, since teaching needs and conventions vary across schools, uniform counting practices may not adequately reflect efforts in different schools. As described below, we plan to do an in-depth analysis of the teaching practices at UCI.

Assessment Processes in Place

We have three main strategies for collecting data that allow us to make assessments of the current status of gender equity on campus, and changes made since the initiation of the program: surveys, in-depth interviews, and analyzing data from the UCI administration. We describe what we have learned from each, and how we have used the knowledge we have gained to modify our current efforts.

Surveys

The first assessment tool is a periodic survey of the UCI faculty and Department Chairs. We administered a faculty survey during the first year of the grant to establish a baseline measure of gender differences on perceptions of department climate, workloads, level of support, productivity, funding, and job satisfaction. We are currently finishing up the data collection stage for the second survey, and will be able to analyze the degree to which there have been changes since the baseline survey. We added several questions to the second survey about faculty members' level of knowledge of the NSF ADVANCE Program, contact with Equity Advisors, and their views on gender equity and its importance.

In addition to the faculty survey, we also collected department-level and campus-level information from Department Chairs. We assessed gender equity in teaching load, course releases, nominations for awards, merits and promotions, and the gender balance of new cohorts in graduate programs. During year 1 we also conducted information in a follow-up survey of Department Chairs. We found that information collected in this way was not very helpful, and have decided to collect this information by other methods.

In-depth Interviews

The second assessment tool is in-depth, qualitative interviews of (mostly senior women) faculty members. This effort is aimed at hearing about women faculty member's work/life experiences at UCI, along with their concerns. These interviews should reveal different types of information than we collected through the survey, and allow us to learn about their backgrounds, their personal lives, their academic lives, and how they perceive the situation for women at UCI. The analysis of this data has just recently begun. As of fall, 2004, the researcher has completed about 50 in-depth interviews (conducted in years 2 and 3 of the grant), and has provided preliminary findings. She found that the women she interviewed see subtle patterns of gender discrimination at UCI. They suggest that these inequalities are complex, and not easily addresses by any single set of strategies. They feel that the climate at UCI is somewhat chilly, and that the university's efforts to improve them have been mostly window dressing.

Existing Data

The third assessment tool is the collection and analysis of information from the UCI administration. This includes a wide range of information on women and men faculty members by school, including new hires, separations, tenure review, years in rank, endowed chairs, administrative positions, salary, space allocation, and start-up packages. These data have served as the basis for the analysis of NSF indicators.

Our data analysis experiences have allowed us to reflect on what questions we have been able to successfully answer with the data we have collected, and what collection efforts need improvement.   As mentioned above, we decided that the information we received from the chairs' survey was not worth the effort. Instead, we decided to collect the information we needed from the UCI administration. In addition, we have initiated collection of several new datasets, all of which are described in detail below.

New Data Collection Efforts

Equity Advisor's Yearly Reports. The Equity Advisors have submitted yearly reports that explain in detail their efforts during the year. We will use these reports to create a dataset that specifies the level of effort and specific actions on each target area (e.g. work with recruitment committees, mentoring, talking with faculty members with complaints, etc.) by school. A complete list of variables to be coded from these reports follows.

Variables to Code from Equity Advisor Reports

Hiring
- Number of searches in the past year (N)
- Number of searches in which Equity Advisors signed off on "Plan and Advertisement" form (AP-82) (N)
- Number of search committee chairs that Equity Advisor met with at any time (N)
    - Before applicant review process (N)
    - During applicant review process (N)
    - After applicant review process (N)
- Number of full search committees that Equity Advisor met with at any time (N)
    - Before applicant review process (N)
    - During applicant review process (N)
    - After applicant review process (N)
- Number of search committee chairs with which Equity Advisor discussed best practices (N)
- Number of search committees with which Equity Advisor discussed best practices (N)
- Number of search committee chairs that received pamphlets (N)
- Number of search committee members that received pamphlets (N)
- Number of searches for which Equity Advisor received applicant pool lists (N)
- Number of searches for which Equity Advisor received short lists (N)
- Number of search activity statements Equity Advisor reviewed (AP-80) (N)

- Number of search activity statements Equity Advisor discussed with Chair (N)
- Number of career partner requests (N)
- Number of career partners requests granted (N)
- Number faculty hired in school
- Number of women faculty hired in school

