EVALUATION OF ADVANCE AT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA - IRVINE

March 2005

Submitted by

LAURA KRAMER, PH.D.
Professor of Sociology
Montclair State University
Montclair, NJ 07043

(973) 655-7168
laura.kramer@montclair.edu

I. The Visit

The proposal for funding for an ADVANCE program at UC Irvine described the following goals for its movement towards institutional transformation: increased recruitment of women faculty, developing a network of pre-tenure support and guidance, monitoring of the program's progress, and promoting networking and mentoring for tenured women faculty. This program is unique among ADVANCE institutions, in having included ten schools, rather than being limited to units including STEM fields.

The proposed means for achieving these goals included the development of the Equity Advisor position, workshops, and establishment of two named Chairs. This visit focused on the activities and strategies developed in and evolved from the initial proposal, and on institutional factors outside the ADVANCE Program affecting ADVANCE itself and ultimately the institutional transformation of UCI.

UCI-ADVANCE has entered the final third of its funding by the National Science Foundation. After reporting on activities and outcomes to date, this report turns to recommendations for ADVANCE priorities during its final year and a half of funding, and recommendations for actions by the University administration needed to achieve institutional transformation.

Preparation for the visit included a review of program-related materials, materials available on the UCI website, and several lengthy phone conversations with the Director. Additional materials were provided during and after the visit. In all, the following materials have been reviewed: the initial proposal; the year-end ADVANCE reports for the first three years of funding; the report of the NSF site visit team (2004) and the ADVANCE response; reports on the first and second department chair surveys, and the first faculty survey; a report on exit interviews conducted by the ADVANCE Program Director; a statistical summary of visits to the UCI-ADVANCE web site starting in 2002; copies of all Equity Advisors annual reports; a copy of a department's mentoring manual; a copy of the questionnaire about mentoring sent to all assistant professors (results now being compiled); and printed materials (for fundraising and for recruitment committees). I also reviewed the draft of a report on new data collection efforts, with recruitment data, gender distribution of faculty; a statistical analysis of Equity Advisors' reports, correlating Equity Advisors activities and hiring outcomes, workshop feedback, and an analysis of offer letters.

On February 11, 14, and 15, I met with people individually or in small groups. On the first day, I began with an early breakfast meeting with the Program Director; on the fifteenth I ended with a dinner meeting with the PI, one Co-PI, and the Program Director. On all three days, meetings were also held over lunch. I met with the following administrators: the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC), the Associate Executive Vice Chancellor (an ADVANCE Co-PI), the Deans of Biological Sciences (ADVANCE PI), Engineering, Information and Computer Sciences (an ADVANCE Co-PI), and Physical Sciences. In addition, I met with four department chairs and one department administrator below department chair, from the Schools of Engineering and Physical Sciences.

I met with both ADVANCE Term Chairs (one of whom has served as an Equity Advisor), and with seven other Equity Advisors from five schools. I met in small groups with eight women faculty (at junior and senior levels) who are neither administrators nor Equity Advisors. I met with the leader of the Faculty Women's Association. I met with the two

sociologists most involved with the project's quantitative work. The political scientist who has been conducting a qualitative study of senior women faculty was traveling at the time of my visit.

Interviews were scheduled for forty-five minutes, but often ran through the fifteen minute break, to the next interview on my schedule. Only one interview ended early. The ADVANCE office did an excellent job meeting the logistical challenges of my schedule. The selection of individuals enabled me to meet with people simultaneously representing a variety of campus units, at a variety of points in their careers, and with varied experiences with the ADVANCE program. Clearly, and significantly, these individuals also have widely varying degrees of power and influence on the campus.

Faculty Recruitment

Recent recruitment

In the last cycle of hiring, the School of Physical Sciences and the School of Engineering have shown marked improvement in the recruitment of female faculty. Additional increases of women faculty are expected as a result of the searches now being completed. The impact of ADVANCE Equity Advisors is undoubtedly one factor contributing to this improvement. Through their work with deans, search committees, and the Council on Academic Personnel, Equity Advisors and the ADVANCE Program Director have helped attune those involved in recruiting to the numerous points in the process where traditional practices may undermine a truly open search. The introduction, in the second year of funding, of a recruitment authorization form that requires the signature of an Equity Advisor institutionalizes equity-focused oversight into UCI faculty searches. More generally, the work of ADVANCE has certainly been important in raising campus awareness of the importance of a diverse faculty and the seriousness of the administration's commitment to this goal.

