SU ADVANCE Brief: A Summary of Program Activities, 2017-2019
March 2019

Jodi O'Brien (SU ADVANCE PI)
Jean Jacoby (SU ADVANCE Co-PI)
Amelia Derr (SU ADVANCE and Social Work)
Kevin Krycka (SU ADVANCE and Psychology)
Kristi Lee (SU ADVANCE and the College of Education)
Reine Mages (SU ADVANCE and International Studies)
Agnieszka Miguel (SU ADVANCE and Electrical & Computer Engineering)
Jacquelyn Miller (SU ADVANCE and the Center for Faculty Development)
Donna Sylvester (SU ADVANCE and Mathematics)
Jen Tilghman-Havens (SU ADVANCE and the Center for Jesuit Education)
Sarah Trainer (SU ADVANCE Research Coordinator & Program Manager)

Background from the original NSF Proposal

Seattle University is a comprehensive, mission-driven, liberal arts university. Founded in the Jesuit tradition of education of the whole person and social justice leadership, SU serves a primarily undergraduate population with additional master's level programs in specific fields and professional schools in business, education, law, nursing, and theology. SU emphasizes diversity as a matter of institutional policy and as an integral component of educational excellence. In 2011, SU achieved a Carnegie Foundation designation as a leading institution in mission, culture, and leadership and in 2012, SU received the President's Award for Community Service, the highest award a university can receive for service and community programming.

Institutional service and leadership are prominent components of comprehensive, mission-driven universities. Leadership activities, including shared governance and administrative roles (full or part time), are foundational in cultivating and maintaining the unique educational mission of the university and they can be deeply compelling and personally rewarding for faculty members. Paradoxically, however, these activities are often taken-for-granted and less recognized as part of the formal faculty development and evaluation process.

As with other values-based institutions, the SU mission is actively emphasized in the hiring of new faculty and in the early phases of faculty development. The majority of faculty members say that they appreciate the opportunity to work in a mission-driven university and endorse these values, including academic excellence, diversity, justice, and leadership. To some extent, these themes are reflected in the guidelines for tenure and promotion to associate professor although the perceived trend is increasingly toward a research focus. Our guiding orientation in this project is that, in the absence of clearly articulated tenure and promotion standards that fully reflect the activities that constitute comprehensive education excellence (teaching, service-leadership, and community-based scholarship), faculty and evaluating committees prioritize research achievements in ways that may have the effect of devaluing teaching, community engagement, and service-leadership with regard to tenure and promotion.

Through the NSF Advance grant we propose a 4-track collaborative transformation program that consists of: 1) systematically gathering and communicating perceptions among faculty, evaluating committees, and administrators regarding expectations for promotion; 2) collaboratively developing and implementing revisions to university promotion guidelines and procedures that more clearly reflect our comprehensive educational goals; 3) communication of the changing higher education climate for broader recognition of multiple contributions, and 4) formal education and mentoring of faculty, university administrators, and evaluation committees toward better aligning these goals with the expectations and procedures for promotion. Our overall goal is institutional cultural and structural transformation that brings the promotion standards, perceived

expectations, and mentoring processes fully into line with the values-based educational mission of the university.

Strategic Communication within the Community, January 2017- January 2019

The intent of communication across the Seattle University community is to encourage awareness of and engagement with the program and to solicit input from stakeholders and leaders. To date, we have met with all of the administrative groups we listed in our original proposal as important to our aims. This includes the Provost's Council (which includes the Chief Diversity Officer and the deans); Academic Assembly; the College of Arts & Sciences Faculty Senate; the Wismer Faculty Diversity Liaisons; the College of Science & Engineering Executive Committee; and the Council of Associate Deans. Each of these conversations was facilitated by the PI (O'Brien) and/or the Co-PI (Jacoby), along with other team members. In addition to our planned communication, we have increasingly been invited to present our work on other occasions. In Year 2, this included a presentation to the Board of Trustees, a presentation at a College of Arts & Sciences All College Meeting, and an update to Academic Assembly. In Year 3, the PI (O'Brien) has begun meeting routinely every month with the Provost and the Co-PI (Jacoby) and is now meeting regularly with the Co-Chairs of the University Strategic Planning Committee (who are in the midst of launching the university's five-year Strategic Plan). In November 2018, the SU ADVANCE Internal Evaluator (Krycka) sent out a survey to all SU faculty, to assess awareness of and attitudes towards the program. Over 130 faculty responded; the results indicated that roughly half of the respondents are deeply informed and hopeful about SU ADVANCE initiatives; the other half expressed more pessimism that SU ADVANCE would be able to shift campus culture and institutional policy. This is a realistic concern and one that our External Consultants also discussed (see more details in the "External Networking and Activities" section below). It underlines the importance of continued, multi-level communication across the university, as well as the fact that all our recommendations must be grounded in the data we gathered from the community, as well as in faculty governance models.

