

*Organizational Change Strategies in ADVANCE Institutional Transformation Projects:
Synthesis of a Working Meeting*

Ann E. Austin, Michigan State University
Sandra L. Laursen, University of Colorado Boulder

September 2015

1. Purpose and Context for the Meeting

Our research project seeks to develop and share knowledge of effective change processes that promote the recruitment, retention and success of women scholars in STEM fields. Such knowledge will help institutions to strategically select and adapt sets of interventions well suited for their own contexts, and then to implement, manage and sustain these efforts in ways that make a lasting difference in the opportunities and advancement of STEM women scholars. The central research question is:

What has been learned about the effectiveness and long-term viability of organizational change efforts to create institutional environments that are conducive to the success of women scholars, particularly in STEM fields?

Our research drew upon the experiences and insights of the first 19 institutions to receive ADVANCE Institutional Transformation (IT) awards in Rounds 1 and 2 (awarded 2001-2004), using documents, interviews and site visits to gather data. To date our analyses have focused on multiple aspects of organizational change, including:

- the change strategies chosen by institutions and the impact of those strategies
- the reasons why these strategies have been effective or not
- the impact of organizational culture and context on the initial choice and ultimate impact of the chosen strategies
- “lessons learned” about effective theories of change and change strategies and processes.

These analyses have been distilled for practitioners on our web-based resource, the StratEGIC Toolkit (www.strategictoolkit.org). Analyses focused on the change interventions are presented in a series of 13 Strategic Intervention Briefs, and analyses focused on the way particular institutions combined interventions into a comprehensive change plan are presented in a series of 15 Institutional Portfolios.

Our research has also identified a number of important change processes that connect interventions and shape their influence on transformation goals. To enrich our understanding of these cross-cutting organizational change processes, and to incorporate new ideas generated over time as later IT projects built upon and extended prior ADVANCE work, we designed and conducted a working meeting with selected leaders from ADVANCE IT projects funded in

Rounds 3-6 (awarded 2006-2012) to share our work and enrich our understanding with new perspectives. The meeting had multiple purposes:

- To disseminate the findings from our research and gather feedback on the content and usefulness of the StratEGIC Toolkit (www.strategictoolkit.org)
- To gather data about dimensions of organizational change processes that have been identified in our data collection as critical for achieving change goals
- To provide ADVANCE leaders with an opportunity to reflect on and refine their perspectives as institutional change leaders, exchange ideas about effective change strategies, and strengthen their professional networks with other leaders working to advance women in STEM fields.

2. Workshop Design and Data Gathering

The workshop was held August 28-29, 2015, in Chicago, IL. Fourteen participants attended, with some representing specific ADVANCE IT awards and others representing leadership and practical expertise on gender, inclusion, STEM and the academy (see Appendix A). The meeting agenda and driving questions were designed to facilitate systematic data collection.

To prepare for the meeting, we constructed a list of all ADVANCE IT awards in Rounds 3-6, awarded 2006-2012. We studied these institutions' websites, read their reports and other materials, and sought recommendations from colleagues familiar with a range of ADVANCE projects about institutions that had done distinctive work and about individuals who could represent those projects and contribute thoughtfully to a wide-ranging conversation. To identify areas of distinctive interventions or approaches, we summarized key features of each institution's IT project in a form similar to the Institutional Portfolio that we developed for our earlier sample.

We developed the meeting agenda and driving questions to generate conversation on topics pertinent to our research questions and to build in opportunities for participants to share insights and develop connections. Meeting activities included an initial social gathering, small- and large-group discussions, shared leadership for breakout groups and reporting, and opportunities to reflect individually by writing responses to open-ended questions posed by the facilitators.

To prepare participants for this work, we developed a pre-meeting packet that was sent out about two weeks prior to the meeting, including the meeting agenda and driving questions, and pre-meeting reading including participant bios, a project summary, our 2015 *Change* article, and suggestions for reading on the StratEGIC Toolkit. We asked participants to reflect in advance on the driving questions and suggested that they might wish to speak to ADVANCE colleagues about these topics. We sought and received participants' consent to take part in the working meeting as human subjects, with a protocol approved by the Institutional Review Boards at both Michigan State and the University of Colorado Boulder.