If possible, code the following variables for each search:
- EA signed off on AP82 (Y/N)
- Met with search committee chair before review process (Y/N)
- Met with search committee chair during applicant review process (Y/N)
- Met with search committee chair after applicant review process (Y/N)
- Met with full search committee before review process (Y/N)
- Met with full search committee during applicant review process (Y/N)
- Met with full search committee after applicant review process (Y/N)
- Discussed best practices with search committee chair (Y/N)
- Discussed best practices with full search committee (Y/N)
- Delivered pamphlets to chair of search committee (Y/N)
- Delivered pamphlets to each search committee member (Y/N)
- Equity Advisor received applicant pool lists (Y/N)
- Equity Advisor received short lists (Y/N)
- Equity Advisor reviewed search activity statements (AP-80) (Y/N)
- Equity Advisor discussed search activity statements with Chair (Y/N)
- There was a career partner request (Y/N)
- Career partner request was granted (Y/N)
- Faculty hired (Y/N)
- Faculty hired was a women (Y/N)

Mentoring
- Type of mentoring program (group/one-on-one)
  - Number of junior faculty members that participated (N)
  - Number of junior women faculty that participated (N)
  - Number of senior faculty members that participated (N)
  - Number of senior women faculty that participated (N)

Pay Equity
- Have there been any measures to deal with pay inequity? (Y/N)
- Have you met with chairs regarding salary residuals? (Y/N)
- If yes, with what outcome?

Communication with Faculty
- How frequently do equity advisors communicate with faculty regarding the ADVANCE program? (daily, weekly, monthly, bi-monthly, quarterly, less often)
- In general, how have you been received by departments? (favorably,/neutral/unfavorably)

- How have the Equity Advisors split the work (if there are two EA's)
- Predominant method of interaction (e-mail/person/other)
  - Use email (Y/N)
  - Contact in person (Y/N)
  - Other ways (Y/N)

Graduate Students/Post-docs
- Are there any programs for graduate students and/or post-docs?

Deans
- How many Dean's council meetings has the Equity Advisor attended? (N)
- Amount of interaction at these meetings about gender equity (?)
- How many individual meetings with Chairs? (N)
- How many individual meetings with assistant Deans? (N)
- How many individual meetings with Dean? (N)

Other issues (not present in the 2003-2004 questionnaire)
- How many cases of alleged sexual harassment came up that year? (N)
- How many times did Equity Advisor have input on nominations of women faculty for honors/awards (N)

Although our numbers are small (and therefore, doing systematic analyses may be problematic), we hope to be able to relate this information to various NSF indicators. For example, when Equity Advisors met with full search committees (rather than just the Chair of the committee), was the search more likely to yield a woman hire? Did schools using one-on-one mentoring differ from those using SPP mentoring with regard to the percent women with favorable tenure decisions?

Reports on Experiences with Mentoring. At the end of the 2003/2004 academic year, most Equity Advisors sent out queries to junior faculty members in order to determine whether or not they have received mentoring, and if they have, to obtain their evaluations of that mentoring. We will systematically evaluate this feedback on the mentoring programs. We will see if junior women faculty members who have experienced mentoring were more likely to receive favorable tenure reviews and if senior women who have received mentoring were more likely to have advanced through the step system at a quicker pace. Of course, we don't expect dramatic results in the short-term, since these efforts are more likely to impact women's progress over the long term, so we will look for general patterns. These reports are yet to be coded and analyzed.

Workshop Feedback. We have been collecting feedback from workshop attendees after each NSF ADVANCE workshop. We have used these comments to informally guide our later efforts, but will now systematically examine them. We will code and analyze these data to see what the attendees report about these workshops. Again, we expect

attendance at workshops to equip women faculty members with the tools necessary to advance through the system. These data are yet to be coded and analyzed.

