BGSU ALLIES: Building Inclusive Leadership Practices and Policies to Transform the Institution

Annual Report to NSF – July 31, 2019

Cover

Federal Agency and Organization Element to Which Report is Submitted:	4900
Award Number:	1760389
Award Title:	BGSU ALLIES: Building Inclusive Leadership Practices and Policies to Transform the Institution
PI/Co-PIs:	Margaret Yacobucci Lisa Hanasono Julia Matuga Michael Ogawa Sheila Roberts
Recipient Organization:	Bowling Green State University
Project/Grant Period:	09/01/2018 – 08/31/2021
Reporting Period:	09/01/2018 – 08/31/2019

Accomplishments

1. What are the major goals of the project?

BGSU ALLIES is adapting components of the evidence-based ADVANCE-Institutional Transformation projects of North Dakota State University ("Advocates & Allies" program) and Florida International University ("Bystander Leadership" program) into an integrated model to build faculty allies within departments and inclusive leaders across the university. The BGSU ALLIES project focuses on how administrators and faculty allies can work collaboratively to reduce biases and transform institutional policies and practices.

The project goal is to make allyship and inclusive leadership the expectation and norm at BGSU. To achieve this goal, the project is pursuing four key objectives:

1) Revise institutional policies and processes to make allyship and inclusive leadership the expectation for faculty and administrators.

2) Design training materials, workshops, and online modules to develop departmental allies and inclusive leaders knowledgeable about inclusion and intersectionality and empowered to actively combat bias.

3) Deploy new data collection processes allowing better tracking of faculty advancement in the context of intersecting identities (including non-binary gender, race, ethnicity, national origin, sexuality, dis/ability status).

4) Disseminate training materials and best practices to other institutions through a strategic communication plan and a regional conference to be held at BGSU in Spring 2021.

BGSU ALLIES is working with 17 academic units in STEM and Social & Behavioral Sciences (SBS) across four colleges: Arts & Sciences (A&S), Business (CoB), Education & Human Development (EDHD), and Technology, Architecture & Applied Engineering (TECH). These units include approximately 271 full-time faculty and Chairs/Directors.

2. **What was accomplished under these goals? You must provide information for at least one of the 4 categories below.**

   a) **Major Activities**

   In Year 1 of the BGSU ALLIES project, we pursued seven objectives:

   1) Establish project's infrastructure.

   We identified office space, acquired supplies and a laptop, established a shared email account (allies@bgsu.edu) and project website (https://www.bgsu.edu/allies), and developed a logotype and graphic element for the project.

   2) Initiate a marketing and communication plan.

   We produced an initial press release covered in two local newspapers (*Sentinel-Tribune* and *BG Independent Media*) and featured in the university's newsfeed.

   The ALLIES team gave presentations about the project at Dean's Council, Faculty Senate, Provost's Chairs/Directors meeting, College of A&S Council, A&S Diversity Committee, and Undergraduate Student Government.

   ALLIES held a Kickoff Event in October 2018, to which STEM and SBS faculty, Chairs/Directors, and Deans were invited. Over 50 people attended this event, during which the team shared information about the project and its planned activities. This overview was followed by small-group structured discussions on allyship and inclusive leadership.

   To increase the project's visibility and spark broader conversations across campus, we designed placards for ALLIES participants to place on their office door with the project logo and goal along with a prompt to "Ask me about allyship!" Not only does this provide recognition for the Faculty Allies and Advocates, but will increase awareness about the program and its benefits.

   3) Develop and run a half-day pilot faculty workshop on allyship and bystander intervention.

The ALLIES team reviewed the literature and consulted with both of our model ADVANCE programs to create an effective training approach for our faculty participants.

We created a competitive application procedure for the workshop and emailed the call for applications to all full-time faculty in our target academic units, Chairs/Directors of those units, and the appropriate College Deans. Fifty-two complete applications were submitted for 50 available seats. Four applications were from faculty in non-target units. These faculty were invited to participate but without the funding incentive; all declined to attend. All 48 remaining faculty members were accepted into the workshop and 46 attended, representing a broad mixture of disciplines and ranks, genders, and racial/ethnic identities.