To capture participants' insights and ideas, we recorded all discussions and breakouts with digital recorders and transcribed these *verbatim*, and took notes at all sessions. We asked each

breakout group to identify a member to record notes and report out to the full group, and collected these notes. We also collected individual responses to two sets of reflective questions posed during the meeting.

In this report, we summarize selected insights extracted from the meeting discussions, organized under the four main meeting topics:

1. the role of context in organizational change
2. organizational change processes: leadership, alliances, communication
3. the use of theory and research in organizational change
4. sustainability issues in organizational change.

These and other insights from the meeting will be analyzed comprehensively and incorporated into our future scholarly and practical products of this research.

3. The Role of Context in Institutional Transformation

Our study has been guided by our interest in understanding both the interventions used by institutions to effect institutional change in support of inclusive environments, and our interest in examining how context matters in institutional change. Through our research on the nineteen institutions that received ADVANCE IT grants in Rounds 1 and 2, we gathered examples of the role of context in organizational change processes. We have seen that an intervention that is successful in one institution may play out differently in another: How an intervention is perceived, its likely impact, and its usefulness all vary depending on context. Institutions may articulate similar goals for their ADVANCE projects, but their portfolios of interventions to address and achieve those goals are likely to differ based on key contextual features.

Institutional leaders often ask “What are the best interventions to use?” or “What has been successful at other institutions?” Our research shows that these are not the most strategic questions to ask; a more helpful question is “What interventions would be most effective and appropriate for our institution’s goals and context?” We have learned that consideration of context can help frame the problem to be addressed, the interventions most appropriate for a specific institution, and the most powerful ways to communicate about the project.

To probe the role of context in the change processes of ADVANCE institutions, we asked the participants in the working meeting to discuss questions about the way their project had considered context in identifying problems, solutions, and adjustments over time, and to identify specific contextual features that had been important in practice or in perception. Participants highlighted several key contextual factors that play a role in organizational change, including:

Location: The location of a higher education institution is relevant to the interventions that will be most effective and relevant. For example, policies to address dual career needs of faculty members are likely to be much more important at institutions in rural settings, where the broader community may offer fewer employment options for partners than it would in an urban area.

Economics: The local or regional economic situation often affects institutional hiring opportunities and can affect the efforts of ADVANCE projects. For example, when an institution that has faced constraints on new hiring shifts into a phase of extensive hiring, the moment is particularly opportune to offer deans and department chairs support and guidance in equitable search and recruitment practices. At such times, the institutional interest in integrating new and effective strategies may be especially strong, and ADVANCE can make inroads by presenting the project as a source of support and help for institutional hiring goals.

Institutional Characteristics: The list and examples below highlight an array of institutional features that create the stage on which organizational change endeavors play out.

- **History:** The history of an institution affects what faculty and administrators think is important and what they perceive to be possible. Major events or problems can sometimes set the stage for administrators and faculty to see ADVANCE goals as important.
- **Size:** The size of departments and the institution overall can shape issues, needs, and options. For example, in small departments, the array of senior faculty who can serve as mentors is also small, requiring innovative approaches to mentoring plans. Privacy needs may also be greater, and early-career women may also prefer to participate in mentoring relationships with colleagues from other departments in order to protect their privacy.
- **Leadership:** The goals, priorities, interests, and styles of senior leaders are key factors in the success of ADVANCE projects. Changes in senior leadership, as occur frequently, can pose challenges and opportunities for organizational change projects, requiring ADVANCE leaders to determine whether to adjust strategies to fit the new leadership context. Sometimes new leaders identify new issues to address; ADVANCE can sometimes be offered as a “solution” that addresses issues identified by a senior leader.
- **Structure and Governance:** Whether an institution tends to be decentralized or centralized, and whether administrative structures are more flat or more hierarchical, are important contextual factors. ADVANCE leaders need to consider where to locate their offices, with whom to connect in the central administration, and how to relate to governance bodies. Whether an institution is unionized or not is another important structural feature for planning.
- **Policies:** Some institutions have a history of offering family-friendly and other policies that contribute to inclusive environments. Others do not. What is already in place thus affects the priorities for addressing policies as a lever for change.
- **Culture:** Higher education institutions are each distinctive in the features that define what life is like at that institution, how work is done, and how change occurs. Some key cultural variables include whether the campus has a “family” feel or a more “business-like” ambiance, the ways in which administrators and faculty interact, and the values that inform daily interactions.