Teaching Loads. Initially, we asked Department Chairs to relay information about teaching, new hires, accelerations and promotions. We found that the low response rate of chairs to our survey, to be problematic. As a remedy, we have acquired primary data from the administration regarding teaching and new hires. We now have data on the number of courses (along with type of course, headcount, and credit hours) by individual faculty member. We have begun to analyze this by gender at the department level. Preliminary analyses by school (without control variables) show no gender differences in teaching loads, but we will conduct a systematic department-level analysis, using the appropriate controls. This will reveal a more accurate picture of teaching by gender. If we discover a gender disparity within departments, we will ask the EVC to promote awareness and to work with Deans and Chairs on making sure that policies are in place and they are applied uniformly. We will investigate the nature of existing teaching policies, and pay particular attention to buy out policies. We will suggest that Academic Personnel provide wokshops on teaching assignment and policy in order to achieve consistency.

Startup Packages. To address the issue of start-up packages for new hires, we have collected all (we are missing only one) offer letters for jobs beginning fall 2004. We will code these for the various perks that are offered upon hiring. We will analyze these offer letters to determine if they reveal any gender inequalities. Following is a list of variables we will code and analyze.

Variables to Code in Offer Letters**:**

- Year
- Department
- School
- Gender of applicant (M/F)
- Tenure track/non-tenure track
- Level (Assistant/Associate/Full)
- Step (1-6)
- Salary ($ amount)
- Research funding ($ amount)
- Summer compensation ($ amount)
- Summer compensation (number of months)
- Startup package ($ amount)
- Office/lab space (square footage)
- Administrative assistance (average (shared secretary)/additional help)
- Spouse helped through career partners programs (Y/N)
- If yes, permanent or temporary position (P/T)
- If permanent, tenure track (Y/N)
- Spouse helped with other job offer (Y/N)

- Course Load Undergraduate (N of courses)
- Course Load Graduate (N of courses)
- Housing loans (Y/N)
- Moving expenses independent of startup package ($ amount)
- On-campus housing (offered home in University Hills)

Exit Interviews. The ADVANCE Director has conducted exit interviews with a high percentage of those who left UCI last year. Data from these interviews have been given to Dr. Doris Sorkin in the School of Social Ecology for analysis. We are currently setting up interviews with Deans and Department Chairs to get information about these separations from the institutional perspective. We have asked the UCI administration to assume responsibility for these interviews in the future. Our suggestion is that Academic Personnel, in conjunction with OEOD conduct these interviews and analyze the data derived from them.

Because our program covers the entire campus, we are limited in our choices of assessment models. We cannot compare units that are covered by the program with those that are not, because all units are covered. We can't conduct any type of experiment with random assignment into groups, again, because all units are already involved. The preferred assessment model to test many of the NSF indicators is time-series analysis. This model requires that we collect trend data (a rule of thumb is that we collect data on at least 30 points in time), in order to determine if the intervention (the various aspects of the NSF ADVANCE program we introduced) changed the trajectory for various outcome variables. It will be difficult to obtain data for 30 points in time, and the small N's we are dealing with for most variables will make our task even more difficult. We plan to collect as much trend data as possible, and make the most of what we have. We will attempt to test for significant changes in trajectories. History may be a threat to internal validity, so we will take care to control for any changes we expect that can be attributed to the passage of time (and special historical events that occurred within that timeframe).

Another possible model is to compare outcomes in units that used different strategies to attack the same problems. For example, we can compare outcomes in units that chose the SPP mentoring with those that used one-on-one mentoring. We must keep in mind though, that differences in outcomes may be due to a self-selection process (e.g. schools where women faculty members faced more obstacles may have been the ones that selected one method over the other). This method may also be applied to an examination of how variations in Equity Advisor's activities matter for NSF indicator variables.

As mentioned above, each of the assessment models we propose to use has problems. Yet by collecting data from multiple sources and analyzing them with different models, we can accomplish a triangulation of methods that will allow us to see whether or not our findings are consistent across methods and data sources. If our findings are consistent across these measures, we can have more confidence in claiming a role for our interventions.

Finally, we add a note about NSF indicators. These focus on measures for women faculty members in science and engineering disciplines. Since our program covers the entire campus, we will separate findings for the science/engineering faculty from those from other parts of campus. This way, our findings can be compared with those of other ADVANCE Programs that cover only science and engineering faculty.

Campus Understanding of the ADVANCE Program

The Equity Advisors have been active in the schools and we have been hosting workshops for over two years now, and mentoring programs have been underway for one year in most schools. We expect that faculty members are familiar with our goals and activities. We will be able to assess whether or not this is true by analyzing the faculty survey questions on familiarity and contact with the program. The Equity Advisors' queries of junior faculty members will give us a more detailed look at the level of contact that they have had with the program.

