**"What Counts as Success? Recognizing and Rewarding Women Faculty's Differential
Contributions in a Comprehensive Liberal Arts University"**

Introduction

Seattle University (SU) is a comprehensive, mission-driven, liberal arts university. Founded in the Jesuit tradition of education of the whole person and for the purpose of social justice leadership, SU serves a primarily undergraduate population with additional master's level STEM programs in engineering, computer science, criminal justice, and psychology, and professional schools in business, education, law, nursing, and theology. SU is one of the largest independent universities in the Northwest and one of the most diverse. We are committed to emphasizing 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 is currently ranked as one of the top "community engagement" universities. In 2012, SU received the President's Award for Community Service, the highest award a university can receive for service and community programming. In these ways, SU is distinct from the research-intensive universities that have received ADVANCE IT funding and our proposed project is likely to resonate with a large cohort of values-based institutions. A large number of faculty in STEM and SBE fields are employed in primarily undergraduate universities such as SU and many students access education in STEM and SBE disciplines through these institutions.

Comprehensive universities can be difficult to characterize, but faculty advancement tends to revolve around the expectation of some balance and integration of teaching and research. Because most faculty are trained in research-intensive graduate programs, primarily undergraduate institutions face the interesting challenge of mentoring faculty not only in the craft of teaching, but often in its value as part of a comprehensive career in higher education. This is especially the case in mission-driven universities in which faculty are expected to familiarize themselves with and integrate institutional values into their teaching and scholarship (22, 26).

Institutional service and leadership are other 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. Unless a university has made an explicit attempt to incorporate this work into its tenure and promotion structure, the work can go unrewarded and become a hindrance to advancement (5, 18, 19, 26).

Hidden Work

In 1957, organizational sociologist Alvin Gouldner published a paper titled, "Cosmopolitans and Locals" in which he described the two-tier hierarchical structure of academic institutions (18). "Cosmopolitans" pursued research grants, illustrious speaking engagements and fellowships, and achieved acclaimed professional status as scholarly stars in their fields. When they taught, it was typically to select graduate students who would carry on their research legacies. "Locals" taught rank and file undergraduates and engaged in the day-to-day service and leadership activities that kept the university afloat. Gouldner's central focus was the disproportionate reward structure that recognized and celebrated the accomplishments of the cosmopolitans (research faculty) while under-valuing the contributions of the locals (teaching and service faculty). For Gouldner, this model was organizationally "unfit." In his assessment, a thriving model of comprehensive higher education required an infrastructure that fully recognized and rewarded the diverse but necessary contributions of both research and teaching faculty.

Women faculty are likely to be over-represented in mid-level leadership and service activities in comprehensive colleges and universities (7, 14, 15). In other words, women faculty provide a significant level of university maintenance work, but this work is typically not recognized or rewarded as part of the advancement process. Scholars of women and work note that many of the activities that are integral to the strong reputation and everyday functioning of an organization are often performed by women and, accordingly, are taken-for-granted as a "natural" expression of women's preferences for this sort of work (e.g., 1, 8, 12, 27, 31). This "hidden work" (8, 10) is unrecognized and unrewarded despite the fact that it is foundational to the healthy functioning of the organization. Women faculty in primarily undergraduate colleges and universities are contributing significantly through their leadership, community engagement activities, and their focus in areas such as science education research, and these activities sustain the educational mission of the university. However, they can be undervalued in the path toward promotion with the result that many women faculty members in STEM and SBE fields are stalled at the associate professor rank (7, 15, 28).

"Just Say No"- Mentoring Women to Success

The disproportionately higher level of advancement among men relative to women faculty has been the subject of considerable research (e.g., 5, 6, 7, 14, 15, 24, 28, 28, 32, 33). This research is notable for the emphasis on mentoring and support for women faculty, especially in terms of informal networks and increased opportunities for becoming involved in research and for finding venues for publications. These efforts result in success for individual women faculty who learn to limit their teaching and service activities and to emphasize a research trajectory. In other words, as these women learn to say no to the "hidden work" of academe, they achieve more success in terms of traditional, research-focused measures. However, many women do not necessarily want to pursue this path. For many women in comprehensive universities, science education and leadership service are rewarding. These women want to be recognized and rewarded for the contributions they are already making. Many women faculty at SU have actively chosen to focus on science education teaching, community engagement, and leadership, especially with the intent of reaching under-represented student populations and mentoring other women and minority faculty. Faced with the choice of "just saying no" to these activities in order to focus on individual disciplinary research as the only path to promotion, many of them elect to continue their institution-focused work and resign themselves to remaining at the rank of associate professor.

