

Collaborative Transformation Project

Mail address: 1550 Beardshear • Office: 118 Office & Lab • Iowa State University • Ames, IA 50011 • advance@iastate.edu

Rounds 1 & 2 - Focal Department Synthesis Report*

Animal Science

Chemistry

Civil, Construction and Environmental Engineering

Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology

Genetics, Development and Cell Biology

Materials Science Engineering

April 2010

**Sharon R. Bird, Laura Rhoton, Carla Fehr and
Lisa M. Larson**

Citation information: Sharon R. Bird, Laura Rhoton, Carla Fehr and Lisa Larson. 2010. *ISU ADVANCE Collaborative Transformation Project: Rounds 1 and 2 - Focal Department Synthesis Report (April 2010)*. Iowa State University ADVANCE Program. Report available online at: <http://www.advance.iastate.edu/resources.shtml>.

*Contact: sbird@iastate.edu for more information about the ISU ADVANCE Collaborative Transformation Project.

*The research reported here was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation SBE 0600399. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Iowa State University ADVANCE Leadership Team

ADVANCE Principal Investigator (PI)

Susan Carlson

Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement and Diversity
and Professor of English

ADVANCE Co-Principal Investigators (Co-PIs)

Sharon R. Bird

ADVANCE Research Director
Associate Professor Sociology

Bonnie Bowen

ADVANCE Executive Director
Adjunct Assistant Professor Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology

Diane Debinski

Professor Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology

Carla Fehr

Associate Professor Philosophy and Religious Studies

Sandra Gahn

Associate Director Office of Institutional Research

Florence A. Hamrick

Associate Professor Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

Findings

April 2010

This report summarizes research from the Iowa State University ADVANCE Collaborative Transformation (CT) Project. The results discussed here are based on intensive research conducted within six Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) departments at ISU during 2006-2009. The report also reviews some of the activities within the departments aimed at enhancing workplace climate and improving recruitment, retention and promotion of diverse faculty that have been inspired and informed by the CT Project. These activities are funded by a 5 year grant from the National Science Foundation's ADVANCE Institutional Transformation program, which is designed to create an infrastructure for transforming structures, cultures, and practices in ways that enable and support recruitment, retention and promotion of women faculty in STEM fields. This report represents one step in an overall multistage process. The CT Project will eventually include three additional focal ISU STEM departments, a further synthesis of findings from all departments over a 5-year period, and the development and refinement of assessment tools aimed at identifying and reducing barriers to faculty scholarly success—including issues that hinder the recruitment, retention and promotion of women faculty.

The first three departments to participate in the CT Project were Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology (EEOB), Genetics, Development and Cell Biology (GDCEB), and Materials Science Engineering (MSE). These departments began participation in 2006. The second three departments to participate in the CT project were Animal Science, Chemistry, and Civil, Construction and Environmental Engineering. These departments began participation in 2008. The first 6 focal departments represent three colleges: The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, and the College of Engineering. Department Chairs and faculty in each of these departments have been working together with researchers (scholars in the fields of organizational studies, women in science, and higher education) and members of the ISU ADVANCE Co-PI Leadership Team and its partners to help ISU better understand how to ensure positive departmental work environments and to achieve the overall goals of ADVANCE grant project. These departments were selected, in large part, because of their willingness to contribute to achieving greater understanding of the structures, practices, and cultures most conducive to faculty success at ISU and, collectively, among STEM disciplines. The departments selected for the ADVANCE CT Project are home to many nationally prominent graduate programs and world renowned scholars. Each of these departments and their department Chairs, all of whom have dedicated considerable time and attention to the ISU ADVANCE project, are to be commended for their efforts.

The departmental work involved in the project was organized by ADVANCE Professors, Department Chairs and a departmental team or advisory group in each respective department. The methods for gathering the in-depth qualitative data were focus groups,

individualized interviews with faculty and chairs, and existing documents (e.g., departmental governance documents) from each of the three STEM departments. The average participation rate among the faculty in the three departments was **76.75 percent**. All interviews and focus groups were audio-recorded and then transcribed. Transcriptions yielded more than 2000 double-spaced pages of raw data in addition to the respective governance documents and notes from focal departmental web sites. The data were first analyzed separately for each department. Separate reports (executive summary, findings, strategies for addressing salient issues, summary of research methods) were then written for each department so that individual departments could begin the process of addressing issues particular to their own department.

