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13 Individuals from 9 ADVANCE Projects Participated During 2005 with the Working Group

- New Mexico State University (Lisa Frehill & Cecily Jeser-Cannavale)
- University of Alabama, Birmingham (Helena Sviglin)
- University of California, Irvine (Priscilla Kehoe)
- University of Michigan (Abby Stewart, Jan Malley, & Ellen Meader)
- University of Puerto Rico, Humacao (Elena Batiste)
- University of Texas at El Paso (Susan Gonzales-Baker)
- Utah State University (Kim Sullivan)
- University of Wisconsin (Jenn Sheridan)
- University of Washington (Sheila Edwards Lange)
- National Science Foundation (Alice Hogan)
Evaluation occurs at different levels

National

Workshops or events

Initiatives/ Programs/ Policies

Institutional/ Local

www.cpst.org

. . . Your workforce data source.
Purposes of evaluation

• Accountability
• Program improvement
• Knowledge generation
• Hidden agendas
Different Types of Evaluation

• Impact evaluation
  – Did the program (intervention) have the desired effect?
  – What have been the program’s impacts?

• Cost/Benefit analysis
  – Was the impact of the program worth the expenditure of funds?

• Formative evaluation
  – Is the program operating as you wanted it to?
  – Are you reaching the people you want to?
  – How satisfied are people with the programming?

• Participatory evaluation
• Process evaluation
• Policy analysis
USING EVALUATION DATA AS EVIDENCE OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

- Identify the audience – appropriate analysis and presentation modes.
- Determine what issues are of most interest to the audience -- proper frame for presentation.
- Determine the amount of time you will have with the audience.
- Have a credible presenter.
- Have multiple reviewers of your presentations prior to any public display to catch small but potentially problematic errors.

www.cpst.org
Each aspect of your program needs internal evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Involved Groups</th>
<th>Workshop Elements</th>
<th>Assessment of Outcomes</th>
<th>Possible sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and tenure workshops</td>
<td>Provide faculty members with information on processes, policies</td>
<td>Faculty, Deans, Department chairs, P&amp;T committee members</td>
<td>Writing statement, Identifying letter writers, Compiling the package, Do’s and don’ts in process, Understanding when “ready”</td>
<td># of faculty attending workshops, # of faculty who are promoted and tenured, satisfaction with workshop elements, perceptions about relevance and usefulness of information presented</td>
<td>Sign-in sheets, Workshop eval forms, Quick post-workshop phone calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair training</td>
<td>Increase leaders awareness of gender equity, Improve leaders ability to govern, Improve leaders ability to manage faculty (conflict resolution, faculty development, etc.), Improve processes of implementing policies</td>
<td>Chairs, Faculty, Deans, Provost, EOO</td>
<td>Communication skills, Managing difficult people, Understanding policies and human resources regulations, Leadership skills, Self-reflection of management style, Gender bias in ratings and evaluations, Unconscious bias</td>
<td>Change in knowledge about issues, Interviews with faculty about change, Satisfaction with event elements, Perceptions about relevance and usefulness of information presented, Change in policy utilization and implementation, Implementation of anti-bias processes, Dissemination of information at faculty meetings</td>
<td>Workshop eval forms, Quick post-workshop phone calls, Departmental climate survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some Issues in Assessing Impact

• Comparators.
• Time frame of impacts
  – Recruitment data: a “quick fix”.
  – Retention/advancement: longer term ➔ need intermediate indicators.
  – Institutional transformation ➔ literature says 8-10 years!
• Behavior versus beliefs.
  – What do people really DO vs. what they say they do?
• Institutions are far from sterile environments.
Women as a Percent of Newly-hired faculty, Pre-ADVANCE and during ADVANCE by School, with Availability Data

- Biological Sciences
- Physical Sciences
- Donald Bren School of Information & Computer Sciences
- Henry Samueli School of Engineering
- Social Ecology
- Social Sciences
- Merage School of Business
- Health Sciences-Basic
- Claire Trevor School of the Arts
- Humanities

Availability data from www.cpst.org

... Your workforce data source.
UC system had lots of great data that permitted comparisons

Women as a Percent of Newly Hired Faculty

- UC-System: 2002-2005, 1st 3 years of ADVANCE
- UCI: 2002-2005, 1st 3 years of ADVANCE

- Tenured:
  - UC-System: 22.9%
  - UCI: 29.6%
  - 1999-2002: 22.9%
  - 2002-2005: 29.6%

- Untenured:
  - UC-System: 33.3%
  - UCI: 30.4%
  - 1999-2002: 33.3%
  - 2002-2005: 30.4%

- Tenured:
  - UC-System: 39.2%
  - UCI: 40.3%
  - 1999-2002: 39.2%
  - 2002-2005: 40.3%

- Untenured:
  - UC-System: 25.7%
  - UCI: 28.4%
  - 1999-2002: 25.7%
  - 2002-2005: 28.4%
UCI had the greatest increase in under-represented minority faculty among newly hired untenured faculty during the ADVANCE period versus the period prior to ADVANCE.