The Dean of Physical Sciences has authorized multiple offers in several searches, resulting in the hiring of more faculty than lines were authorized, and leading to a significant improvement in the gender-diversity record. This approach may appear to be impractical, but the benefits are clear, with the creation of critical masses of women in fields where they are often isolated. The costs of this approach should be compared with the costs of high turnover or unsuccessful searches of apparently more fiscally conservative approaches. The institution might well explore more such hiring patterns in the future, with the impending retirement of many long-term faculty during the next decade, a likely source of some flexibility.

One increasingly common approach to recruitment is the use of joint or split positions, through which an individual faculty member has responsibilities in two departments (sometimes crossing school lines as well). There is an inconsistency among units in the effective protection of faculty with multiple homes from being called upon to perform more than a normal share of service obligations. Furthermore, the growing use of such positions may lead to an inflated perception of the extent to which the faculty has moved toward gender integration. It is realistic to expect this inflated perception to develop, as the same woman is viewed in the eyes of members of both units to which she belongs. She is counted as a full colleague (as she is in certain senses) but does not serve as one (unless she has a double burden of service and teaching, which clearly would not be an acceptable practice). This perception is important to recognize, because it may otherwise lessen the commitment of decision makers to seeking women candidates for open positions.

A multiplicity of factors affect the outcomes of a hiring cycle, and drawing conclusions from comparisons of different cycles is unwise given the major impact of other historical variables (such as state budget issues). There is no doubt, however, that by the fourth year of ADVANCE's presence at UCI it has had a positive impact on the recruitment of junior women faculty in units previously underperforming in their integration efforts. It is important that the administration and ADVANCE review search outcomes unit by unit, however, rather than combining the results within schools such that a significant unevenness in performance is masked, with extremely successful units (such as the Department of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science) balancing out the continued underrepresentation of women in others (such as the Department of Bioengineering).

Authorizing positions and training search committees

While improvements have contributed to searches producing more diverse pools and appointments, some of these improvements are not institution-wide. Further, current efforts could be enhanced by changes to features of the search process thus far overlooked. For example, it is not until a search is under way that its progress is evaluated with reference to the pool profile. By all accounts departments do not regularly consider the demographics of specialty areas as a factor when they initially review the several areas of need from which they must choose in making their requests for position authorizations to the EVC. This is especially serious for those departments that do not expect to have positions authorized in every cycle.

Demographics should become a factor in choosing from the various specialty areas that a department considers important to strengthen. For many fields, quantitative pool composition data for specialty areas is easily available on both the UCI Academic Personnel and ADVANCE websites. For some fields (notably engineering disciplines) quantitative pool data on specialties is more difficult to locate. In such cases, faculty could use the resources of professional organizations and women's organizations within the profession to learn earlier about the demographic profile of the pools. This may include contacting departments known in the discipline for having exceptionally high numbers of women faculty or doctoral students or both (such as the Mechanical Engineering program at the University of Texas at Austin).

Failing to consider demographics will be most fateful in the shaping of new academic groups. As the university grows, the number of programs it offers is expanding (the changes to the organization of the health sciences is an illustration). The first people brought in to a new group (whether a department, program, or "cluster of excellence") will have an important impact on shaping the long term culture and (formal and informal) processes of that group. Bringing in as founding members of the group faculty from specialties having the chilliest climate lowers the possibility of creating a climate friendly to a diverse faculty.

The Equity Advisors' involvement in the early stages of the search committees is widely perceived as generally useful as the committees proactively design searches to attract strong and diverse pools. The assignment of two advisors to most schools has brought multiple voices to the search committee briefings. By some accounts this makes the presentation and discussion much more effective (this has ramifications for the future of the Equity Advisors' program, see Recommendations section). Each Dean must involve Equity Advisors in each search; learning how some searches (e.g., the search for a position in the new pharmacy program proceeded without such consultation) have "fallen between the cracks" will help in developing procedures to prevent its recurrence. Indeed, this apparent ignorance of gender-equity related procedures and resources may be most likely in those programs most in need of them.

As effective as the training of each search committee may be, it will need to be continued well beyond the NSF funding period. Department chairs have a high turnover rate, and the University faculty itself is changing and will continue to do so as retirements rise. Those trained today cannot be assumed to constitute those who will lead and participate in future searches.