The CT Project is designed to “mirror back” to faculty within each department aspects of their own workplace climate that influence how positive their climate is and how effective the department’s recruitment, retention and promotion practices are. This requires using focus group and interview data to better understand departmental structures, practices, and cultures. Departmental *structures* include codified and or routine decision-making processes, including governance documents, resource allocation procedures, and committee configurations. Departmental *practices* refer to the systematic actions in which faculty members generally engage. And departmental *cultures* refer to prevailing values, norms, assumptions and symbols of departmental members and their activities.

After the six separate departmental reports were completed (as noted above), the data for all six departments were then analyzed collectively in order to identify those issues that were salient across all six departments. **Thus, this synthesis report is not a simple merging of all findings from the separate departments, but rather represents only the issues that were common to all six departments.** For example if an issue was identified as salient in only one or two departments, it was not included in this report. Each major finding outlined below represents an issue that faculty in all six departments addressed during focus group and interview sessions.

The seven major findings across ALL six departments are (1) mentoring of faculty; (2) transparency in assigning courses/teaching loads and rewarding teaching; (3) collegiality; (4) faculty recruitment and retention structures and practices; (5) promotion and tenure structures and practices; (6) work-life balance structures and practices; and (7) facilities and space. These are outlined below, with assessment tools for identifying possible next steps below each finding. Note that while all of the issues presented as findings below have clear implications for women faculty and other underrepresented faculty groups, each also has implications for those groups that are not underrepresented in faculty roles.

FINDING 1: MENTORING FACULTY

- In all 6 departments, Chairs were identified as playing a crucial role in mentoring Assistant professors by helping to increase Assistant professors’ understanding of expectations for tenure and/or promotion and work with them during promotion and tenure processes.

- All department Chairs meet with Assistant professors annually to conduct a performance review. Most of the 6 focal department Chairs also have adopted the practice of meeting with Assistant professors as a group once or twice a year to discuss any issues of interest or concern to junior faculty. Assistant professors report that they benefit greatly from this.
- Faculty across ranks, and especially Assistant professors, stress the importance of senior faculty mentoring for Assistant Professors. Many Associate professors also stress the need for senior faculty to mentor faculty at the Associate level, though the issues of greatest interest among Associate professors (regarding mentoring) differ somewhat from those of Assistant professors.
 - Among Associate professors who expressed the need for better mentoring (for promotion to Full), for example, central issues include the need for more information about the level of *research* accomplishment and about *when* to seek promotion. Assistant professors, by comparison, express the need for clearer and more consistent messages from senior colleagues regarding the level of accomplishment in teaching, service *and* research required for promotion and tenure
 - Department culture plays an important role in determining the consistency and effectiveness of mentoring for both Associate and Assistant professors. Mentoring of Assistant (and to some extent, Associate) professors is a more recognizable aspect of some departmental cultures than others.
- The Assistant and Associate professors who are MOST satisfied with the level of mentoring that they receive are:
 - those who (by their own accounts) receive consistent messages from senior faculty and the department chair regarding expectations/requirements for tenure and/or promotion;
 - those who perceive departmental documents regarding tenure and promotion to be transparent;
 - those whose colleagues have gone through the tenure and/or promotion process and have communicated to other, more junior faculty that the process was transparent and fair.

Assessment and implementation tools: Not all departments have cultivated formal mentoring relationships between junior and senior faculty. In departments where mentoring is a part of departmental culture, not all mentoring relationships are consistently beneficial to junior faculty. Departments seeking to improve mentoring relationships between Assistant professors and their more senior colleagues and/or between Associate professors and Full professors may benefit from the following (see also Bird and Hamrick 2008):

- Sharing aggregated departmental information about faculty productivity by rank, particularly in the areas of publishing, obtaining external funding, professional practice, teaching and service;
- Chair-led meetings with Associate professors (collectively and/or individually) about promotion similar to the discussions that department Chairs and Assistant professors regularly have;
- Assistant and Associate professor participation in university-wide (rank-specific) forums and workshops regarding promotion and tenure, including discussion of the

relative value and rewards to be attached to teaching, research, obtaining external funding, professional practice and service;

- Regular meetings among departmental mentors to share information about mentoring and mentoring strategies; and
- College-wide and/or university-wide training for mentors.

