

MU-ADVANCE Steering Committee Meeting
Tuesday, March 6, 2007
Minutes

Present: Marcia Harrison, Tina Cartwright, Judy Silver, Beverly Delidow, Frances Hensley, Patricia Logan, Kathleen Miezio, Howard Aulick, Elizabeth Murray and Heidi Williams

Brochure: The updated brochure was passed out to all committee members for review. The following comments/suggestions were offered:

- Very hard to read
- The font needs to be consistent
- Too much green – the “green on green” does not contrast enough
- Need to be sure to target the right audience (perhaps candidates and existing faculty should get different brochures)
- Only list those involved with MU-ADVANCE once as “featured women participants.”
- For potential faculty, it might not be a good idea to highlight the barriers that WV women face (Institute for Women’s Research Policy)
- Purpose of the brochure is to raise awareness of the program on campus.

Newsletter: MU-ADVANCE will publish a newsletter to highlight the program. One purpose is to present bits of statistics that will be more useful in a newsletter layout, than in the brochure or on the website.

-Logan stated that she would be very impressed if she were interviewing at a university and a program, such as ADVANCE, handed her a newsletter that highlights the accomplishments of women.

Welcome Reception – the survey responses were collated and it was determined that two workshops will be conducted within the next month: 1) Mentoring (Thursday, March 15th at 12:30 pm) and, 2) Work-Life Balance (TBA). These workshops will have a more structured discussion and lunch will be provided to participants.

-Due to the number of people, none of the workshop times will fit into everyone’s schedule, but we will try to be as inclusive as possible.

-Networking and Mentoring workshops generated a great deal of interest.

-A workshop on institutional policies received the least interest.

-Murray suggested that maybe a standing date (maybe the third Friday of every month) that a group of people should meet at a restaurant to encourage networking.

-Delidow suggested that if e-mails are sent to announce events, to please put the important information in the body of the e-mail rather than as an attachment – this involves another step.

-Delidow suggested that MU-ADVANCE put a link on the website to mentor.net

Visit to Virginia Tech:

-VT administered their climate survey in YR 2. They will duplicate the survey again Fall '07 (in the program’s 4th year).

-VT used a research survey center to administer the survey. The survey center has the capabilities to identify those who have not yet filled out the survey and sends them a reminder.

-VT had a 60% response rate.

-VT found that people’s identities lie within the department. They identify most at this level. There was some resistance on behalf of departments to believe that their departments had any faults – they felt their departments were different. However, after the results of the survey were revealed, they realized that there were problems and that changes needed to be made.

-VT suggested doing gender differentiations at the college or university level.

-VT suggested that the social science research be presented by a fellow scientist to other scientists – much better received if from a colleague.

-Marcia and Tina will work with Dr. Baker on search committee kick-off workshops.

-Harrison stated that Christina Murphy (Dean of COLA) asked if Criminal Justice could be considered STEM and therefore could benefit from ADVANCE. The committee unanimously agreed to allow CJ to be identified as STEM. The program director at NSF said she could see no future problems with including CJ.

-Harrison will request information for CJ from IR.

Climate Survey:

-Harrison would like to administer the survey on assessment day, April 4th.

-MU is trying to shorten the survey.

-The survey will be conducted anonymously.

-The IRB has been approved.

-Miezio stated that we are doing a physical survey, because Marty Laubach (professor-Sociology) said people do not like on-line surveys, and the research is clear that paper surveys given in a group setting generate more response.

-The survey would be folded in half and stapled down the side, to create a booklet.

-Miezio would like to offer a "reward" or "incentive." It was suggested to put \$10 on university ID cards for those who participate.

-Marcia will talk to department chairs about giving the survey on assessment day – make a special request – this is a window of opportunity.

-If given in a group setting, ADVANCE will have a representative to introduce the survey and will remain to collect them.

-A realistic time limit should be stated prior to the participants taking the survey. (Maybe give a pep talk and parameters, such as no talking, etc.)

-Logan feels that there is a real contamination problem with giving the survey in a group setting.

-Harrison thought that maybe if surveys are pre-delivered (paper copies) to the participants prior to assessment day and asked to bring them filled out to the meeting, it may generate a more accurate response.

-Delidow stated that Med. School faculty will not be willing to fill out a paper survey. They would prefer to do it on-line at a convenient time for them.

-In order to fulfill the reward requirement, if we offered an on-line version, the participant could print off a receipt and bring it to the ADVANCE representative to collect the reward (or give their 901 #s if that's how we decide to do it).

-Hensley said that people can fill out the survey through their MyMU.

-Delidow offered to "pump up" the survey to her department about the survey and try to convince them to fill it out.

-Hensley doesn't like the "MU" part on the survey. She doesn't really feel that we can determine anything at the university level – cannot really determine if it is based on perception or on experience. For example, sexual orientation....if people feel that harassment or biases on campus exist-is this because they have witnessed/experience it or just assume this? This survey could be a valuable tool for policy changes at Marshall if worded accordingly. She feels that we have one shot, so to speak, at getting faculty to fill these out.

-Harrison stated that policies on recruitment and retention need to be the main focus of the survey.

-Murray – every question asked needs to be of use.

-Tables were passed out on search updates.

-MU-ADVANCE will be requesting to look at search committee information for the past two years.

-Aulick suggested that Bruce Day at the IRB be contacted to see who can review applicant information – can students or does it have to be staff members?

-Perhaps a recommendation can be made that HR do something with the white cards that applicants fill out and return – maybe send them to the hiring department or official. HR needs an on-line process.

Mini-grant applications:

- Ten applications were received. They have been reviewed.
- Delidow feels that the applicants should get feedback from the committee on their application to find out what was good and not so good.

Committee Memberships:

- Committee membership graphs were passed out.
- We will go back over it to ensure that no staff are included in the analysis.
- It was suggested to include non-STEM people as well.

-Stop the Clock should be a primary policy that MU-ADVANCE should focus on!

Heidi M. Williams
Administrative Assistant
College of Science
Marshall University
One John Marshall Drive
Huntington, WV 25755
(304) 696-3987