Proposed Project Overview

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, as we describe below, 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.

The focus population for this project is women faculty at the associate professor rank at SU, many of whom have served for more than a decade in mid-level leadership positions such as program director, department chair, center director, or associate dean. Nearly half of all women STEM and SBE associate professors are currently serving in these mid-level leadership positions. Relative to men faculty, these women appear to be stalled or advancing more slowly toward promotion. Our project orientation is that mid-career women faculty in STEM and SBE programs who are actively perpetuating the university values through their service and leadership are at risk for not advancing toward full professor because

2

these activities, while crucial to the university mission, may not clearly count toward faculty advancement.

Through the NSF Advance grant we propose a 4-track collaborative transformation program that consists of: 1) systematically gathering and communicating perceptions among STEM and SBE 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. These goals will be realized in the form of multiple-track standards for promotion and a formal training program for promotion and tenure committees (Cf. Georgia Tech ADEPT, 16).

Participatory Action Research and Multi-Dimensional Institutional Change Models

Kezar delineates between first- and second-order change, or minor adjustments within one of a few areas of the institution versus multi-dimensional transformation across the institution (21). In the SU case, an example of first-order change is the introduction of faculty fellowships that provide release time from teaching to focus on a research project. We seek to implement second-order change in the form of an institutional shift regarding the value of multiple tracks toward promotion. Similar to Austin, et al., this level of transformation involves nonlinear strategies, multiple levels of change, and efforts to link an array of tactics (4). In other words, the institutional change we intend is multi-faceted and directed at all levels across faculty and administration. Our project is guided by, and also expands on Boleman and Deal's multi-frame change model which emphasizes four domains for institutional transformation: structural; human resources; political; and symbolic (9). Each of our objectives reflects at least one, and in most cases, a mix of these domains. The project is grounded in Naples principles of participatory action research (23) whereby the aim is to simultaneously generate systematic information in a shared manner across a community or organization and collectively engage with the information in ways that result in changed perceptions, practices, and standards. In this process we are incorporating research from the Iowa State University ADVANCE project on "collaborative transformation" (7).

As we discuss in the "context" section below, members of organizational communities such as universities often have shared concerns about standards or practices, but may not recognize that others share these concerns. To the extent that there is collective awareness of a concern, members may feel institutionally disempowered to effect change. Our observation is that many of the SU faculty, particularly women and faculty of color, have concerns about the under-valuation of teaching, leadership, and community engagement but are only partially aware that others share this concern, and some actively believe that administrators do not share their concerns. Faculty in mid-level administrative positions have a more articulated shared awareness, but feel their concerns are out of sync with university-level priorities. Faculty evaluation committee decisions reflect diverse values and commitments. University-level administrators may be aware that promotion standards are vague and in need of revision, but have not yet fully articulated a direction for revision.

The SU case reflects varying degrees of awareness and understanding both within and across levels of the organization that can respond well to collaborative interventions (7). The consideration of STEM and SBE advancement priorities provide an opportunity for having needed discussions across silos of individual colleges and schools. A participatory action research approach means that the project team members (who represent key stakeholder levels of the university) are simultaneously gathering information and engaging in collaborative change-making conversations and activities based on this information at each level. The Boleman and Deal multi-dimensional approach provides a framework for

strategically tailoring these conversations and activities toward structural, human-resource level, political, and symbolic transformation. The specific activities are described in the "activities" section below.

Context and Data
The observations that guide this project are:
- Similar to many other non-research intensive universities, SU is a values-based, comprehensive university with an emphasis on academic excellence, diversity, community engagement, and leadership.
- Accordingly, faculty are expected to demonstrate sustained teaching and research achievement and are strongly encouraged to engage in leadership-oriented service to the university and community.
- As indicated by institutional support for and promotion of a Center for Faculty Development, and a Center for Community Engagement, the university has a demonstrated commitment to faculty development in the area of mission teaching and community engagement.
- However, the valuation of these activities for advancement to the rank of professor is perceived to be vague.
- Women faculty (along with faculty of color and LGBT faculty) at the rank of associate professor are disproportionately involved in these leadership and mission-related activities.
- These women faculty are at risk for not advancing apace of their colleagues (men and women) who emphasize research. [Note: This project focuses on women faculty in STEM and SBE fields, but our observation is that it extends to the experiences of both women and men faculty in other fields across the university]