FINDING 2: TRANSPARENCY IN ASSIGNING COURSES/TEACHING LOADS AND REWARDING TEACHING

- In all 6 departments, many if not most faculty stress the importance of excellence in teaching and take pride in teaching.
- In all 6 departments, many faculty also stress the need for greater transparency in the ways in which teaching assignments (courses and loads) are made; how “excellence” in teaching is determined and the extent to which excellence in teaching influences tenure and promotion decisions and annual salary increases; and in how credit for teaching and teaching-related activities (e.g., advising, teaching large vs. small sections, etc.) is allocated.
 - Overall, faculty perceptions of transparency in teaching assignments, loads, and rewards vary across departments.
 - Assistant, Associate and Lecturer faculty express greater concern over these issues than Full professors.
- Faculty perceptions of *fairness* in teaching assignments and in the distribution of teaching-related rewards are related to faculty perceptions of transparency in teaching assignments and reward-allocations. The more transparency that faculty members perceive, the more apt they are to believe that teaching assignments, loads, and rewards are fair.
- Faculty concerns about transparency in teaching assignments and rewards were greater among Round 2 focal departments of the ADVANCE CT project than among Round 1 departments. Faculty members in Round 2 were more apt to link these concerns to university budget issues. Faculty in Round 2 were also more apt to explain that the need for transparency in teaching is especially crucial given the likelihood that most faculty in most departments will be teaching more students in the near future.
 - Faculty who participated in Round 2 of the CT project appear to be less resistant to the idea of teaching more students than they are to an anticipated lack of transparency in how decisions about teaching may be made. Faculty members in many (focal) STEM departments believe that teaching more students and a higher course load is inevitable.

Assessment and implementation tools: Gaps in understanding and/or differing assumptions among departmental faculty members regarding teaching assignments, course loads, and/or the *relative value of* and *reward structures for* teaching (especially as they pertain to promotion and tenure or salary decisions), may result in dissatisfaction among faculty members. Departments seeking to increase transparency regarding teaching may benefit from the following (see also Bird and Hamrick 2008):

- Departments may benefit from sharing information regarding: average teaching loads for faculty (by rank) within the department, and the number and type of courses taught by each faculty member each year.

- Departments that share information regarding faculty teaching responsibilities would be advised to also *contextualize* work responsibilities of faculty members, keeping the following issues in mind.
 - Not all faculty members share the same kind of academic appointment (i.e., Personal Responsibility Statements (PRSs) vary).
 - Not all faculty members are supported at the same level by grants and contracts.
 - Not all faculty members serve on the same number of university, department and student committees.
 - Not all faculty members support/work with the same number graduate students, or advise undergraduate students.
 - Not all courses taught by faculty require the same time and effort investment (e.g., larger vs. smaller enrollment courses, courses with and without lab sections).
- Departments may benefit from the development of strategies to document and publicly recognize especially meaningful contributions in service or teaching. For example, departmental awards for leadership or teaching excellence may highlight major accomplishments in a manner that might be more readily recognized by faculty colleagues or external reviewers.
- Departments may benefit from the development of a departmental strategic plan, developed with wide faculty participation (to ensure broad ownership of the plan), that describes concretely the values placed on research, teaching, outreach and service.

FINDING 3: COLLEGIALITY

“Collegiality” was the term used to describe a wide array of faculty behaviors and practices. These included seeking out colleagues for research collaborations; being able to express differing viewpoints during faculty meetings; being comfortable questioning assessments made by colleagues regarding applicants and on-campus candidates for faculty positions; socializing with faculty during or after working hours; supporting one’s colleagues for awards nominations; effectiveness and willingness to act as a mentor; “pulling one’s weight” on departmental committees; demonstrating a willingness to fill in for colleagues in cases of emergency or prolonged illness; and taking leadership roles in ensuring that one’s colleagues feel welcomed to express differing views or to ask questions regarding departmental procedures and practices.

Faculty members explained that whereas some departmental practices contribute positively to collegiality, others detract from it. Collegiality (and perceptions of it), in turn, influence many other dynamics within departments.