The Faculty Allies team developed a pre-workshop online module with a survey, links to Harvard University's Implicit Association Tests (IATs), and readings about privilege and gender. Participants were required to complete the survey, the IAT on gender and a second IAT of their choice, and the readings before the workshop.

Eight ALLIES personnel were trained to be presenters and facilitators for the 4-hour workshop held on Jan. 24, 2019. The workshop included opening remarks by BGSU's new Provost and an overview of the ALLIES project, followed by an icebreaker activity, a presentation on the "so what?", and a hands-on activity for participants to engage with the concept of privilege. Next, we introduced the concept and principles of bystander intervention; participants then discussed examples of specific scenarios at their tables, guided by a facilitator. The workshop concluded with a discussion of the costs of acting as an ally, a teaser for upcoming events, and completion of the workshop's evaluation.

Acknowledging the importance of giving faculty time and space to think about and practice ally behaviors, we developed a series of follow-up events for Spring 2019, including 3 brown bag discussions, 4 networking events, a face-to-face discussion of the workshop readings, and an online discussion of additional allyship scenarios. 57% of our Faculty Allies attended more than the minimum two Spring events required to be eligible for their $1,000 stipend.

4) Select Faculty Advocates for Years 2 and 3 of the project.

Following NDSU's "Advocates and Allies" model, 12 senior faculty members from the first workshop cohort were selected to become ALLIES Faculty Advocates.

To be eligible to serve as Faculty Advocates, applicants needed to show a demonstrated commitment to supporting gender equity and inclusion through allyship, service, teaching, research, or informal actions within their own academic unit, university, or professional organization.

We received 12 applications and, after review, accepted all of them. One Advocate later declined the role and we solicited a replacement from among the senior faculty workshop participants. Two faculty are sharing one Advocate position (one serving in Year 2, the other in Year 3) due to a faculty leave, while the others have committed to serving in both years.

The Faculty Advocates will work with the ALLIES team to develop workshop materials and learn effective facilitation practices, help facilitate faculty workshops, serve as liaisons to the ALLIES departments, and participate in the Spring 2021 BGSU ALLIES regional conference.

5) Develop Chair/Director training materials on inclusive leadership principles and practices.

After consultation with the literature and extensive discussion, the team developed a definition of inclusive leadership intended to be clear and measurable. Inclusive leaders:
1. Proactively advocate for all the faculty they lead;
2. Cultivate a climate in which each faculty member feels valued and included;
3. Enact equitable workplace policies, procedures, and practices; and
4. Work to identify and break down barriers and biases that hinder the career success of women and faculty of color.

Three trainings for all BGSU Chairs/Directors were developed this year. A modified version of the 4-hour Faculty Allies workshop was offered in July 2019 to provide a common grounding in key concepts related to inclusion. The ALLIES team will then provide a 90-minute session on inclusive leadership at the Chairs/Directors retreat in August 2019. The session will guide Chairs/Directors in exploring six signature traits of inclusive leaders and crafting their own action plans to incorporate inclusive leadership practices into their work. These action plans will be revisited in December 2019 to assess progress. The third event will take place in the Fall 2019 semester and involve a network mapping exercise to show campus leaders the value of being more intentional in broadening their personal networks. The ALLIES team will track these network maps over time to see if the Chairs/Directors' networks do, indeed, become more inclusive over the duration of the BGSU ALLIES project.

6) Review relevant institutional policies and practices.

BGSU ALLIES strives to ensure that all campus leaders are formally evaluated on their achievements in inclusive leadership. To this end, the team reviewed existing university and college policies and handbooks and found no university-wide statement of expectations or evaluation processes and little language reflecting inclusive leadership.

ALLIES has therefore been working with the College of Arts & Sciences to add inclusive leadership as an explicit expectation in the A&S Chair/Director handbook and has developed items on inclusive leadership to submit to the College Deans as they develop a proposal for a university-wide tool to evaluate Chairs/Directors, Associate Deans, Deans, and Vice Provosts.