All these characteristics are relevant to making decisions about which interventions to include or omit in an ADVANCE change portfolio, and about how to design those interventions for the best reception on campus.

4. Processes of Organizational Change

From our earlier data, we identified several cross-cutting processes of importance in ADVANCE projects. These included selecting and building the leadership team, forming and maintaining strategic alliances, and preparing and executing communication strategies—all processes that require explicit attention and that can enhance, expand and cement the work of ADVANCE on a campus if done well and consistently. We asked participants to consider these three processes in breakout groups that were guided by questions about the importance of these processes, the nature and success of various institutional approaches, and lessons learned.

4.1. The Role of Leadership

We asked breakout group participants to consider questions about their project's approach to leadership, key characteristics and roles of their leadership team members, the ways they built and sustained their leadership teams, and the ways leaders' activities and roles had evolved or different needs had arisen over the life of the project. Participants brought out the following points about the composition and characteristics of ADVANCE leadership teams:

- Different types of leadership are needed at different times within a project. Thus leaders must be flexible, nimble, and agile. They must listen well to determine which leadership skills are most needed at a particular point.
- ADVANCE project leaders need to realize that leadership teams will change. Project leaders reported that they try to cultivate potential leaders on an ongoing basis and then must be attentive to integrating new people into the leadership group as needed.
- A key strategy for cultivating new leaders is helping them experience a sense of ownership for the project. Bringing in men as full-fledged leaders helps to creating greater ownership of ADVANCE projects.
- While centralized leadership is important, so too is faculty involvement in leading ADVANCE projects. Cultivating faculty ownership and leadership has benefits in developing support and long-term sustainability. At the same time, however, faculty members often feel pulled toward their other responsibilities, and may have limited time to offer. Thus, project leaders must consider how to balance faculty ownership and involvement with centralization of leadership responsibilities.

As they work, leaders need to understand that change takes time and involves both successes and failures. Just because something does not work as planned does not mean that it is a failure. Rather, leaders should see this situation as evidence from which to learn.

Both institutional leaders and ADVANCE leaders are in positions where they can show that ADVANCE projects are integrally connected to broader institutional missions. They can create and use occasions to speak to various audiences to highlight ADVANCE and its work, emphasize the value of its contributions to the institution, and share findings relevant to creating a diverse and inclusive campus.

Finally, participants noted that ADVANCE project leaders can be strategic in inviting senior institutional leaders—presidents, provosts, and deans—to speak at major events such as ADVANCE kick-off activities or institutional celebrations. The involvement of these senior leaders signals the importance of ADVANCE in the campus mission and priorities. Some ADVANCE leaders invited provosts, deans, or chairs to introduce visiting speakers as a way to ensure that such these leaders were aware of and felt part of ADVANCE endeavors.

4.2. Building Alliances

We asked this breakout group to discuss their approaches to creating relationships with key groups and people, their rationale for these choices, and the challenges they had faced in engaging allies. Participants identified a number of people and offices, both internal and external to the institutions, who could be useful allies. Alliances within the institution included:

- *Provosts, Associate Provosts, and Deans*: Individuals in these roles can often help with work on policy issues and promoting ADVANCE in a variety of circles.
- *Diversity Offices*: These are important alliances to cultivate, but sometimes difficult to develop because many diversity offices are compliance-oriented.
- *Human Resources*: These institutional offices are often compliance-oriented, but they can be useful allies.
- *Institutional Research*: Creating connections with IR offices can pave the way for access to important institution-gathered data. Some institutions arranged to support time for IR staff to work on specific research questions, and others included an IR representative on the ADVANCE internal leadership team,
- *Governance Bodies*: Alliances with faculty governance bodies were mentioned, but only a few examples were provided at the meeting.
- *On-campus Centers for Women or Faculty of Color*: Examples of alliances that had been locally fruitful included a local consortium of university women and associations of faculty of color.
- *Faculty Development or Teaching and Learning Centers*: Collaborations were not typical between ADVANCE projects and institutional faculty development centers, but such arrangements can be useful, for example in designing and advertising faculty development activities.