- ***Departmental practices that contribute to collegiality.*** Departmental practices that contribute positively to collegiality center mainly on the extent to which faculty members perceive fairness and *transparency* in decision-making regarding key departmental functions and secondarily on the extent to which faculty members are familiar with colleagues’ work and support one another.
 - Transparency issues that influence collegiality include transparency in making teaching assignments, distribution of course loads, and student advising; procedures for evaluating faculty members for tenure and promotion; procedures for evaluating faculty members for annual salary increases; and practices of recruiting and

- evaluating candidates for faculty positions. Less transparency was associated negatively with perceptions and experiences of collegiality; greater transparency was associated positively with collegiality.
- Mutual support issues that influence collegiality include faculty collaborations with one another; faculty socializing together; and faculty offering assistance to one another in times of professional or personal need. Less mutual support was associated negatively with perceptions and experiences of collegiality; greater mutual support was associated positively with collegiality.
 - ***Departmental dynamics that are influenced by collegiality.*** A proportion of the faculty in each department (the proportion varies) expressed concerns regarding the effects of collegiality on promotion and tenure, willingness to express opposing viewpoints, teaching responsibilities, research collaborations and on the distribution of departmental resources, and awards nominations.
 - Lecturers (and Adjuncts) and Assistant professors were more apt to express concerns about the effects of collegiality than were Associate and Full professors.
 - Across all six departments, faculty members who feared negative repercussions (e.g., in tenure decision votes, teaching assignments, awards nominations) reported being less likely to express personal perspectives and to disagree openly with more senior faculty (e.g., at faculty meetings or in one-on-one conversations with colleagues).
 - Faculty across ranks noted that collegiality enhances (and is enhanced by) colleagues' willingness to step in during emergencies or situations involving the needs of a faculty member's family, to support one another by helping teach other faculty members' courses and by reviewing grant proposals.
 - Faculty across ranks noted that collegiality contributes positively (and is enhanced by) colleagues' active promotion of departmental faculty for college, university and professional association awards.

Assessment and implementation tools: In departments in which collegiality is low or declining, departmental cohesiveness and faculty members' commitment and productivity may suffer. Low levels of collegiality may also dampen faculty members' willingness to participate fully in departmental activities and decision-making. Under these conditions, departments may in turn be operating under false assumptions about how much agreement actually exists among the faculty regarding important departmental issues. Departments hoping to tap the range of faculty members' viewpoints and potential contributions may thus benefit by implementing the following types of practices and procedures:

- Regularly reviewing and posting "best practices" for effective and efficient faculty meetings.
- Increasing transparency in decision-making regarding teaching assignments and rewards associated with teaching (see ISSUE 2 above).
- Chair-led (or some substitute for the Chair) discussions with the faculty about the teaching needs of the department in conjunction with faculty input regarding how to meet departmental teaching needs.
- Increasing transparency in decision-making regarding tenure and promotion and annual salary increases (see ISSUE 5 below).

- Increasing transparency in decision-making regarding faculty recruitment, hiring and retention (see ISSUE 4 below).
- Designating a faculty member at each faculty meeting to facilitate dialogue in a manner that encourages respect for colleagues and equitable opportunities for diverse ideas from the full range of faculty participants.
- Encouraging faculty members to learn more about colleagues' research (e.g., review grant proposals and attend research presentations) and facilitating the development of collaborations among faculty in the department and across departmental units.
- Encouraging faculty members to work together to help ensure that colleagues' are able to balance work and family/life responsibilities.
- Cross-departmental Chair workshops that focus specifically on best practices for promoting collegiality in departments and/or among faculty in cross-departmental programs.

FINDING 4: FACULTY RECRUITMENT, HIRING AND RETENTION STRUCTURES AND PRACTICES

Faculty members across all departments express the belief that recruitment, retention and promotion of the very best faculty members is essential to the success of the department and university. Faculty members across all departments, furthermore, express the belief only highly qualified candidates should be hired.