7) Develop evaluation plan and instruments for ALLIES activities.

Our internal evaluator, Dr. Rychener, has worked closely with the rest of the ALLIES team to develop evaluation instruments that align well with the project's objectives. Rychener and Yacobucci have had two substantive conference calls with our external evaluator, Dr. Christine Pribbenow, who also visited BGSU in April alongside our External Advisory Board.

In Year 1, the ALLIES evaluation has focused on formative evaluation of the Faculty Allies Workshop and follow-up ALLIES events (details elsewhere in this report) and developing the evaluation instruments for the Chair/Director trainings (still in progress).

b) **Specific Objectives**

In this section, we describe in more detail the objectives and process for some of our major activities.

1) Kickoff Event (October 2018):
The goals of the kickoff event were:
1. To explain NSF's ADVANCE program, what they support, where we fit relative to other ADVANCE institutions.
2. To explain BGSU data, the problem in context.
3. To describe the ALLIES approach: inclusive leadership and faculty allyship plus policy and data collection revisions; the 3 I's of inclusion, intersectionality, and interconnections.
4. To describe plans for Y1 and Y2 – need to recruit first cohort of faculty allies and leaders.
5. To get feedback from participants on perceptions, self-evaluation of current knowledge, examples of bias, current leader development and ally building activities and practices within units.
6. To build list of contacts for potential participants in ALLIES programming.

After hearing an overview of the ALLIES project, participants were asked to discuss how we might define allyship and inclusive leadership, and how prepared they felt to take action to prevent or challenge instances of bias. Faculty were then asked to share ways they have demonstrated allyship on a colleague's behalf and to discuss some of the factors that influence their decision to act when witnessing an act of bias or discrimination. Administrators were asked to share examples of their own or others' inclusive leadership, and what policies, initiatives, or programs their unit has to promote allyship and inclusive leadership.

2) Faculty Allies Workshop (January 2019):
A competitive application procedure for the workshop was created with two written questions:
1. Identify specific reasons why you would like to be a faculty ally and explain why you might be effective doing ally work.
2. What do you think the benefit of this training will be to you and your department, program, or school?

The goals of the workshop were to:
1. Create an initial cohort of faculty allies within STEM and SBS departments.
2. Begin developing a critical mass of faculty empowered to act as change agents within their departments.
3. Build a supportive network of faculty across the university interested in shaping a more inclusive institution.

The workshop objectives were to:

1. Know:
- Concepts of privilege, intersectionality, allyship, bias, inclusion.
- Issues at BGSU and why they matter, responsibility to work for gender equity.
- Characteristics of an inclusive workplace.
- Barriers to bystander intervention.
- Effective communication strategies for raising difficult issues.

2. Be able to:
- Recognize privilege from an intersectional lens.
- Recognize bias, know when and how to intervene, and effectively act to intervene when witnessing implicit and explicit biases at the individual, institutional, and cultural levels.
- Communicate these concepts to their faculty colleagues.

3) Faculty Advocates Selection and Initial Training:

Potential Advocates were asked to answer three questions on their application:
1. Describe some examples of how you have taken action to promote gender equity and inclusion. If you have done this work with faculty, please highlight that work.
2. How have you used and/or shared what you learned in the January workshop?
3. Describe some previous experiences you have had in training and/or influencing your peers.

Initial Faculty Advocates Meeting (May 2019) - The objectives of this meeting were to:
1. Introduce attendees to the conceptual basis for the Advocates program
2. Describe the role and expectations for Advocates
3. Outline the resources available on the Canvas shell for Advocates
4. Engage Advocates in peer discussion of their "hopes, fears, and needs" for the program and solicit their advice on what strategies work best in their own departments

4) Chair/Director Trainings:

Allyship for Faculty Administrators Workshop (July 2019)

The goals of the workshop are to:
1. To inform faculty administrators about the goals and rationale of the BGSU ALLIES project
2. To introduce strategies for faculty administrators to promote inclusion within their departments and colleges
3. To build a supportive network of faculty administrators across the university dedicated to creating a more inclusive institution

The workshop objectives are to:
1. Know:
- Concepts of privilege, intersectionality, allyship, bias, inclusion.
- Issues at BGSU and why they matter, responsibility to foster a culture of gender equity.
- Characteristics of an inclusive workplace.
- Interpersonal and structural barriers to bystander intervention and intervening as a leader.