- *Informal leaders within the faculty*: Identifying and connecting with faculty members who are widely respected, whether or not they hold formal leadership roles, can be an effective path for spreading the word about ADVANCE and for finding other interested faculty colleagues.
- *Male colleagues*: Some institutions found explicit ways to connect with faculty men who will support the goals of ADVANCE. This is important to demonstrate that the problem of gender equity is not just a problem for women, and to have informed voices in places of influence, such as awards committees, especially where women's numbers are low.

Forming alliances with other provosts was one useful type of alliance external to the institution. Provosts attend meetings with leaders from other campuses where they can learn from each other and clarify their understanding of the role of campus climate and equitable evaluation processes.

Participants shared some lessons learned about building alliances and working with allies, including some of the challenges they had faced.

- The issues that emerge in alliances cannot be fully predicted, so flexibility is needed. Different alliances may become important over time, at different phases of the project.
- ADVANCE leaders should know the institution well and should think strategically when developing plans to create alliances. Taking time for pre-planning is important, as leaving out groups when connections are being created can result in the need to repair relationships.
- Some projects ask someone from outside the local ADVANCE community to introduce visiting speakers in order to make more connections for ADVANCE.

4.3. The Importance of Communication

We asked participants in this breakout group to describe their communication strategies, the rationale for these, the challenges they had faced in developing and maintaining communication strategies, and their advice to others. Participants highlighted a variety of specific tactics for communicating with a wide range of stakeholder groups. These included e-mail lists, newsletters, website features, and in-person meetings with a variety of groups: key administrators, groups with formal leadership roles (e.g., council of deans, faculty senate), relevant task forces and committees, stakeholder groups (e.g., women's faculty network), and key opinion leaders whose support was seen as essential.

Celebrations and events could be used strategically to inform as well as celebrate accomplishments. For example, one project invited a dean or chair to introduce each ADVANCE speaker and used the opportunity to share with them information about ADVANCE. Featuring a variety of faculty colleagues in workshops and panels also led to broader awareness and participation. Finally, it was also helpful when institutional leaders embedded ADVANCE products or news in their regular activities and communications, such as featuring new work/life policies on the website of relevant offices such as faculty affairs.

Key lessons learned were:

- Good communication to external groups requires making multiple efforts on multiple levels, creating both inclusive and targeted communications, paying constant attention to who was reached or not, and giving thought to what could be done to attract others.
- This steady effort requires support. Paid staff time was seen as essential to keep generating material for newsletters and websites.
- Internal communication is important too, as leaders must be well informed across all facets of the project. Leadership teams found strategies such as weekly or bi-weekly lunches to enhance their own understanding and clarity of shared goals.

5. The Use of Theory and Research in Organizational Change

Our prior findings show that ADVANCE IT projects make use of various kinds of data, including existing institutional data, national data sets, and their own research and evaluation work, as well as bodies of prior theoretical and empirical literature. Social science research and theory have played an increasingly important role in more recently funded ADVANCE IT projects in response to greater emphasis in recent calls for proposals. We asked participants to consider how theoretical perspectives and empirical data had informed the work of their projects and had made an impact on their project design, planning, communications and outcomes.

5.1. The Use of Theoretical Perspectives

Social science theory is one way to generate a shared language or framework for talking about the work of ADVANCE, but other compelling frameworks may be derived from experience (e.g, prior work in ADVANCE) or from shared understanding of the institution's culture, values, and challenges. Earlier projects experienced some tensions between the perspectives of social scientists and STEM faculty around the role of data and theory, including publication of project-generated data. Again, prior planning is important: It is useful to think about how ready the campus is for interdisciplinary conversation of the type that ADVANCE projects often require.

