Making Data Work For You
Not just “busywork” or “hoops”

- Data are persuasive to resistant faculty/administrators
- Different formats appeal to different people
  - Qualitative vs. quantitative
- Can help you focus your efforts
- Provide rationale for future institutionalization of programming
- Basis for dissemination
Different types of data

- NSF Indicators
- Evaluation forms
- Interview/focus group data
- Climate surveys
- Attendance logs
Human Subjects/IRB approval

- Highly recommend going through IRB approval process
  - Air of formality, places interventions in realm of “research”
  - Protects you from evildoers
  - Ability to link different data sources

- Exceptions?
  - Some interviews/conversations with highly identifiable persons
NSF Indicators

- Toolkit #1
- Work closely with your IR office
- Create nice tables, graphs
- Link to ADVANCE activities where appropriate
Percent Female, New Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
Biological & Physical Sciences

Participating Departments 2005
- 21/84 (2003-2005)
- 17/49 (2006)

Non-Participating Departments 2005
- 33/89 (2003-2005)
Evaluation forms

- Immediate feedback for program improvement
- Useful data for convincing administrators of program effectiveness
- Feeds into summative program evaluation
“This program generates a feeling of commitment to this institution, and a desire and willingness to give back, to help ensure that others benefit from similar institutional support in the future. . . I have told others about the grant in the context of explaining why I think UW-Madison is such an exceptional institution. For example, I have mentioned it to job candidates as an illustration of how this institution takes seriously life cycle issues and is genuinely humane and supportive in not just accommodating but actively supporting faculty through periods where personal and professional life pressures may be unnaturally intense or exacerbated by unforeseen health issues. The distinction between “accommodation” and “support” that is embodied in this program is crucial, and it really sets it apart from the kinds of institutional responses to life cycle issues that are the current norm in American universities (not to mention other kinds of workplaces).”
Interview/focus group data

- Provides rich, in-depth data on personal experiences
- Persuasive to people who like to hear personal stories (even scientists!)
- Provides a wealth of “quotes” to use in papers, publications, reports
- Has an effect on the interviewees—makes them feel they have a greater stake in the ADVANCE outcome
Climate surveys

- Provides attitudinal data
- Specific to your campus
- Can be used to evaluate particular programs, policies, or initiatives
- Very useful for measuring change
- Can be linked with other data (with IRB approval)
Figure 1. The climate for women in my department is good
Figure 3. Climate for Women is Good
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Figure 5. Climate for Women is Good
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Attendance logs

- Keep track of who comes to your events
- Link to other data—both individual-level and unit-level
- Provides list that is useful for evaluations, reports
- Creates record of where ADVANCE efforts are actually placed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Searching for Excellence &amp; Diversity Workshops</th>
<th>Climate Workshops for Department Chairs</th>
<th>Celebrating Women in S&amp;E Grants</th>
<th>Life Cycle Research Grants and Vilas Life Cycle Professorships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Particip.</td>
<td>% Total</td>
<td># Particip.</td>
<td>% Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine &amp; Public Health</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agricultural &amp; Life Sciences</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Letters &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Pharmacy</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Search Workshops: Business (1), Law (2), SoHE (2), Education (2), Nursing (1), Graduate School (2), and other units such as UHS and Dean of Students (12); Celebrating Grants: GWIS, Life Cycle Grants: Education, SoHE, IES.
On a different note….

- If you will be hiring a program coordinator, CONTACT ME!

  sheridan@engr.wisc.edu