- Effective communication strategies for raising difficult issues.

2. Be able to:
- Recognize privilege from an intersectional lens.
- Recognize bias, know when and how to intervene, and effectively act to intervene when witnessing implicit and explicit biases at the individual, institutional, and cultural levels.
- Communicate these concepts to faculty and administrator colleagues.

Inclusive Leadership Principles and Practices (August 2019)
The session will guide Chairs/Directors in exploring six signature traits of inclusive leaders (cognizance, curiosity, courage, cultural intelligence, commitment, and collaboration). Tables will be assigned one of the six traits and participants asked to brainstorm how their past and/or future actions as Chair/Director might reflect that trait. After a report-out, each participant will develop an individualized action plan describing specific steps they will take to incorporate inclusive leadership practices into their work. These action plans will be revisited in December 2019 to assess progress.

Inclusive Networks (Fall 2019)
This session will focus on broadening one's personal network to become more inclusive. Chairs/Directors will be asked a series of questions about individuals who are currently part of their network. They will then provide information on the gender and race/ethnicity/nationality of the people in their network. This network map exercise will show campus leaders the value of being more intentional in developing an inclusive sphere of influence. It will also serve as preliminary data so the ALLIES team can track networks over time to see if they do, indeed, become more inclusive over the duration of the BGSU ALLIES project.

5) Evaluation Instruments
The Faculty Allies Workshop Survey used retrospective pre- and post- questions on the quantitative portion of the survey that assessed allies' concepts, awareness, actions, behaviors, response efficacy, self-efficacy, and perceptions of the workshop content, materials, space, and discussion. The qualitative questions focused on faculty perceptions of the most beneficial components of the workshop, suggested modifications to the workshop, allyship strategies faculty learned and would utilize, and additional support needed. Data from the survey were used to modify the Faculty Allies Workshop.

The Faculty Allies Event Survey is a brief formative survey that examines overall rating of the event, key takeaways, any modifications to the event needed, and other topics faculty would like to see addressed. Faculty complete the survey after each event and the data are used to improve service delivery as well as suggest other topic areas for the support of Faculty Allies.

c) **Significant Results**

Below we outline some of our key findings, products, and lessons learned so far.

1) October 2018 Kickoff Event:
   At the table discussions, participants talked about how to weigh the costs and benefits of intervening, especially for pre-tenure and non-tenure track faculty whose position in the academic hierarchy makes them more vulnerable to retaliation. Faculty also suggested that the ALLIES project could provide guidance on knowing when and how to intervene. Some faculty asked why administrators would want to be allies when there is no incentive for them to change the status quo, while others suggested that it is the chair/director's job to intervene in cases of bias, not faculty's role. This feedback was tremendously helpful to the ALLIES team as it informed how we structure our trainings and what aspects of allyship and inclusive leadership we need to emphasize.

2) Faculty Allies Workshop and Follow-Up Events:
   We were pleased that faculty were willing to complete the pre-workshop module on Canvas. Participants were engaged and highly satisfied with the workshop experience, finding the activity regarding the recognition of one's privilege and the discussion and practice with real-world scenarios especially helpful. Specific real-world examples were clearly most effective in training faculty. Participants also appreciated being able to talk with like-minded colleagues from other academic units and felt the networking opportunities were beneficial. Many faculty wished the workshop could have been longer, which is a positive sign.