Two impediments to effective, open searches were identified in some units. First, the advertising for authorized positions was often extremely slow to receive approval (this problem was repeatedly reported in the School of Engineering). Late advertisement is widely known to diminish the availability of candidates from underrepresented groups.

The second impediment is the preference shown for identifying and recruiting "targets of excellence" (who, as senior professionals in a field with only recent pipeline changes, are similarly drawn from a disproportionately male pool, relative to that field as a whole). These appointments usually result in the elimination of junior appointments (from pools that are at least somewhat less homogeneous). While the organizational attraction of bringing in stars is clear, serious questions were repeatedly raised about the difficulty of creating a more diverse faculty if junior people with great promise are not actually sought and considered.

An experimental approach: centers of excellence

During the recruitment cycle just beginning, for which line requests are to be submitted this spring, departments and deans are not the initiators of requests. Instead, groups (which may be intra- or cross-departmental) are to propose new "centers of excellence" which are focused around a research area. Hiring of individuals into the University faculty will be done by those groups whose center proposals are accepted. This experiment is suited to a push for more interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary research in rapidly growing areas. For the challenge of achieving gender equity, several areas in the implementation of this procedure require special attention:

Joint and split appointments are likely to be more common (presumably faculty appointments will come with "tenure homes" and service obligations in a standing department rather than the center-of-excellence). Even those faculty without a split or joint appointment will have serious service obligations to the newly established center through which they are hired, as well as their standing department. It will be essential that new (particularly junior) faculty are protected from service expectations in both units simultaneously (the department and the "center"), and that new junior faculty be protected from any significant service expectations at all during their first year or two at the institution.

To create a professional profile that will justify its designation and promote the rapid garnering of external funding, a proposed center's current faculty are likely to push to hire at the most senior levels, recruiting people who have already earned exceptional reputations. Given the more extreme homogeneity of pools at the highest ranks, this practice will work against increasing faculty diversity.

The framing of the subject areas of the centers will be susceptible to prestige differences between those areas traditionally associated with more and those with less male-dominated specializations. In choosing from among all the applications, the administration should take into account the demographic profile of the various subfields being considered.

For those centers chosen, the order in which the positions are authorized will be significant for shaping the center's culture in the future. The diversity of the various pools should be a factor considered as the positions are released.

The Career Partner Program

The "two body problem" is serious throughout academia; the UCI experience has been that "trailing partners" have performed at or above the level of professional accomplishment expected of all faculty. Many of those I spoke to had praise for this program, through which the funding for a "trailing" partner comes in equal parts from the central administration, and the units of the "leading" and "trailing" partners. In more than two dozen cases, it has enabled the recruitment of two strong faculty, where neither would have been recruitable, and has been a not-insignificant source of women faculty (as trailing or leading partner).

There seems to be an uneven use of the program, with some units apparently reluctant to give serious consideration to individuals whose candidacy at UCI follows a partner's application. It is, of course, clear that hiring someone over the objections of the department or school leadership would put the newcomer in an undesirable situation.

Conversely, however, tolerating a unit's functionally opting-out of the Career Partners Program supports an implication that those already hired through it may be less qualified than other faculty. The administrative leadership (at the school and University levels) has to devote more effort to diminishing the hostility toward this type of candidacy where it persists. The administration should put a higher priority on convincing reluctant units of the efficacy of the program for strengthening the institution, as well as the diversity of its faculty. Given that approximately two-thirds of "trailing" positions have gone to females, this places women, more than men, in a position where their qualifications even after they arrive at the University may be under special scrutiny.

Quantitative data on the full use of this program are difficult to obtain. An instance is only counted as a request made when both the primary candidate and the partner's potential home departments have agreed to the appointments. Thus, the proportion of requests that have been granted (which is very high) indicates the supportive reception that these requests have met at the EVC's level. Likewise, the statistics do not include cases in which the leading partner has withdrawn from candidacy to accept an offer elsewhere, which might or might not have involved the pursuit of a Career Partner appointment. Finally, there are no statistics on the cases in which the proposed department (or school) for a trailing partner has not agreed to cooperate.

Pre-tenure support and guidance

During the first years of the ADVANCE program, Equity Advisors in each school worked hard to develop the most appropriate mentoring program for it. At this time, for each school with which I met there was a sense that a system is now in place that will work well. Mentoring through the Strategic Planning Process is practiced in several schools. It provides an important way for faculty to get regular and thorough feedback on their current activities and future plans. Other schools have one-on-one mentoring for new faculty, a more common model of the mentoring relationship. The Equity Advisors in such schools are actively involved in matching up mentors and their junior colleagues, and in providing training to the mentors.