- ***Recruitment structures and practices.*** Most faculty members across departments express support for recruiting a diverse range of faculty members, including scholars with differing research interests, women scholars, scholars of color, and international scholars. A smaller portion of the faculty in each department (the proportion varies), however, also expressed the belief that efforts aimed specifically at increasing the percentage of women faculty or faculty of color in a department may result in the gender or ethnicity of the candidate being viewed as more important than the quality of the candidate's scholarship. This sentiment (when expressed) is often framed as a "lowering of standards." Faculty who subscribe to this view may not yet be convinced that searches aimed specifically at increasing the number of candidates from diverse backgrounds result in job offers to individuals who are as highly qualified as those who receive job offers under processes that do not specifically target underrepresented groups.
- Many faculty members (again, the proportion varies) who articulate the belief that targeting women and minorities in hiring processes amounts to lowering standards also subscribe to the belief that in order for the number of highly qualified women and candidates of color to increase, the percentages of women and people of color earning advanced degrees in STEM fields will have to increase. Putting more effort into recruiting more women and people of color, from this point of view, will produce little added benefit because there simply aren't enough highly qualified candidates among these groups.
- The extent to which departments actively try to recruit women and people of color varies, as do departments' *primary recruitment strategies*. Departments' primary recruitment strategies (arranged from those more common to less common) include:
 - Relying primarily on faculty search committees (in conjunction with department Chair and departmental faculty consultations) to determine short lists of candidates

- to pursue, review applications, and develop short lists (some departments rely more primarily on search committees to do this work than do others);
- Use of personal professional networks to identify promising graduate students and post-docs for future recruitment into faculty positions;
 - Inviting promising graduate students and post-docs to ISU to give guest lectures before they go on the job market (in hopes of eventually making job offers to some of these promising new scholars);
 - Highlighting the departments' positive work culture and collegiality; this may be accomplished, for example, by routinely introducing faculty candidates to graduate students and support staff to help them get a feel for the department and the larger community; and
 - Actively trying to recruit women and underrepresented minorities from other universities, cities or regions of the country that have more under-represented people of color.

Some faculty members in each department, however, disagree with the strategy of specifically targeting women or underrepresented minorities in hiring processes—preferring instead to use “gender blind” and “race/ethnicity” blind recruitment strategies.

- ***Hiring structures and practices.*** Faculty members report that start up packages and salary competition with other Universities often leaves Iowa State University at a disadvantage when it comes to hiring faculty. Many of the candidates for faculty positions, and perhaps especially women faculty candidates and faculty candidates of color, are recruited by multiple schools at once.
 - While some ISU STEM departments purposely offer these candidates more money in order to recruit them, Iowa State University often cannot compete with the job offers of other schools.
 - The practice of inviting scientists to give guest lectures before they are on the job market in order to attract the candidate to Iowa State has been successful in some instances (and is a practice that is viewed positively by most departmental faculty).
- ***Retention structures and practices.*** The extent to which departments try actively to retain faculty differs across departments. For some departments, retention is viewed as less problematic. Many departments focus more primarily on faculty recruitment than on retention. While the range of retention practices is limited, the most common of these are noted below.
 - Departments proactively support the research of the faculty—a practice that is greatly appreciated by individual faculty members across all 6 departments.
 - To the extent that departments proactively support teaching, faculty also appreciate this; the extent to which departments support teaching, however, varies.
 - Most departments, led by the efforts of department chairs and special departmental committees, consistently boost faculty members' academic reputations within their respective fields of scholarship by:
 - Providing assistance to junior faculty members regarding the preparation of grant proposals;
 - Helping Assistant professors to identify teaching improvement workshops that align specifically with faculty members' teaching needs; and

- Actively and consistently nominating a wide range of faculty members for college, university, and professional association awards.
- Some departments try actively to maintain a positive departmental climate and ensure that faculty members are made aware of “family friendly” policies, and that faculty members within the department “pitch in” to help ensure that when personal emergencies arise, teaching and service responsibilities will be covered.

Assessment and implementation tools: Departments seeking to ensure the recruitment, retention and promotion of the most highly qualified faculty, and to ensure at the same time that faculty of diverse perspectives and backgrounds are recruited, hired and retained, may wish to pursue the following strategies (see also Bird and Hamrick 2008):