   The allyship strategies faculty most felt they could implement included asking for clarification as a way to pause the incident and make time to reflect and assess the situation, naming the specific bias(es) involved to make them visible to others, using "I" rather than "you" statements, calling colleagues "in" and not "out", providing face-saving options when addressing a colleague's behavior, and working with other Faculty Allies in their unit to address specific incidents and to improve general policies and practices in their unit.

   Faculty Allies raised a variety of issues at the Spring 2019 follow-up events. The first event gave faculty an opportunity to discuss the workshop's assigned readings in greater depth. The faculty appreciated how the readings, particularly excerpts from Allan G. Johnson's 2018 book *Privilege, Power, and Difference*, prompted reflection on their own areas of privilege and emphasized the obligation to use that privilege to serve as an ally to others. They noted that microaggressions are often brief and ambiguous, making it hard to intervene in the moment. Attendees considered simple strategies to pause the incident, like saying "I feel uncomfortable with what was just said." Participants also noted that they feel empowered to confront microaggressions involving students but much less so when an incident involves colleagues because they are not in a position of authority.

   At one of the brown bag sessions, we provided attendees with a list of ally actions and asked them to brainstorm in small groups some challenges to taking each action and possible strategies to overcome them. Faculty cited various barriers to intervening, including fear of misspeaking, misunderstanding a situation, or becoming a target of bias themselves. Attendees also noted that it can be hard to know whether their actions would be welcomed by a victim of bias. Several faculty noted that, in order to nominate women colleagues for recognition or advocate for them, they must first learn what their colleagues are doing, but there is no mechanism to network or share such information.

3) Faculty Advocates
   In our initial meeting with our Faculty Advocates, we asked them to identify their hopes and fears in serving as Advocates, what they need to be successful, and what strategies they think would be most effective in their own academic unit. Advocates hoped to improve their department climate, to make it more equitable and to spark meaningful conversations about how individual actions can contribute to a more inclusive workplace. They worried that their efforts may not be effective, due to faculty indifference or resistance and a lack of institutional support. They were also concerned about the skill, time commitment, and emotional energy required to be an Advocate. What Advocates need from the ALLIES team are advice on strategies and time to practice their skills in having difficult conversations, and data, examples, and links to resources they can use to support their discussions. From the institution, they want clear messaging that their work is important and their time commitment is recognized. Advocates from different departments recommended different strategies. Some emphasized the importance of working with the Chair and getting his or her buy-in first. Others thought small-group discussions and/or collecting anonymous experiences from faculty would work better. One Advocate thought it best to bring in outside Advocates to conduct a climate review of her/his department. These insights will be invaluable as we expand our work within our target units.

4) University Policies
   The BGSU ALLIES team developed the following potential items on inclusive leadership for a Chair/Director evaluation instrument:
   - Encourages participation from all members of Department/School.
   - Open and transparent in their decision-making.
   - Seeks input from diverse sources when making decisions.
   - Effectively supports faculty development.
   - Allocates service activities in a fair and unbiased manner.
   - Deals with problems in a proactive and fair manner.
   - Actively promotes a culture of inclusion within the department/unit.
   - When necessary, oversees changes in policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that an inclusive culture is maintained.

5) IAB and EAB meetings/campus visit
   We held our first meetings of the BGSU ALLIES Internal (IAB) and External (EAB) Advisory Boards in April 2019. Both groups were provided with a report on project activities prior to the meetings. The IAB encouraged the team to think carefully about long-term sustainability of the project after the end of the grant period. They recommended working with BGSU's Human Resources and with existing faculty mentoring and Chair/Director onboarding programs within Colleges to institutionalize our Faculty Ally and Inclusive Leadership training and working with the College Deans to add inclusive leadership items to Chair/Director evaluation instruments.

   The EAB and External Evaluator visited BGSU on April 23-24, 2019 and met with the BGSU ALLIES team, senior administrators, Chairs/Directors and faculty in our target units, including participants in our Faculty Allies training. Their recommendations are summarized in the attached External Advisory Board/External Evaluation report. The EAB highlighted the

progress that the program has made in a short time (initiated in September 2018). They were impressed with the quality of the work thus far and its impacts as expressed by the participant interviews. They made a number of recommendations to improve the logistics of the project and elements to consider for the allies and inclusive leadership training.