The Equity Advisor feature of the proposal was designed to allow the tailoring of activities to the particular unit, and the people serving as Equity Advisors have proceeded in a

manner to maximize their effectiveness while minimizing any potential resentment in response to their involvement. For example, Equity Advisors often rely on informal contacts with department leaders or with junior faculty to keep an eye on how new faculty are doing. This indicates the constructive rather than monitoring role that the Equity Advisors seek to perform.

While this generally works well, some problems have not been detected as early as they might have been with a more systematically designed system or a more common one-on-one model of mentoring. While the Strategic Planning Process serves several functions associated with classical mentoring, the infrequency of its convening (twice, or sometimes only once per year) leaves new faculty on their own unless they consider their situation problematic enough to contact their school's Equity Advisors or the ADVANCE office, or if their department has a culture of regular and frequent interaction (such as the weekly lunches of each of the three divisions of the Chemistry Department faculty).

Workshops for women faculty have been held often, and some have had very positive reception. In addition to their content, workshops provide networking opportunities. Up to this time, most ADVANCE events have been aimed at women faculty.

Monitoring the Program's Progress

From its beginning, the Program's Director has worked closely with Equity Advisors, the PI and Co-PIs to optimize the design of the various features of the UCI ADVANCE program. In contrast, problems have interfered with the rapid collection and analysis of qualitative and quantitative research originally planned for the project. At this time, many data collection efforts are, although belatedly, coming to fruition, including a report based on exit interviews (conducted by the ADVANCE Director), and analyses of the activities of Equity Advisors and their correlations with hiring patterns. The survey of junior women faculty about mentoring is in the midst of completion. The next few months should provide the program with important feedback to be used in its final period of funding and in designing an optimal organizational structure for the institutionalization of necessary changes.

Three areas of administrative weakness have been important in slowing the analytic activities of the project: the Institutional Review Board (IRB), the Office of Analytical Studies and Information Management (OASIM), and the historical failure to aggressively pursue faculty exit data (now provided by an interview study conducted by the ADVANCE program). I describe them not simply because of their impact on the assessment data available thus far, but perhaps more seriously because of their implications for the institutional changes required for permanently serving the goals supported by the ADVANCE grant.

In some cases these problems have led to the ADVANCE office taking on responsibilities that should have been performed elsewhere, and in others have simply seriously slowed the collection of data by ADVANCE. It is not clear why the EVC's office has not clarified to these University units the high priority to be assigned to the ADVANCE-related activities.

The IRB has been a source of obstacles to the timely conduct of research (precluding completion of bench-line data from the time before ADVANCE activity). Several questionable practices about which I heard include: the IRB's judgment that sending more than one e-mail request as a follow-up to survey recipients (who had not responded initially) would constitute coercion, and is unacceptable. Further, the IRB judges that the ADVANCE survey of department chairs had to go through a review to which other work-related information gathering from chairs

by the administration would not be required. To repeat a survey as part of a time sequence requires an IRB review even when no change is proposed for the instrument or the procedures.

In one instance, the OASIM, in the office of the EVC, was slow to provide information needed by the ADVANCE project. Data on faculty teaching loads were slow to arrive and when they did, they omitted information on the gender of the individuals (precluding the most central analysis pertinent to ADVANCE). The data were returned with a request for inclusion of gender; the raw data have now been given to the ADVANCE researchers for analysis.

An important component of the initial proposal was a qualitative study of climate, based on interviews with senior faculty early in the ADVANCE experience, with re-interviews of the same faculty during the last months of the funding period. The data would have two uses: an assessment of the impact of the program, and a systematic description of climate to help in the specific design features of the ADVANCE team's interventions.

The study was proposed including men for comparative purposes, but that aspect of the design was changed by the researcher. Further, because an initial request for participation elicited enough faculty overall to keep the interviewer busy, there was no follow up request for participants (as originally planned). However, omitting the follow up was a problematic decision, given that those who initially responded included a very small representation of women faculty from STEM units. At this time there is still no final report available to ADVANCE on the baseline study. There is no clear explanation for the lack of a final report to date, nor the failure to pursue a more representative sample of senior faculty women.