In some projects, more than one theoretical framework was used, depending on the need. No one framework fits all; different frameworks were seen as useful for different audiences or different tasks. Some projects had identified special resonance between the social science framework the team was using and the local cultural context; for example, a theoretical basis that emphasized personal agency and autonomy played well on a western campus where independence was valued. Participants described different uses of theoretical thinking for internal and external contexts, such as communicating within the core team or to a broader external audience. Examples of where theory had been useful included:

- Considering the needed initiatives and designing them as one strategy for team planning.
- Framing the project narrative, for example in explaining to stakeholders the rationale for a particular strategy. This helped to build a common language as campus members

“learned to speak ADVANCE.” In this way, a change in language also became an indicator of progress.

- Thinking about strategic moves, for example analyzing power relationships or networks of influence in deciding how to get things done.
- Illuminating new ways to think about a problem. For example, when an issue was viewed from a different theoretical perspective, new insight might be gained.
- Designing evaluation plans and presenting evaluation data. For example, if the guiding theory predicts certain kinds of outcomes for faculty, the project can look for these outcomes as indicators of the desired changes.
- Giving legitimacy to the work. Theory was used to signal the team’s expertise and let faculty participants know their time was being well used, which in turn built commitment. Moreover, when the theory was also being tested as part of the project, this was interesting to faculty and aligned with their academic values.

Intersectionality is one theory that is emerging as important and useful to ADVANCE projects as they engage women of color and cast their work more broadly in terms of inclusion. This theory emphasizes the importance of treating people with multiple marginalized identities as distinct groups with experiences and needs that are specific, not simply the sum of their identities (e.g., gender and race). Reading and discussing the literature in this area has been useful for getting people on board, building alliances, and generating a common vocabulary for conversations. However, there are not yet many good examples or guidelines for how to apply this theory in the practical work of change.

5.2. The Use of Data

Participants described several types of quantitative data as useful, such as data on faculty salaries, local and national faculty hiring pools, and service loads. Such data helped to describe the nature and extent of issues with women’s representation and to localize the problem to the campus and department. These data were most useful when disaggregated by faculty rank and discipline. Qualitative data were useful for understanding the issues to address and for identifying unexpected or serendipitous outcomes; participants suggested they gave “voice, depth and dimension” to the quantitative data that helped listeners value and remember key lessons from the data.

Participants identified several functions or uses of data in their ADVANCE work:

- To create accountability. For example, recruitment and hiring data on faculty searches helped administrators judge if the effort made to recruit a diverse pool of applicants had been sufficient such that the search should proceed.
- To raise awareness. For example, some projects compared departmental diversity data with data from national pools to raise department heads’ awareness of local challenges

and opportunities for hiring and retention. This was seen to dispel misconceptions about the availability of women or minority candidates, to enhance accountability, and to engender a competitive spirit. It also alerted project evaluators to some assumptions or nuances in the data that helped them develop better explanations or better methods (e.g., examining variation of gender balance by subfield).

- To give legitimacy and power. Making data public (e.g., on salaries, service loads) enabled faculty members to make well-informed decisions or pursue opportunities. Sharing the data expanded transparency and accountability, as everyone had an equal chance to be informed.
- To publicize the project and to show that progress is being made. As data were shared, people saw other ways to use it (e.g., in grant proposals) and it had a ripple effect.

To maximize the use of data, ADVANCE projects must develop the clientele and make the case that the data are useful. They must help users of the data articulate its value and ask for it as part of institutionalization. However, participants noted, it is difficult to demonstrate that availability of data has played a role in these ways.

5.3. The Use of and Impact of Research and Evaluation

Research and evaluation have different purposes, but some of the research being done under ADVANCE IT projects does have evaluative value, and may be highly practical in adjusting current activities or shaping future work. Yet it can be challenging to gather and analyze research data quickly enough for the findings to help the project, as rigorous analysis may be slow, and publication in peer-reviewed venues is time-consuming. As a community, ADVANCE is still seeking good models for how to communicate research data in timely and project-relevant ways.