6) Evaluation
Formative evaluations were conducted for each Allies event and data from the surveys were utilized to improve future programming. Detailed findings of the evaluation of BGSU ALLIES program are described in the attached internal evaluation report and integrated into the discussion of specific programs described above in this report.

d) **Key outcomes or other achievements**

Other Achievements

Title IX:
To ensure that our training materials and practices are consistent with Title IX requirements, we met with BGSU's Title IX Coordinator in November 2018. Of particular concern was clearly informing participants about mandatory reporting requirements, as both workshop facilitators and participants are considered mandatory reporters at BGSU. In talking with our External Advisory Board and External Evaluator, we have found that the ALLIES team is "ahead of the curve" on the issue of compliance with Title IX reporting requirements, something we think will be interesting to explore further and share with other ADVANCE teams as the project proceeds.

Research Project:
A social science research project is not required by NSF for ADVANCE-Adaptation track grants, but the ALLIES team believed that the Faculty Allies training represented an excellent opportunity to help fill in the gap in the research literature about faculty attitudes, beliefs, skills, and behaviors related to allyship.

Led by co-PI Hanasono, the team developed a project to better understand what factors make faculty members more likely to engage in ally behaviors, including bystander intervention.

Drawing from the literature, we propose:
Hypothesis 1: Increased (a) knowledge, (b) self-efficacy, (c) response efficacy, (d) communication skills, and (e) motivation will increase faculty members' likelihood to engage in ally behaviors (including bystander intervention).

Hypothesis 2: The BGSU Allies Workshop should increase participants' (a) knowledge, (b) self-efficacy, (c) response efficacy, (d) communication skills, and (e) motivation to engage in ally behaviors.

Research Question 1: How will participants' ally behaviors differ by (a) rank, (b) gender, (c) race/ethnicity, (d) sexual orientation, and (e) discipline area (STEM vs. Social/Behavioral Sciences)?

Findings from this project will help us identify ways to more effectively train faculty on how to enact ally behaviors.

The team received BGSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval (Project #1364145) to use data from the pre-workshop survey, immediate post-workshop survey, and a follow-up survey distributed in May 2019 for research purposes. These data will be analyzed and compared to data from the Chair/Director version of the workshop in July 2019 and the Year 2 workshop for faculty.

3. What opportunities for training and professional development has the project provided?

BGSU ALLIES provided training on allyship and bystander intervention for STEM and SBS faculty in our target units through our Faculty Allies program (described in detail above). We modified the Faculty Allies workshop and offered it for Chairs/Directors, Associate Deans, and Deans in late July 2019.

4. How have the results been disseminated to communities of interest?

A report on our Year 1 activities has been shared with our Internal and External Advisory Boards, and we will distribute a newsletter summarizing our activities and plans for Year 2 to all faculty and Chairs/Directors in our target units at the start of the 2019-20 academic year. In addition, the BGSU ALLIES website will be updated with news and resources by August 2019. We have also submitted a session to the Early-Stage Innovations track of the Equity in STEM Community Convening, to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in October 2019. This session will describe the carefully sequenced set of learning opportunities we have designed for our Faculty Allies.

5. What do you plan to do during the next reporting period to accomplish the goals?

In Year 2, we will continue our work to make allyship and inclusive leadership the norm and expectation at BGSU. We plan to:
1) Continue to engage our first cohort of Faculty Allies via face-to-face events and online discussion.
2) Train our Faculty Advocates to facilitate the Faculty Allies workshop and begin their work within individual departments.
3) Revise and run our Faculty Allies training program for a second cohort of STEM and SBS faculty. Revisions will enhance the focus on intersectionality and faculty with multiple marginalized identities.
4) Deploy inclusive leadership training for Chairs/Directors, including the network mapping activity and evaluation of individualized action plans.
5) Develop online training modules for Faculty Allies and Chairs/Directors on specific topics, such as responding to microaggressions, addressing intersectionality, and evaluating faculty performance.
6) Roll out our updated website and new social media accounts and organize targeted action campaigns via social media (e.g., a "nominate your colleagues" campaign to

increase the number of women and faculty of color being nominated for university and external awards).