The ADVANCE Term Chairs

A large variety of decisions at UCI are made by committees composed of distinguished faculty (those in named chairs, or distinguished professorships, or members of learned societies such as the National Academy of Science). Establishing the two ADVANCE Term Chairs (with NSF funding) significantly increased the pool of women to be drawn on for such committees. The two ADVANCE chairs perceive themselves as well accepted by their peers; further, they have, indeed, encountering situations where they provided input into deliberations in a voice different from those of their male colleagues.

While unmeasurable, there has clearly been a positive symbolic impact derived from these Chairs, certainly on some women faculty, and perhaps on the recruitment of graduate students. One administrator reported that the existence of these prestigious positions was a factor in his recruiting of a woman to the University faculty. The Chairs have been widely publicized, and are hoped to have an impact on fundraising. In addition, the two distinguished faculty currently holding the Chairs have defined active mentoring and other faculty development work as part of their role.

The initial proposal called for the establishment of these as permanent chairs, with an institutional commitment for external fundraising to support them. As yet, there has been little support forthcoming from the development office for this project. With the NSF funding winding down, it is imperative that the priority placed on this effort be clarified, and the development office lead this effort, with support as appropriate from the Program and the current Chairs.

Mentoring and networking for tenured women faculty

The two prevalent approaches to serving needs of the senior faculty have been the very active involvement of ADVANCE, including its Equity Advisors, in working towards pay equity, and the work to identify women to nominate for various honors and awards (which will certainly be bolstered by the participation of the two ADVANCE Term Chairs).

Mentoring has not been well developed for mid-career and senior women, generally, and it should become a high priority. The Schools of the Humanities and Social Ecology provide good models to be explored by the Equity Advisors for the other units at UCI. In Humanities, the first Equity Advisor led the creation of an internal grant (funded by the dean) for a course release to support women at the Associate Professor level as they developed new scholarly programs for themselves. In Social Ecology, one-on-one mentoring has been arranged for mid-career and senior women as well as junior faculty.

University-wide, mid-career and senior women benefit from some of the workshops offered, and serving as individual mentors and on the Strategic Planning Process panels may well be beneficial. Obviously the experience of serving as an Equity Advisor provides opportunities to network and to develop and exercise administrative and leadership skills.

Although it is one of the foci of the initial NSF proposal, this area has been less fully developed than the program's work with junior women. When a final report from the qualitative research on senior faculty women becomes available, it should help in the expansion of ADVANCE and institutional activities to further senior faculty development.

Pay equity

The UC-Irvine administration has tried to address issues of pay inequity in several ways. Each year the institution prepares a list of the mean salaries of tenured faculty at each rank and step for each of three separate pay scales (for the Graduate School of Management and the Schools of Engineering and Information and Computer Sciences; for the College of Health Sciences; and the regular scale. A description of the methodology for producing the UCI pay equity data is available on the office of Academic Personnel's web page, which states "The purpose of the model is to flag individuals and academic units with salaries that may require closer scrutiny." A "pay equity review" may be initiated by the individual, or the dean or department head. There is nothing on that site describing where responsibility lies for taking action and for insuring an equitable review of those who believe they are underpaid. In the spring (in 2005 it was in early March) these data are released, and publicly available on the EVC's and the ADVANCE websites. It is not clear why they are not available closer to the time when they are collected (they are based on pay as of the previous October 31).

The EVC releases to each dean the list for his or her school, identifying the faculty who are paid less than predicted by the model (which does not include measures of scholarly productivity). Deans are instructed to review the list, but are not required to account for their determinations of who does and who does not require a salary adjustment. Rumors abound concerning the extent of inequity that would be required before an action would result. Some people think there's no use in applying unless one's salary is at least one-half a standard deviation below the mean; others have heard it should be a full standard deviation below, and others have heard that for budgetary reasons there will be no increases given to applicants for a pay equity review during the current year. In the absence of a clear and broadly communicated statement on this practice by the EVC, such rumors are to be expected.

Finally, relatively highly paid administrators and lower paid faculty may have different views of whether the process is worthwhile in cases where the potential raises would be only a few thousand dollars. Thus far, limited use has been made of pay equity reviews, with most faculty choosing to wait until they are being reviewed as part of a regular merit review or a promotion application.

Rather than using the exceptional method of the "pay equity review," many faculty choose to combine a salary review with the regular and frequent career reviews required across the UC system. However, the data on mean salaries are not made available in time for those faculty members preparing their materials for submission by established deadlines.