- Research indicates that the notion that one must “lower standards” in order to recruit and hire more women and underrepresented minorities is a myth (National Academy of Science 2007; Onwuachi-Willig 2010; Turner, Myers and Creswell 1999).
 - Previous research suggests that the “lowering standards” myth, in turn, may contribute to faculty members’ unwillingness to explore and implement new strategies for *expanding existing faculty networks* to include potential faculty candidates whose backgrounds differ from their own (in terms of diversity of thought and diversity of personal backgrounds) (Onwuachi-Willig 2010).
 - Departments (and colleges) may wish to invest additional energies into dispelling the myth of “lowering standards” and, in turn, refocus faculty attention on making ISU STEM departments a destination for women and faculty of color (as well as all other groups).
- The argument that emphasizes a lack of Ph.D. and post-doctoral level women and/or underrepresented minorities in STEM is called the “pipeline” metaphor. This argument suggests that the underrepresentation of certain groups in academic STEM is due primarily to their lack within the STEM “pipeline.” Research, however, indicates that the underrepresentation of women faculty and faculty of color cannot be fully accounted for by the proportion of these groups in the “pipeline” (Goulden, Frasch, Mason 2009; Marschke, Laursen, Nielsen and Rankin 2007; National Science Foundation 2004). A proportion of this underrepresentation is due to the “leaking” of women from the “pipeline” (i.e., women leaving academic science at a disproportionate rate).
 - Previous research suggests that the pipeline argument, in turn, may contribute to faculty members’ unwillingness to explore and implement new strategies for *expanding existing faculty networks* to include potential faculty candidates whose backgrounds differ from their own (in terms of diversity of thought and diversity of personal backgrounds) (Onwuachi-Willig 2010).
 - Departments (and colleges) may wish to invest additional energies into addressing the limitations of the “pipeline” argument and, in turn, refocus faculty attention on making ISU STEM departments a destination for women and faculty of color (as well as all other groups).
- Departments may wish to discuss diversity as a requisite part of a strategic plan for achieving and maintaining excellence.

- Departments may wish to discuss the explicit use of agreed upon evaluation criteria and conscious monitoring of discussions about applicant files to ensure observations about faculty candidates are supportable by the evidence.
- Departments may wish to discuss inviting as seminar presenters women and persons of color who are post-docs and graduate students at universities known to graduate and attract (as post-docs) higher proportions of women and people of color;
- Departments may wish to hold presentations that highlight studies about unintentional bias problems associated with the recruitment and evaluation of candidates.
- Departments may wish to use uniform candidate forms for evaluating candidates that include a list of the criteria in the position announcement/job description.
- Departments may wish to try discussing each candidate's (or short list of candidates') strengths as well as weaknesses to help minimize the potential effects of unintended biases.
- Departments may wish to emphasize to on-campus interviewees faculty awareness of issues faced by women faculty and faculty of color, partner accommodation efforts, and university "family friendly" policies, including part-time tenure.
- Departments may wish to develop strategic plans for retaining faculty members that include goals for:
 - Engaging senior faculty members more actively in mentoring junior faculty members;
 - Ensuring that Assistant professors have the support they need for preparing grant proposals;
 - Providing consistent feedback to faculty members regarding teaching; and
 - Developing/maintaining active departmental awards committees that help to gain recognition of faculty excellence in research as well as teaching and professional practice.
- Departments may wish to discuss, identify and implement department-level policy changes that might clarify the department's long-term commitment to its faculty and to a family-friendly workplace.

FINDING 5: PROMOTION & TENURE STRUCTURES AND PRACTICES

- ***Faculty reviews and evaluations:*** Some faculty members noted confusion and concern over how teaching, research, securing grant funding and service were evaluated for promotion and tenure within their departments.
 - Some faculty noted that unequal distribution of teaching and service responsibilities hinders their ability to devote time to research and external funding which may negatively effect their promotion (usually from Associate to Full professor). Concerns were voiced over the value applied to teaching and service relative to the value applied to research and obtaining external funding.
 - Some faculty noted that the timing of faculty reviews and the meaning behind evaluations and reviews was unclear and unhelpful; some of these faculty members also report being confused about the purpose of faculty reviews and evaluations.
 - Some faculty noted that the criteria used in reviews was inconsistent from person to person and often changed.
 - Other faculty questioned the value of conducting reviews, especially if everyone appeared to be given the same level of affirmation for their accomplishments.

- ***Transparency in promotion and tenure:*** Some faculty noted that the information sharing process about promotion and tenure is inadequate. The reasons for this vary, but include spatial proximity to colleagues and mentoring.
 - Some faculty note that there is lack of understanding of the expectations for promotion and tenure. For example, some departments don't specify how many publications are needed
 - Some faculty note that there isn't enough support for Assistant faculty members during the promotion and tenure process (e.g., regarding how to package the appropriate materials for P&T dossiers).
 - Some faculty note that there is less support for Associate professors than for Assistant professors. In some departments, faculty note that standards for promotion from Associate to Full are extremely vague and appear to vary from person to person.
 - Some faculty note feeling stressed when they are unclear about the process.