University Guidelines and Faculty Perceptions
The guidelines for tenure and promotion as stated in the SU 2015 Faculty Handbook are excerpted below:

A. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
- Possession of the earned doctorate or other terminal degree appropriate to the field.
- Unless upon appointment the individual received credit for prior service, at least five years successful teaching as a ranked faculty member. The five years shall have been completed at the time of application for tenure.
- Evidence of sustained excellent performance in the classroom and in working with students.
- Evidence of excellence in scholarly achievement and professional activity, as well as promise of continued scholarly development.
- Evidence of substantive participation in departmental and college or school curricular and governance activities.
- Evidence of good professional standing, for example, by maintaining any required professional license.
- Success in satisfying the elements of faculty quality and academic and ethical responsibilities described above.

B. Associate Professor to Professor
- Continuing fulfillment of the standards for tenure.
- A minimum of four years, normally at Seattle University, of successful teaching experience as an associate professor prior to the time of application for promotion.
- Sustained superior performance in the classroom and in working with students.
- Attainment of national stature in one's discipline as evidenced by a sustained record of significant scholarly and professional activity, such as paper presentations; participation in professional colloquia and seminars; publication of scholarly essays, journal articles, textbooks, monographs; or artistic/musical accomplishment.

- Evidence of significant service to the University through distinguished academic leadership at the department or school or college level and participation in special academic programs, curricular and governance or professional service activities.

These guidelines suggest that significant institutional leadership is one element of a successful petition for promotion. A question, however, is how this leadership record is assessed in combination with teaching and research. Distinguished university leadership may buttress an already strong research record in petitions for promotion, but in cases of a modest research record, rather than tipping the scale toward promotion, some faculty feel that a long-standing record of distinguished leadership may actually tip the decision negatively.

As part of a President's Task Force on Diversity, SU recently conducted a campus-wide climate study administered through Rankin and Associates (25). According to this survey, a majority of faculty members perceive the tenure and promotion standards to be "reasonable" but 56% disagree or strongly disagree that the standards are applied equally. Twenty-five percent of the respondents felt pressured to change their research focus to achieve tenure; 37% of the faculty of color respondents reported feeling this pressure. In depth perceptions were shared in follow up focus group discussions held in conjunction with the newly formed Wismer Office for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusive Excellence (henceforth referred to as the Wismer Office). Among the women who participated (N=37), several were from the departments and programs that make up the population for this proposal (N= 19; 10 associate professors; 9 assistant professors).

Focus group responses indicate that faculty perceive the standards for tenure to be well-documented and, in most cases, faculty receive considerable mentoring in the nuts and bolts of file preparation, as well as extensive feedback in a mid-probationary review process. However, standards for promotion to professor are considered vague and non-inclusive.

Mixed Messages. One of the themes that emerged from these discussions was concern about work expectations, especially the balance between expectations for teaching, service, and scholarship. Tenure track faculty expressed a perception of "mixed messages." As they described it, there is a strong emphasis on leadership and community engagement and they are frequently asked or invited to participate in service activities related to mission, but told to be cautious, because these things "don't count" toward tenure. Women of color in particular discussed the unique forms of service they provide in support of the university emphasis on diversity and inclusion, but noted that their department chairs rarely count these contributions in annual faculty evaluations and other faculty often counsel them to do less of this work.

Collectively, the perception is that the university does not formally value leadership or community engagement work as part of the promotion process. When asked about the possibility of preparing for promotion, most of them agreed that, in the words of one faculty member, "that ship sailed long ago." Their comments reflect both the perceived split between research and teaching/leadership service, with the former being perceived as the only route to promotion, and an acceptance of "hidden work" as the particular domain of women who have made choices to prioritize community and institutional maintenance.

This institutional perception is echoed in comments made by deans and department chairs who, increasingly, are counseling recently tenured women faculty to "double-down" on their research focus in order to prepare for promotion. However, many mid-career women faculty wonder if the pendulum has swung too far in the research direction; without complementary focus on the activities that sustain SU's unique mission focus, they wonder how future generations of faculty will work.

Based on the climate study survey data and information gathered from focus groups and interviews, the President's Task Force on Diversity has made specific recommendations for revising the promotion standards to integrate "multiple tracks" that reflect the varied contributions of faculty in a mission-driven comprehensive university.