We have also recently hosted two campus visits from visiting experts. Dana Britton (Rutgers University), a member of our External Consulting Network and a former NSF ADVANCE Program Officer, visited campus for three days in December 2018. Dr. Britton met with all of the SU ADVANCE team members repeatedly to discuss the results of our research, our planned strategic communication, and our central deliverables around revising promotion guidelines and establishing a "Mentoring the Mentors" program. Dr. Britton, together with the PI, Co-PI, and Research Coordinator, also met with President Sundborg and Provost Martin. Then, in January 2019, we kicked off the Winter Quarter with a visit from Martina Ramirez, the Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence at Loyola Marymount. During Dr. Ramirez's visit, we engaged in more discussions about the organization and scaffolding of our "Mentoring the Mentors" program.

During the university's Winter and Spring quarters 2019, we have planned a presentation for the Albers School of Business & Economics, another meeting with the Associate Deans, and an SU ADVANCE Reception to which the entire SU community will be invited. Meetings with the Provost and the Strategic Planning Committee will continue as well. Lastly, we anticipate another campus visit from an ADVANCE scholar. Jessi Smith, now Associate Vice Chancellor at Colorado Springs but formerly an ADVANCE PI at Montana State, will be visiting us in May 2019 to run a workshop on bias for interested faculty.

External Networking and Activities, January 2017-January 2019

The SU ADVANCE team has cultivated several active networks over the past two years. These networks include traditional ADVANCE allies, as well as fellow Jesuit university partnerships.

Four team members (O'Brien, Krycka, Trainer, and Mages) attended the national AWIS conference in Washington, D.C. in October 2017. PI O'Brien also participated as a member of the review team for the 3rd Year Site Visit to the University of Houston in December 2017, visited Montana State University's ADVANCE Program in early 2018, and attended a small conference, "Beyond ADVANCE" in Chicago in November 2018.

Trainer and Internal Advisory Board member, Nalini Iyer, both attended the NWSA annual conference in November 2018 and participated in several panels on ADVANCE-related concerns. Another Internal Advisory Board member – and the new Chair of our Task Force – Kristi Lee attended the 18th International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement Annual Conference in July 2018 and focused on clarifying how better to "count" community-engaged research in tenure and promotion files.

We have also networked with other university partners who are thinking deeply about mission and pedagogy. O'Brien and Trainer visited Loyola Marymount in November 2017 and met with a variety of stakeholders and administrators at that institution. O'Brien and Jacoby gave a presentation to the West Coast Deans gathering from the AJCU (Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities) in May 2018 and O'Brien, together with Jen Tilghman-Havens (SU ADVANCE team member and Associate Director of SU's Center for Jesuit Education), is currently participating in a year-long program, the Ignatian Colleagues Program, that brings together administrators from across the AJCU and invites them to think creatively about education and mission within an Ignatian framework.

Our External Consulting Network has been helpful to us as well. SU ADVANCE team member Agnieszka Miguel (also Chair of Electrical & Computer Engineering) convened a group that includes Eve Riskin (University of Washington), Dana Britton (Rutgers University and a former NSF ADVANCE Program Officer), Jenna Carpenter (Campbell University), Roger Green (NDSU), Daryl Chubin (Independent Consultant), Teri Reed (University of Cincinnati), Sarah Rajala (Iowa State University), Laura Kramer (Montclair State University and a former NSF ADVANCE Program Officer), Klod Kokini (Purdue University), Laura Grindstaff (UC Davis), and Bevlee Watford (Virginia Tech). Miguel has been strategic in asking for advice and input from our consultants–all of whom have considerable experience implementing and running ADVANCE programs. During a phone conference at the end of 2018, for example, Miguel, Jacoby, and Trainer asked the consultants for advice on potential pitfalls ADVANCE programs typically face in years 3 and 4 and the response centered on the difficult task of changing campus culture and policies simultaneously, not just one or the other.

Social Science Research Activities, January 2017-January 2019
The social science research component of the SU ADVANCE project is framed as an institutional ethnography in which we have explored the complex and dynamic ways in which people interact with each other and with policies and practices, parsing out the layered means by which the sociocultural context of the institution influences everyday experiences and interactions. We are particularly interested in examining faculty career trajectories within the institution, their quarter-by-quarter workloads, their articulated attitudes towards their work and the institutional reward systems, and their expressed overall wellbeing. In keeping with our mandate from the NSF ADVANCE, we have also looked at all of these with an eye towards exploring possible gendered and race-based inequities.