Participants discussed the need for clarity in the roles and expectations for the research team and the internal and external evaluators. They gave examples of ways in which external or internal evaluators had been helpful, such as strengthening the logic model, and presenting data and providing context for internal leaders or the external advisory board. External evaluators could be especially helpful in collecting certain types of sensitive or difficult data.

Projects had mixed experiences with their external advisory boards (EAB); EAB visits were time-consuming so these interactions needed to be rewarding. Projects with good success in working with EABs reported using them as a sounding board and troubleshooting body to think through how to resolve challenges they were facing. Another had used its EAB visits to practice for the NSF third year site visit, helping them articulate key ideas and prepare for questions.

6. Sustainability Issues in Organizational Change

Sustainability is important to ensure that the goals of ADVANCE are sustained over time, even after the grant is over. We asked participants to consider the meaning and forms of sustainability, and the affordances and limitations of each of these forms. We asked them to

describe how they had planned and prepared for sustainability and how they had used evidence in guiding their planning and decision-making.

6.1. The Meaning of Sustainability

For some, sustainability means maintaining attention to project goals, continuing ADVANCE programming, and knowing that relevant policies and processes have been developed and implemented. Possible evidences of sustainability could include continuation of an ADVANCE office or location, formalization of institutional policies that support a diverse and inclusive campus, appointment of a Chief Diversity Officer or other person responsible for continued progress, or implementation of regular institutional data collection and reporting on campus diversity and inclusiveness issues.

However, participants asserted that sustainability means more than activities, policies, and practices, and that it is “more than hitting benchmark numbers.” Sustainability involves an ongoing process of embracing ADVANCE goals as a campus initiative, wide recognition of the accomplishments of ADVANCE and others in contributing to a strong campus commitment, and incorporating ADVANCE priorities across the institution in support of all faculty.

Participants also observed that, at some institutions where ADVANCE has not been embedded and sustained across campus as a named effort, ADVANCE priorities, programming, and resources may nonetheless be continued within some units of the institution. That is, “pockets of sustainability” may be evident.

6.2. Forms of Sustainability, and the Importance of the name “ADVANCE”

Some institutions report creating permanent offices that continue to use the name “ADVANCE.” At other institutions, ADVANCE work is embedded into a range of offices by the end of the grant period. Participants agreed that both scenarios could indicate sustainability; which is most appropriate and effective depends on contextual factors within a specific institution. Indeed, sometimes ADVANCE programming and resources become so embedded within a range of offices that members of the institutional community no longer realize that these resources originated through the ADVANCE project. Such deep embedding may appear as though ADVANCE has disappeared. However, assessments of sustainability should consider outcomes and impact, not just whether a specific office continues to use the “ADVANCE” title.

6.3. Markers of Impact and Sustainability

Tangible evidence of the impact and sustainability of an ADVANCE effort could include quantitative data about changes in numbers of women in faculty and other roles, the existence of formal policies and processes, and ongoing offerings of programs and resources that contribute to more inclusive environments.

Participants emphasized, however, that qualitative markers of impact and sustainability are equally meaningful and sometimes more useful than quantitative measures. Interviews and observations can suggest ways in which institutional culture has been deeply affected by

ADVANCE activities. Participants gave examples of language in campus conversations that they believed indicates cultural change: “The conversation has changed” or “This is a family-friendly place.” They suggested ADVANCE leaders think about ways to assess sustainability by considering this question: “If sustainability were happening, I would hear... on my campus.”

7. Conclusions

These themes emerged in our working discussions of organizational change processes. In future analyses, we will combine these ideas gleaned from our working group and our study of their ADVANCE IT projects with the data from our comprehensive analysis of the first 19 ADVANCE IT institutions to deepen our understanding of the role and importance of these processes; there is clearly more to learn from the data.