Institutional Culture and Transformation. Our working orientation in this proposal is that the SU promotion standards and processes reflect a set of institutionalized contradictions (Rau and Baker; O'Brien):

- faculty activities that directly sustain the unique mission-centered reputation of the university may not yet be fully integrated into formal promotion processes;
- formally, these activities are recognized as mission activities but disconnected from promotion standards;
- informally, these activities are valued and encouraged among faculty (and especially subsets of faculty);
- mid-career women faculty, faculty of color, and LGBT faculty appear disproportionately engaged in these activities;
- these faculty members find fulfillment in these activities, but perceive them as an alternative path that precludes full advancement in the current context; and
- many junior women faculty and mid-career men find value in these activities, but may perceive them as distractions to advancement.

Activities Description
Institutional Transformation Objectives

- **Revised Standards for Promotion to Professor** – multi-track standards that reflect the educational, scholarly, and leadership contributions that are foundational to sustaining the inclusive excellence of our comprehensive, values-based university.
- **Development of formal mentoring and evaluation training programs** that recognize the "breadth of modes in which faculty can be successful" and the unconscious biases that may simultaneously inhibit this recognition (16 p.D-10)
- **Climate Change** within departments, colleges, and promotion and tenure evaluation committees to reflect, support, and reward women's contributions in teaching, community engagement, and leadership.
- **Promotion to professor** of more faculty at rates independent of gender.

Our long-range objective is institutional transformation that integrates activities that are foundational for our comprehensive, mission-driven university (teaching, leadership service, and community engagement) with the formal standards and procedures for promotion resulting in women faculty advancing to the rank of professor. In line with our theory of change as guided by Boleman and Deal's (9) multi-dimensional model and the organizational engagement practices of participatory action research, we intend to implement a program focused on four areas of activity, all of which are aimed at multiple organizational levels and integrate multi-dimensional aims foci. The activities also include a plan for connecting across these levels. The activities are organized around: 1) Perceptions; 2) Revision of Standards; 3) Talking Points/Communication; and 4) Mentoring and Training.

Institutional Readiness, Commitment, and Sustainability
Accompanying letters of support from university administrators and relevant center directors are evidence of the university-wide dedication to this project. Although the focus is on STEM and SBE faculty, university administrators are keenly aware of the strong need for a formal review and revision of the promotion standards. This project provides an opportunity to approach this institutional level transformation in a way that fully and systematically integrates well-established research regarding differential contributions of women faculty and faculty in under-represented groups (19, 21). This approach is strongly resonant with the Jesuit educational mission and the university emphasis on diversity and inclusion, but is also resonant with other values-based, comprehensive universities across the higher education consortium.

This commitment is formally articulated in the forthcoming report from the President's Task Force on Diversity and Inclusive Excellence (2013-15). The task force is currently completing an institutional assessment that includes data gathered from a university-wide survey conducted by Rankin and Associates (2015). Task force recommendations include specific suggestions for a more focused, intentional integration of the activities of women and minority faculty in teaching, scholarship, and leadership into the recognition and reward structure of the university.

The project team consists of faculty leaders who occupy positions in which we are able to directly implement the various phases of the project. This team of principal investigators includes the Associate Dean of Science and Engineering, and the Director of the Wismer Office. We will be working in close collaboration with the Associate Director of the Center For Faculty Development (CFD). SU has well established programs for faculty mentoring including CFD, the Wismer Office, and school and college level collegia focused on faculty development. This infrastructure provides a ready and effective basis for maintaining the revised focus on multiple tracks to promotion and corresponding training and career development once these paths are clearly delineated, demonstrated to be a more resonant and vibrant reflection of the university mission, and implemented as detailed in the project.

Communications Strategy

Strategic, collaborative communication is a central aspect of our proposed intervention plan and consists of a professionally managed, densely linked website, talking points, and participation by the project team in regularly scheduled meetings at all levels of the university governance. Where needed, an independent consultant will be tasked with some interviews and preparation of data to protect confidentiality and buttress our work. In addition to this university-wide, cross-level communication aimed at maintaining awareness and involvement in the project, we will be preparing and delivering papers at annual regional and national conferences (e.g., AAC&U and AAUW) as described in the "broader impact" section and publishing those papers. Our communication plan also includes ongoing engagement with other Jesuit colleges and universities, which have existing peer networks of faculty, deans, and program directors through the AJCU. SU was recently involved in planning the recent "Crossing Boundaries: Transforming STEM Education" AAC&U meeting held in Seattle (November 2015). The Wismer Office and the Center for Faculty Development are involved in both Jesuit university networks and national diversity education networks that provide opportunities for us to conduct workshops and gather and share information. As the project evolves – most likely in year three – we intend to convene a formal conference of participants from other Jesuit colleges and universities (N=28) and we will also request featured annual articles chronicling the project in *Conversations,* the national magazine of Jesuit higher education.