To date, the SU ADVANCE Research Coordinator (Trainer) has conducted 76 semi-structured interviews. With regard to gender, 55 of these were with women faculty and 21 of them were with men faculty. In terms of rank, 15 interviewees were full professors, 43 were associate professors, 10 were assistant professors, and 8 were NTT faculty. The Research Coordinator (Trainer), the SU ADVANCE PI (O'Brien), and team member, Jacquelyn Miller, also ran two focus groups, with a total of 11 women full professors (9 of them women who were not part of the semi-structured interviews).

A total of 85 individuals have therefore participated in some research activity with us over the past two years. 40 participants were from the College of Arts & Sciences and 29 were from the College of Science & Engineering. The other 16 participants were drawn from the College of Nursing, the College of Education, the Albers School of Business & Economics, and the School of Theology and Ministry. The numbers of faculty of color at Seattle University are low overall and consequently, we have taken great care to not include material from interviews and focus groups that might inadvertently identify individuals. That said, we did have many

extraordinarily articulate faculty of color who agreed to participate in some component of our research and who provided clear feedback about the ways in which race influenced their career trajectories and experiences.

Our data is thus drawn from participants that, taken together, represent a wide cross-section of the entire SU faculty community. Significantly, many of the same themes came up in interviews and focus groups, regardless of the faculty member's rank or school/college.

We include some exemplar (de-identified) quotes below, to illustrate some of the themes that have emerged from the interviews and focus groups:

"I love this place but it is eating me alive." (Woman faculty, associate level)

"In the end, it all comes back to the students. What can I do to make their experience more excellent?" (Man faculty, associate level)

"This quarter, I worked almost 90 hours per week. How could I possibly have work-life balance?" (Woman faculty, associate level)

These quotes illustrate some tensions at work among faculty. On the one hand, people are passionate about certain aspects of their work, especially in terms of connecting to the students. Many also express commitment to SU as an institution. At the same time, however, feeling overworked and undervalued were persistent, powerful, and concerning themes. Two years worth of participant observation research across multiple venues and spaces within the SU community have further bolstered these conclusions.

Two additional research activities have also occupied us over the past two years and have served as complementary sources of information to the interviews and focus groups. (1) To date, we have analyzed 40 CVs from SU faculty, drawn from across the university colleges and departments. Inclusion criteria were: the CVs had to be publicly accessible through the university website(s) and the faculty had to be tenured or tenure track. (2) To date, we have also analyzed 15 faculty's statements from their promotion packets. Inclusion criteria in this case were: the faculty had to give us permission to look at their statements and the faculty had to have gone up for tenure or promotion to full prior to 2018. The CVs and statements have helped us flesh out a nuanced view of the ways in which faculty talk about the different types of work in which they engage, which they see as foundational to their identity as a scholar at Seattle University.

Important themes that emerged from our research include: the wide diversity of fascinating work in which faculty engage and which often remains hidden, uncounted, or dismissed as "service;" the dissatisfaction many in the community feel that can be traced back to the discrepancy between articulated university mission vs. current faculty reward systems; and the difficulty of setting boundaries on workload and work weeks in the face of so many administrative and student "asks." Also central to these considerations was the underlying questions of what it means to be an "institutional good citizen" (quoting Dana Britton) and how to better reward that within the institution itself.

Projected Deliverables in Year 3 and Year 4 (through June 2020)
The two central goals in Year 3 (the 2018-2019 academic year) are: (1) the launch of our task force to make recommendations to revise promotion guidelines, and (2) the planning and scaffolding of our "Mentoring the Mentors" program.

The Task Force, chaired by Kristi Lee (from the College of Education), was formally convened at the beginning of February 2019 and met for the first time at the end of that same month. This group was formally charged with generating a set of concrete recommendations to revise the current university guidelines for the promotion of associate faculty to full professor status. Key in these considerations will be recognizing the wide and diverse

range of faculty activities and mission alignment. We have set aside the entire academic year 2019-2020 to allow the task force recommendations to make their way through the various levels of faculty governance, including Academic Assembly.

"Mentoring the Mentors" planning is proceeding apace, facilitated by SU ADVANCE team members Jean Jacoby, Jacquelyn Miller (also from the Center for Faculty Development), Jen Tilghman-Havens (also from the Center for Jesuit Education), and Sarah Trainer. This mentoring program will be aimed at providing training for deans, associate deans, department chairs, and program directors and will be rooted in Ignatian practices that reframe faculty administrative leaders as mentors/guides who accompany faculty in professional development processes. This program will be grounded in practices that encourage faculty to recognize, articulate, and organize around their own excellence with the understanding that when they do so, this work elevates the entire university.