- ***Career flexibility:*** Not all faculty members in all departments are fully aware of family friendly policies as they relate to tenure and promotion. (See also Finding 6 below).
 - Some faculty reported not knowing that the tenure clock can be delayed for the birth or adoption of a child or to take care of an ailing family member.
 - Among some faculty who are aware of family friendly policies, there is skepticism about the use of those policies as they pertain to tenure and promotion.
 - Some senior faculty members worry that other departmental senior colleagues will expect junior faculty members who “delay” or “stop” the tenure clock to produce “extra” research products.
 - Some untenured tenure-track faculty worry that departmental senior colleagues will “hold them to a higher standard” in promotion and tenure decisions.
 - Some faculty reported (in addition) being confused as to how to evaluate faculty members who have stopped the tenure clock.
 - Many faculty reported that because successful promotion and tenure often relies on obtaining grant funding, the ability for faculty to take time off is reduced due to responsibilities surrounding grant-funded research.
 - Some faculty note that taking parental leave, especially in the form of a reduced teaching load, places undue burden on other faculty members who may then have a more negative view of the faculty member taking time off, impacting promotion and tenure.

Assessment and implementation tools: Departments seeking to enhance promotion and tenure structures and practices may benefit from the following:

- Departments may wish to hold discussions over criteria used and corresponding reward structures used for the evaluation of teaching, research, professional practice and service as these relate specifically to promotion, tenure and annual salary increases.
- Conducting an annual review and discussion of university work-life balance or “family friendly” policies led by the department Chair at a faculty meeting.
- Departments, furthermore, may wish to discuss annually and perhaps outline in their departmental governance document (or a departmental faculty handbook) department-

specific steps involved in and general expectations for tenure and promotion (which, again, must be consistent with college and university guidelines), including:

- Minimum criteria for research, teaching, professional practice and service competency for tenure, promotion to Associate, and promotion to Full;
- Relative value placed within the department on research, teaching, professional practice, and service;
- Relative value placed among faculty within the department regarding different publication outlets;
- Relative value placed within the department on different forms of external funding; and
- How teaching assignments are derived and expectations for teaching excellence in promotion and tenure processes.

FINDING 6: WORK-LIFE BALANCE STRUCTURES AND PRACTICES

- Most of the faculty support, in principal, the idea of family friendly policies. The extent to which faculty are aware of existing policies, however, varies considerably across departments, as do levels of support (in practice) for these policies. Faculty who were aware of family friendly policies noted that Iowa State had made progress in that area and were able to cite examples of colleagues successfully using these policies.
- Several faculty (within each department) noted that not everyone is aware of family friendly policies or support such policies.
 - Some faculty noted that delaying the tenure clock was seen as “unprofessional” because it placed undue burden on other faculty members having to teach for an individual taking time off.
 - Some faculty expressed the belief that faculty should not be allowed to delay a tenure clock for any reason.
 - Some faculty noted that their department has a “workaholic” culture that does not support delays or time off.
 - Many faculty noted that family leave requests have been handled on a case by case basis and that decisions have been inconsistent. This observation was more prevalent among the first round of departments, however, suggesting that over time, family leave requests are being handled more consistently.
 - Some faculty noted that hiring temporary instructors for faculty on leave is sometimes not financially possible for the department.
- Many faculty noted that delaying a tenure clock or taking time off of work was not plausible given the research demands of their occupation.
 - While faculty note that having family friendly policies is beneficial, they do not see it as plausible to use them.
 - Some faculty note that there are increased expectations for travel and other work obligations that make taking time off implausible.
 - Some faculty also note that the attitudes of others are slow to change and express concern over how faculty will be evaluated when it comes time for tenure and promotion if they have taken a leave or delayed a tenure clock.