For more recent appointments a strong effort has been made to bring faculty in with high enough salaries so junior people will not suffer from pay inequity. An ADVANCE analysis of offer letters sent to faculty starting at UCI in the current academic year shows a statistically insignificant gender difference in start-up packages and salaries, with the difference in the school and the step of the appointments accounting for the observed differences.

The relatively high average salaries of recent appointments contributes to a sense of inequitable pay among longer-term employees, whose salaries grow slowly unless they have negotiated increases by bringing in offers from other institutions. This approach is one which is long associated more with men than with women, and the "loyalty penalty" contributes to gender inequity among longer-term faculty.

The EVC has developed a "shadow salary" program to be used for three years (starting in July 2003) in evaluating pay levels of tenured faculty as part of their regular career review, or applications for accelerated merit review, or for promotion. After dropping the three highest and three lowest salaries at that rank and step within a scale, the mean is calculated and the individual with a salary lower than the mean is given a raise up to the mean amount. Because each tenured professor is reviewed every third year, all should have the opportunity to be reviewed during the life of the "shadow salary" program. A complete analysis of the impact of this practice will be available as the program continues. It is viewed by some as effective in reaching relatively large numbers of people (compared to other available processes) but as resulting in relatively small salary adjustments (compared to the gaps, for example, between those hired in the last few years and those who have long been at UCI and have not used outside offers as a way to negotiate raises).

Disseminating results

The website

Although there is no counter visible on the website (consistent with current best practices in web design and administration), the numbers have been made available to me, and the web site reaches a large audience. In addition, statistics are collected on the usage of particular pages at the site, which could be useful input as the webpage design is revisited.

Professional meetings

Presentations of UCI-ADVANCE materials are an important vehicle for disseminating the Equity Advisor system, the lynchpin of the UCI program. Through their activities with recruitment, mentoring and the facilitation of mentoring systems, the review of pay equity, and

the development of useful workshops and networking opportunities, tailored to or tweaked for the specific characteristics of each school and its departments, the Equity Advisors have made an impact on the institution. The Equity Advisors can bring to their professional meetings a sense of the range of their activities and the promise that accompanies tailoring activities to particular unit. For example, one of the ADVANCE Term Chairs, who had served as an Equity Advisor, presented a poster on the UCI program at the Fall 2004 meeting of the American Geophysical Union.

Recommendations for the UCI administration

- The central administration must make its policy positions more clearly stated and more widely disseminated. I encountered diverse perceptions, for example, about the salary equity processes and funding commitments, policies and procedures for "stopping the clock" for family obligations, expectations about service loads for people with appointments in two departments.

- Where some constraints on the administration are beyond its control (for example, due to state-wide mandates), alternative forms of rewards should be explored (for example, course release, travel support, student assistance, and the amount and quality of space allocation).

- The responsibility of non-ADVANCE offices to cooperate with ADVANCE needs to be made more explicit. The problems with the IRB, the OASIM, and the slow action by the development office all require attention.

- The ADVANCE program will soon present the administration with a set of recommendations for the institutionalization of ADVANCE's work after funding from NSF ends. The administration must work quickly with the recommendations, so that a seamless change will follow. In particular, the following will be essential:

    Institutionalize the position of Equity Advisor (a three year, rather than two year term, may be optimal).

    Offer a course release as an alternative to salary incentive (Equity Advisor, not administrative, choice).

    Formalize the practice of appointing an Equity Advisor to the Academic Planning Group.

    Pair up Equity Advisors of schools that have only one (e.g., Arts, GSM); at least one Equity Advisor of each pair should be a woman.

- Because of the high turnover of department chairs, who are crucial to the effective recruitment and retention of women, the University should provide workshops for chairs. For example, chairs often see ways in which service work is useful to a junior person; they be eager to involve women in governance in a department that has had few or no women to make decisions. A workshop would consider the balance between protecting new faculty from service obligations and making new faculty full members of the unit.

- Increase Deans' accountability for:

  Openness to the Career Partners Program. Meet with any department or school that has turned down a Career Partners Program candidate or even discouraged the exploration of such a candidacy, to make clear both the administration's commitment to the program, and the overwhelming success of appointments that have been made through it.

  Ensuring that each unit's performance is reviewed, rather than relying on some units to carry the weight for institution- or school-wide performance. Require that data indicate departmental as well as school level performance toward equity goals.