7) Continue working with College Deans and the Provost to incorporate inclusive leadership principles and practices in materials to onboard new faculty administrators and evaluate current Chairs/Directors, Associate Deans, Deans, Vice Provosts, and the Provost.

8) Work with university partners, such as the College of Arts & Sciences Diversity Committee, to institutionalize our training components.

9) Review data from the Spring 2019 COACHE survey and incorporate findings into our activities.

10) Develop a plan for improving data collection processes with respect to documenting intersectional identities of our faculty and administrators.

11) Engage in preliminary planning for our Spring 2021 regional conference on faculty allyship and inclusive leadership.

Accomplishments - Supporting Files:

Supporting File: BGSU ALLIES logo
Description: BGSU ALLIES graphic element

Supporting File: Table of targeted units
Description: Target STEM and SBS units

Supporting File: Participant Demographics in Faculty Allies Workshop (pie charts)
Description: Participant demographics in January 2019 Faculty Allies Workshop

Supporting File: Spring 2019 Faculty Allies Events
Description: Schedule of Spring 2019 follow-up events for Faculty Allies

Products

Four files uploaded

1. Project evaluation reports (internal and external)
    a. Internal evaluation report (includes all survey data)
    b. External evaluation report (will be the External Advisory Board's report)

2. Project participant and impact data
    a. STEM & SBS faculty demographics
    b. Impact data-number & demographics of Faculty Allies trained; attendance at follow-up events

3. Survey instruments
    a. Workshop pre-survey instrument
    b. Workshop immediate post-survey instrument
    c. Workshop May survey instrument

4. Other Project Materials = Faculty Allies Training Materials
    a. Workshop participant packet
    b. Brown bag materials for 3 events
    c. Reading discussion questions
    d. Online discussion questions

Participants/Organizations

1. What individuals have worked on the project?

PI/Co-PI Contributions to the Project

Yacobucci:
Responsible for overall project management, Leader of Faculty Allies subteam (Spring 2019)

Hanasono:
Member (Spring 2019) and Leader (Fall 2019) of Faculty Allies subteam

Matuga:
Member of Inclusive Leadership subteam, responsible for policy review with respect to institutional data collection, chair/director training

Ogawa:
Member of Inclusive Leadership subteam, liaison to BGSU's senior administration

Roberts:
Leader of Inclusive Leadership subteam, responsible for policy review with respect to chair/director expectations and evaluation

Name	Most Senior Project Role	Nearest Person Month Worked
Yacobucci, Margaret	PD/PI	3
Hanasono, Lisa	Co PD/PI	2
Matuga, Julia	Co PD/PI	1
Ogawa, Michael	Co PD/PI	1
Roberts, Sheila	Co PD/PI	1
Broido, Ellen	Senior Personnel	2
O'Neil, Deborah	Senior Personnel	2
Peña, Susana	Senior Personnel	1
Ro, Hyun Kyoung	Senior Personnel	2
Root, Karen	Senior Personnel	2
Zickar, Michael	Senior Personnel	1
Rychener, Stacey	Internal Evaluator	1
Current, Kandy	Internal Evaluation Staff	1
Kunk-Czaplicki, Jody	Graduate Student (assistant)	1
Border, David	Internal Advisory Board member	0
Braun, Raymond	Internal Advisory Board member	0
Ciesla, James	Internal Advisory Board member	0
Clark-Taylor, Angela	Internal Advisory Board member	0
Craig, Raymond	Internal Advisory Board member	0
Gallimore, Jennie	Internal Advisory Board member	0
Jackson, David	Internal Advisory Board member	0
McCary, Jennifer	Internal Advisory Board member	0