Assessment and implementation tools: Because the issue of “family friendly” policies is university wide, the issues outlined above would appear to span all departments regardless

of individual department's structures, cultures and practices. Chairs expressed support for faculty members who use these policies, and support the idea of helping other departmental faculty members to better understand how to evaluate the faculty member who utilizes one or more of ISU's existing family friendly policies. Thus, *in addition to further support at the university level*, departments may benefit from the following (see also Bird and Hamrick 2008):

- Departments may wish to review annually during faculty meetings the current University procedures for partner accommodation and extension of the tenure clock.
- Departments may wish to hold discussions aimed at developing department-specific guidelines for providing release time during periods of family leave. These discussions could increase department-wide understanding of such policies and provide support for those who use them.
- Departments may wish to draft guidelines for providing family leave to faculty within the context of University guidelines.
- Departments may also wish to hold faculty discussions about how work-life issues affect those whose parents and other extended family members require care for prolonged illnesses and other life events.

FINDING 7: FACILITIES AND SPACE

- Many faculty report feeling satisfied with the office, lab, teaching and socializing spaces offered by their department and do not feel their work is compromised as a result of the facilities and space.
 - Some faculty note that the dispersion of faculty across multiple buildings makes the development of community difficult, which impacts information sharing, collaboration, mentoring and socializing.
 - Some faculty note that there is inadequate classroom space for both the size of classes and the types of classes taught (for example, the need for specialized classrooms).
 - Lab space in some departments is lacking in quantity and in functionality- some lab spaces are not up to safety codes or there are electrical, plumbing or environmental problems with the space.

Assessment and implementation tools:

- When departmental faculty members are dispersed across multiple buildings (or floors in buildings), departmental chairs may wish to take proactive steps to create spaces and time periods for junior faculty and tenured faculty to interact face-to-face with one another. Dispersion of faculty may impact faculty productivity, mentoring relationships, and faculty members' awareness of their colleagues' contributions to research, teaching, and service activities. Among the many ways to accomplish this are:
 - Department Chairs may wish to organize informal meetings with Assistant professors to discuss issues of departmental norms, policies, and tenure and promotion evaluation processes.
 - Department Chairs may wish to organize more regular faculty meetings and seminars.
 - Faculty members may wish to hold regular social gatherings.

- Departments may wish to hold faculty retreats or other regularly scheduled meetings in which faculty members can discuss their respective research programs and realize opportunities for collaboration.
- As a routine part of scheduling courses and assigning classrooms and labs, departmental teaching coordinators and/or committees may wish to report back to the faculty as a whole on the process by which room assignments are made (and the limitations to scheduling that result from forces beyond the control of the department).
- Departments may wish for form committees (or empower an existing committee) to work specifically on developing procedures (or for enforcing existing procedures) regarding the allocation, maintenance and safety of facilities for teaching and research.

REFERENCES:

- Bird, Sharon R. and Florence A. Hamrick. 2008. *ISU ADVANCE Collaborative Transformation Project: First Round Focal Department Synthesis Report (March 2008)*. Iowa State University ADVANCE Program. Report available online at: <http://www.advance.iastate.edu/resources.shtml>.
- Bystydzienski, Jill, and Sharon R. Bird. 2006, "Introduction." In Jill Bystydzienski, and Sharon R. Bird (eds.) *Removing Barriers: Women in Academic Science, Engineering, Technology and Mathematics Careers*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Goulden, Marc, Karie Frasch and Mary Ann Mason, 2009 *Staying Competitive: Patching America's Leaky Pipeline in the Sciences*. Berkely Law: Center for American Progress, Berkeley, CA (November 2009).
- Marschke, R., Laursen, S., Nielsen, J., Rankin, P. 2007. Demographic Inertia Revisited: An Immodest Proposal to Achieve Equitable Gender Representation among Faculty in Higher Education. *Journal of Higher Education* 78(1): 1-26.
- National Academy of Sciences. 2007. *Beyond Biases and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering*. National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C.
- National Science Foundation. 2004. *Gender Differences in the Careers of Academic Scientists and Engineers (NSF 04-323)*. National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics, Arlington, VA.
- Onwuachi-Willig, Angela. 2010. "Complimentary Discrimination and Complimentary Discrimination in Faculty Hiring." University of Iowa Legal Studies Research Paper, no. 10-11. (Also appears in *Washington University Law Review*, forthcoming, volume 87.)
- Turner, Caroline Sotello Viernes, Samuel L. Myers, Jr. and John W. Cresswell. 1999. "Exploring Underrepresentation: The Case of Faculty of Color in the Midwest." *The Journal of Higher Education* 70(1): 27-59.