  Regularly adhering to a recruitment calendar that optimizes a diverse pool.

  Keeping searches open - rather than substituting appointments as "targets of excellence," which take junior positions out of the pot and counteract movement toward a more diverse faculty.

  Explicitly protecting new and junior faculty from service burdens (perception of service burdens appear as a significant gender difference in both the faculty surveys and the exit interviews). Particular attention should be paid to the situation of those with split or joint appointments.

  Reviewing and acting on salary equity data.

Recommendations for the ADVANCE program

- Making use of the lengthy annual reports submitted by each Equity Advisor, the ADVANCE office should develop manuals for Equity Advising. Because each school has a somewhat different approach, there will be multiple models for organizing an Equity Advising Program. By distilling these materials, future Equity Advisors at UCI will be able to come up to speed faster. In addition, these should be disseminated to other universities. The Equity Advisor dimension of the UCI ADVANCE program is extremely effective, and is perhaps unique to UCI. It should be shared through presentations at disciplinary and other professional meetings (e.g., the ASEE meetings), in publications, and on the UCI website.

- Some further systematizing of Equity Advisor work is called for, to insure that small but important details do not slip through the cracks. For example, the Equity Advisor should be sure to review with the chair of each department the need to shield new faculty members from a service burden during their first year at the University.

- The data that are now or have recently been collected and analyzed should inform future programming as well as changes to the Equity Advisor and mentoring processes. The arrival of a new Program Director in early May will provide a natural moment for reviewing the wealth of data that have recently or are about to become available.

- Additional expansion is expected, of the kinds of mentoring activities within each school, and the kinds of faculty development workshops offered. For example, the Equity

Advisors in the Physical Sciences plan to expand the mentoring program to include new male faculty, which should not be difficult because the parameters of the program have been fine-tuned. The Equity Advisor in the College of Health Sciences, working with a School of Biological Sciences Equity Advisor, is developing a series of workshops, for female and male post-docs and faculty featuring UCI faculty (female and male).

- I recommend that the program turn its focus to the senior women faculty, drawing on the successful work done in some of the schools. In particular, there should be an expansion of mentoring programs, workshops addressing concerns particular to people who have been at the university for a long period of time, and the establishment of internal funding opportunities for course release as part of the development of a new research agenda. As people in mid-career reflect on their professional trajectories, workshops and mentoring will be extremely useful in exploring and preparing to move in new directions.

- In light of the large variety of resources available via the web page, I recommend a revision of its format, such that visitors can more easily recognize the range of resources and navigate them quickly. The web page is a means to recruitment of new faculty and for faculty development. It functions simultaneously as a major tool for informing individuals and units at UCI of local resources and procedures, and should have more internal links to offices at UCI. It should be an important link to learning more about university policies that might otherwise be obscure or difficult to locate (e.g., information on "stopping the clock," on the Career Partners Program, and on the multiple ways to pursue pay equity. The Director may want to consider a short survey about usage before making final design decisions. The Program's new administrative assistant has web design skills which can be put to use to enhance the site's effectiveness. All materials on the web avoid the use of acronyms or other references to only locally meaningful language.

- The new Director, in the new ADVANCE location in the Administration Building, will need to work together with the Associate EVC, who is a Co-PI, to identify and proactively overcome obstacles that are encountered. Units that have been slow to move on ADVANCE-related needs will require early attention from the new Director. The EVC's office must make clear that offices responsible for such tasks need to perform them, rather than informally defaulting with the assumption that ADVANCE staff will take on that work.

- The Director should also work closely with the EVC's office to insure the production of clear statements of institutional policies and their effective dissemination (e.g., on "stopping the tenure clock"; on new faculty service protection; on participation in the Career Partner Program; on protection of faculty in split/joint positions; and on pay equity). Improved communications of these policies will obviously be helpful to all members of the faculty.

- Building on the exceptionally effective work of the Equity Advisors with academic leaders and recruitment committees, ADVANCE should turn to workshops that take on climate issues with all faculty, male and female, junior and senior.

- Highest priority should go to the completion of the analysis of the first wave of qualitative interviews, extending it to a small sample of senior women from schools underrepresented in the initial interviews, who should be asked in their initial interviews

about their experiences with the various aspects of ADVANCE. A follow-up study of the first sample should proceed in a more timely fashion.

- Information on workshops and other one-time events should be collected and analyzed more regularly.