Plans for Dissemination of Good Practices

Any findings we have concerning the impact of the UCI ADVANCE Program may be cautiously generalized to other campuses. We say cautiously, because this is an experimental program that has been tested in only one locale. UCI is unique in many ways: we have an Executive Vice Chancellor who was anxious to cooperate with the ADVANCE Program; we have a fairly new university (without a lot of the bureaucracy and traditions that burden many of the older campuses); we have had a woman Chancellor in the recent past; we have a program that covered the entire campus, etc. Whether or not these same interventions would work similarly in different contexts is yet to be seen. Nevertheless, we plan to fully disseminate all of the information we have developed here in order to enhance future efforts elsewhere.

The UCI NSF ADVANCE Program has a website with many of the training materials, workshop descriptions, and yearly reports. As we complete the additional internal analyses described above, we will also put the results on the website. In addition, we plan to make our Equity Advisor training materials fully available to all. We will do this by posting all material and procedures on the website. This includes data from the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, workshop titles and a summary of their contents, awareness seminar topics, handouts, readings, and discussions regarding UCI Committee on Academic Personnel.

We will also post a copy of AP-82 on the website and send a copy to all ADVANCE schools. And finally, we plan to initiate a newsletter (to be published twice a year) that will be posted on the website and distributed through the list-serve and to other California universities. This newsletter will contain columns by Equity Advisors relating issues and obstacles they confront in their schools, an overview of various program components, statistics, and new developments.

Plans for Continuation of the Program Past the Funding Period

We are currently thinking of ways that we can continue the program past the funding period. An important first step is to negotiate with UCI to get a commitment to funding the Equity Advisor's positions, training and coordination past the funding period. Showing that the Equity Advisor's activities helped to generate more equitable hiring, improved retention of women faculty members, and improved the climate in the workplace, might provide the strong argument we need to secure continued funding (or at least funding until equity is achieved).   Another effort we plan to engage in that aims to continue the role of Equity Advisors is to request that the EVC make sure that Deans and Chairs have ways to institutionalize the programs developed and initiated by the Equity Advisors in their schools. Some Departments already have a representative or committee that deals with Department equity issues. Others have existing committees (like the Human Relations Committee in the Sociology Department) that have complimentary foci. These might serve as a site for incorporating the new initiatives.

As mentioned above, we have made progress with institutionalizing several of the Equity Advisor's roles. An Equity Advisor has been appointed to sit on the Academic Planning Committee, which institutionalizes input at the planning stage. Similarly, the AP-82 form for search committees requires the Equity Advisor's approval, which institutionalizes input during the search process.

If we find that the three-year salary initiative improved gender equity, we will request its continuation.

We have asked the UCI administration to assume responsibility for exit interviews in the future. Our suggestion is that Academic Personnel, in conjunction with OEOD conduct these interviews and analyze the data derived from them.

Our efforts at updating and improving various campus resources (like the UCI Survival Handbook) offer resources that will continue past the grant period.

Finally, we have begun fund raising to ensure the continuation of the program. This seeks funds for three initiatives: 1) endowed chairs, 2) Equity Advisors, and 3) a Faculty Equity Center, with staff to provide guidance, mentoring and other assistance to faculty members with specific gender equity issues.

Plans for an External Evaluation

We plan to follow the advice of the NSF Director Alice Hogan and obtain an external evaluation from Dr. Laura Kramer, a social scientist at Montclair State University. She has extensive experience in evaluating academic programs and has already evaluated other NSF program, including Advance. She comes highly recommended by New Mexico State University's Advance Program PI and Director, Dr. Lisa Frehill. Dr. Kramer has agreed to assess the UCI Advance Program in February or March, 2005 with a full report shortly after that. We look forward to her recommendations to improve the

program and mechanisms to institutionalize our methods that have begun to change the culture toward gender equity.

Timetable for Completion of the New Data Analysis

We expect that the analysis of the new data collection efforts and implementation of new ideas for dissemination of UCI ADVANCE Program components will be completed within 6 months. We will provide the external evaluator with the internal data analyses reports as they are completed, in order to facilitate their evaluation. A report of the results from all new data analyses will be forwarded to NSF no later than April 2005.