This workshop also demonstrated that ADVANCE leaders benefit from exchanging ideas with others about these over-arching strategies—*how* to implement change in the context of one’s own institution—as well as discussing and sharing *what* to do, the specific interventions used in their IT projects, as has been so fruitful at PI meetings. Participants expressed the hope for further opportunities for frank discussion of the opportunities and challenges in running these large change initiatives.

8. Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Karla Bellingar and Heather Johnson at Michigan State University for their work to support the meeting, and to several colleagues who shared ideas and advice that informed our design of the meeting. We thank Elizabeth Creamer for her insights as our external evaluator. We thank all the meeting participants for their involvement and preparation, and the good insights they shared. This study was supported by NSF award HRD-0930097 (2010-2015). All findings and opinions are those of the authors, not of the National Science Foundation.

To cite this document

Austin, A. E., & Laursen, S. L. (2015). *Organizational Change Strategies in ADVANCE Institutional Transformation Projects: Synthesis of a Working Meeting*. Boulder, CO, and East Lansing, MI. www.strategictoolkit.org

Appendix A: Meeting Participants***Conveners***

Ann E. Austin, Michigan State University.

Professor of Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education. External evaluator for LEAP at U. Colorado Boulder, ADVANCE-Nebraska. ADVANCE PAID grantee (this project).

Sandra Laursen, University of Colorado Boulder.

Senior Research Associate and Co-Director, Ethnography & Evaluation Research. Internal evaluator for LEAP at U. Colorado Boulder, external evaluator for TAMU ADVANCE. ADVANCE PAID grantee (this project).

Participants (identified with their permission)

Mindy Anderson-Knott, U. Nebraska-Lincoln. Round 4 IT (2008-13).

Director of Evaluation and Development at the Social and Behavioral Sciences Research Consortium. Internal evaluator for ADVANCE-Nebraska.

Mary Armstrong, Lafayette College.

Associate Professor of Women's and Gender Studies and English, and Program Chair for Women's and Gender Studies. ADVANCE PAID grantee.

Canan Bilen-Green, North Dakota State U. Round 4 IT (2008-13)

Vice Provost for Faculty and Professor of Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering. PI and Executive Director of NDSU FORWARD.

Bonnie Bowen, Iowa State U. Round 3 IT (2005-2012).

Adjunct Assistant Professor in Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology (retired). Director of Iowa State ADVANCE.

Elizabeth Creamer, Virginia Tech. Round 2 IT (2003-10).

Professor of Educational Research and Evaluation. Director of Research and Assessment for Virginia Tech ADVANCE.

Kristine (Kris) De Welde, Florida Gulf Coast U.

Associate Dean of University-wide Programs and Faculty Engagement in Undergraduate Studies and Associate Professor of Sociology.

Patrick (Pat) Farrell, Lehigh U. Round 5 IT (2010-present).

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Principal Investigator for Lehigh ADVANCE.

Melissa Latimer, West Virginia U. Round 5 IT (2010-present).

Professor of Sociology and Adjunct Professor of Women's Studies. Co-PI and Director of the WVU ADVANCE Center.

Loretta Moore, Jackson State U. Round 5 IT (2010-present).

Vice President for Research and Federal Relations and Professor of Computer Science. Principal Investigator for JSU ADVANCE.

Marie Mora, U. Texas Rio Grande Valley (formerly UT Pan American). Round 6 IT (2012-present).

Professor of Economics and Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity. Leadership team member for Advancement and Education and Empowerment efforts of UTRGV ADVANCE.

KerryAnn O'Meara, U. Maryland College Park. Round 5 IT (2010-2015).

Professor of Higher Education and Affiliate Faculty in Women's Studies. Co-PI and Director of UMD ADVANCE.

Jan Rinehart, Northeastern U. Round 4 IT (2008-15).

Executive Director of NU ADVANCE. Former Executive Director, Rice ADVANCE (Round 3).

Sara Rushing, Montana State U. Round 6 IT (2012-present).

Associate Professor of Political Science. Co-director of Montana State TRACS.

Mary Deane Sorcinelli, U. Mass Amherst.

Distinguished Scholar in Residence, Mount Holyoke College, and Senior Scholar, Bay View Alliance for the Reform of STEM Undergraduate Education.