Broader Impacts of Proposed Work

Compared with the universities that have received ADVANCE grants to date, our focus population of women faculty is relatively small. However, we are confident that this project has the potential for significant impact and is highly relevant to assessing ADVANCE goals at values-based, comprehensive universities across the U.S. As we have described, comprehensive, primarily undergraduate colleges and universities require a wide range of faculty activities in order to promote and sustain their teaching mission. These schools cultivate and promote distinct institutional ideals and reputations; faculty dedication to mission-related activities is necessary for the maintenance of this distinction. Research indicates that expectations for faculty advancement in comprehensive colleges and universities are typically varied and often vague (22, 26).

In the absence of clearly articulated standards that reflect specific mission aims and, faculty and administrators may adopt normative standards whereby research is generally more valued than teaching, leadership service, and community engagement. In other words, unless specifically addressed, the mission may not be fully reflected in the tenure and promotion process and an uncritical norm whereby academic success is reflected primarily in research productivity prevails. This two-track, tiered system may

disproportionately affect the advancement of women, faculty of color, LGBT faculty, and faculty with disabilities who may choose to direct their careers into leadership and community-based forms of scholarship that better reflect their particular teacher-activist-leader commitments, particularly in terms of service to marginalized communities. Failure to recognize and integrate these contributions into the formal evaluation and promotion process reflects an organized contradiction for colleges and universities that rely on these same activities as the basis of their distinctive educational promise (19, 20, 26).

Institutional transformation occurs through formal identification and recognition of the value of the sustaining activities of teaching-oriented, values-based universities. This project will provide a model for identifying, recognizing, developing, and implementing evaluation and promotion processes for the diverse contributions that are the foundational basis for inclusive educational excellence.

The members of this project team well positioned to distribute the information from this project through participation in regional and national level conferences and related publishing venues including: AAC&U/LEAP; Women in Engineering ProActive Network; American Society for Engineering Education; The National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity; American Association of University Women; American Association of University Professors; The National Women Studies Association; and the Sociology of Higher Education.

Project Description References

[1] Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender & Society* 4:139-158.

[2] Ambrose, Susan, Therese Huston, Marie Norman. 2005. "A Qualitative Method for Assessing Faculty Satisfaction." *Research in Higher Education*. 46(7): 803-830.

[3] American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE). 2012. *DataBytes: Conflicting trends*. Prism Magazine, April 2012: 18019.

[4] Austin, Ann E., Sandra Laursen, Anne-Barrie Hunger, Melissa Soto, Dalinda Martinez. 2011. "Organizational Change Strategies to Support the Success of Women Scholars in STEM Fields: Categories, Variations, and Issues," Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. http://www.colorado.edu/eer/publications/documents/AERAorgChangepaperFinalMay2011.pdf

[5] Baldwin, Roger, Deborah DeZure, Allyn Shaw, and Kristin Moretto. 2008. "Mapping the Terrain of Mid-Career Faculty at a Research University: Implications for Faculty and Academic Leaders." *Change* 40: 46-55.

[6] Bilimoria, Diana, Susan Perry, Xiangfen Liang, Eleanor Palo Stoller, Patricia Higgins, Cyrus Taylor. 2006. "How Do Female and Male Faculty Members Construct Job Satisfaction? The Roles of Perceived Institutional Leadership and Mentoring and the Mediating Processes." *Journal of Technology Transfer* 31: 355-365.

[7] Bird, Sharon R., Laura Rhoton, Carla Fehr and Lisa M. Larson. 2011. "ISU ADVANCE Collaborative Transformation Project: Rounds 1 & 2 - Focal Department Synthesis Report (April 2010)." Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University ADVANCE Program. http://new.provost.iastate.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/facultyresources/professionaldevelopment/ISUADVANCECTREPORT9_FINAL_synthesisApril2011(1).pdf

[8] Sharon Bird, Jacquelyn S. Litt, Yong Wang. 2004. "Creative Status of Women Reports: Institutional Housekeeping as 'Women's work'" *NWSA Journal* 16(1): 194-206.

[9] Bolman, Lee and Terrence Deal. 1991. "Leadership and Management Effectiveness: A Multi-Frame, Multi-Sector Analysis." *Human Resource Management* 30(4): 509-534.

[10] Bose, Christine, Roslyn Felderg, and Natalie Sokoloff. 1987. *Hidden Aspects of Women's Work.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

[11] Britton, Dana. 2010. "Engendering the University through Policy and Practice: Barriers to Promotion to Full Professor for Women in the Science, Engineering, and Math Disciplines." Pp.15-26 in Birgit Riegraf, Brigitte Aulenbacher, Edit Kirsch-Auwärter, and Ursula Müller (Eds), *Gender Change in Academia: Re-Mapping the Fields of Work, Knowledge, and Politics from a Gender Perspective*. Heidelberg, Germany:Verlag.

[12] Britton, Dana. 2000. "The Epistemology of the Gendered Organization." *Gender & Society* 14:418-435.

[13] Britton, Dana and Laura Logan. 2008. "Gendered Organizations: Progress and Prospects." *Sociological Compass* 2:107-121

[14] Buch, Kimberly, Yvette Huet, Audrey Rorrer and Lynn Roberson. 2011. "Removing the Barriers to Full Professor: A Mentoring Program for Associate Professors." *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 46: 38-45.

[15] Geisler, Cheryl, Debbie Kaminski, Robyn Berkeley. 2007. "The 13+ Club: An Index for Understanding, Documenting, and Resisting Patterns of Non-Promotion to Full Professor." *Feminist Formations* 19(3): 145-162.

[16] Georgia Tech University. 2007. "ADEPT." http://www.adept.gatech.edu/activities.htm

[17] Georgia Tech University. 2001. "ADVANCE IT Research Proposal." http://www.advance.gatech.edu/archive/ADVANCEproposal.pdf

[18] Gouldner, Alvin W. 1957. "Cosmopolitans and Locals." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2:281-306

[19] Gutierrez y Muhs, Yolanda Flores, Carmen G. Gonzalez, and Angela P. Harris. 2012. *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia.* Logan, UT: University of Utah Press.

[20] Huston, Therese and Carol L. Weaver. 2008. "Peer Coaching: Professional Development for Experienced Faculty." *Innovative Higher Education* 33(1): 5-20.

[21] Kezar, Adrianna J. 2001. "Understanding and Facilitating Organizational Change in the 21st Century." *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report* 28(4): 1-147.

[22] O'Brien, Jodi. 2006. "Reorganizing the Contradictions of Teaching and Research." Pp. 16-38 in *Excellent Teaching in the Excellent University* edited by J. Rabow. Bethesda, MD: Academica Press.

[23] Naples, Nancy. 2003. *Feminism and Method: Ethnography, Discourse, and Activist Research.* NY: Routledge.

[24] Nelson, Donna. 2005/2007. "A National Analysis of Diversity in Science and Engineering Faculties." Normon. OK. http://chem.ou.edu/~djn/diversity/briefings/Diversity%20Report%20Final.pdf

[25] Rankin & Associates. 2015. "Seattle University Climate Study Final Report." https://www.seattleu.edu/diversity/

[26] Rau, William and Paul J. Baker, 1989. "The Organized Contradictions of Academe: Barriers Facing the Next Academic Revolution." *Teaching Sociology* 17:161-175.

[27] Ridgeway, Cecilia. 2011. *Framed by Gender.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[28] Rocque, William and Sandra Laursen. 2007. "Faculty Career Trajectories and the Institutional Factors that Shape Them: Comparative Analysis of Longitudinal Faculty Interview Data, A Report to the LEAP Project." http://www.colorado.edu/eer/downloads/LEAPtrajectoriesReport2007.pdf

[29] Schiebinger, Londa (ed.) 2008. *Gendered Innovations in Science and Engineering.* Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

[30] Seattle University. 2016. "President's Task Force on Diversity Final Report." https://www.seattleu.edu/diversity/

[31] Smith-Doerr L. (2004). *Women's work*: *Gender equity v*. *hierarchy in the life sciences*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

[32] University of Delaware ADVANCE IT. http://sites.udel.edu/advance/resources-new/program-documents/

[33] University of Virginia ADVANCE IT "Goal 3: Re-imagined Spaces -Voices and Visibility." http://advance.virginia.edu/index.html