Molnar, Connie	Internal Advisory Board member	0
Shinew, Dawn	Internal Advisory Board member	0
Whitehead, Joe	Internal Advisory Board member	0
Pribbenow, Christine	External Evaluator	0
Bjorkman, Karen	External Advisory Board Member	0
Bullerjahn, Anne	External Advisory Board Member	0
Burnett, Ann	External Advisory Board Member	0
Rose, Suzanna	External Advisory Board Member	0
Singer, Lynn	External Advisory Board Member	0
Barratt, Clare	Workshop participant	0
Birch, Jessica	Workshop participant	0
Cable, John	Workshop participant	0
Carlson, Jadwiga	Workshop participant and Faculty Advocate	0
Chen, John	Workshop participant and Faculty Advocate	0
Dasigi, Venu	Workshop participant and Faculty Advocate	0
Demuth, Stephen	Workshop participant and Faculty Advocate	0
Devine, Leigh	Workshop participant	0
Erickson, Dave	Workshop participant	0
Faulkner, Sandra	Workshop participant and Faculty Advocate	0
Filippova, Daria	Workshop participant	0
Furgal, Joseph	Workshop participant	0
Gajjala, Radhika	Workshop participant and Faculty Advocate	0
Garrett-Ruffin, Sherona	Workshop participant and Faculty Advocate	0
Gomezdelcampo, Enrique	Workshop participant	0
Gorsevski, Ellen	Workshop participant and Faculty Advocate	0
Ha, Louisa	Workshop participant and Faculty Advocate	0
Holman, Elizabeth	Workshop participant	0
Huber, Robert	Workshop participant	0
Johnson-Webb, Karen	Workshop participant	0
Kalaf-Hughes, Nicole	Workshop participant	0
Kear, Andrew	Workshop participant	0
Krishnankuttyrema, Resmi	Workshop participant	0
Larsen, Raymond	Workshop participant and Faculty Advocate	0
Layden, Andrew	Workshop participant	0
Lee, Jake	Workshop participant	0
Lengel, Lara	Workshop participant	0

Leontis, Neocles	Workshop participant	0
McCluney, Kevin	Workshop participant	0
Mejiritski, Ekaterina	Workshop participant	0
Michaels, Helen	Workshop participant	0
Moninger, Kyle	Workshop participant	0
Morris, Paul	Workshop participant	0
Musher-Eizenman, Dara	Workshop participant	0
Rump, Christopher	Workshop participant	0
Samel, Art	Workshop participant	0
Shay, Siobhan	Workshop participant	0
Sirum, Karen	Workshop participant	0
Sivaguru, Jayaraman	Workshop participant and Faculty Advocate	0
Stevenson, Louise	Workshop participant	0
Tompsett, Carolyn	Workshop participant	0
van Staaden, Moira	Workshop participant	0
Worch, Rick	Workshop participant and Faculty Advocate	0
Wu, Yan	Workshop participant	0
Zeilstra-Ryalls, Jill	Workshop participant	0
Zongo, Opportune	Workshop participant	0

2. What other organizations have been involved as partners?

Nothing to report

3. What other collaborators or contacts have been involved?

Nothing to report

Impact

1. **What is the impact on the <u>development of the principal discipline(s) of the project</u>?**

   The BGSU ALLIES team developed and tested an evidence-based program that empowers faculty members and university leaders to actively advance gender equity, diversity, and inclusion by enacting allyship and inclusive leadership behaviors. Our program has helped influential faculty and leaders from our principal disciplines learn how to proactively communicate to prevent and respond to biases and discrimination. The individuals who completed our training can, in turn, apply their knowledge and skills in the classroom (i.e., serve as more effective, equitable, and inclusive teachers), their labs and research spaces (e.g., promoting allyship and inclusive leadership in their research teams), and day-to-day activities at the workplace.

   In Year 1, we collected data for a longitudinal study on faculty allyship. The findings from this study have the potential to expand the body of social scientific scholarship on the antecedents and outcomes of faculty allyship—and the different types of communicative responses that allies can use to respond to macro- and microaggressions.

2. **What is the impact on <u>other disciplines</u>?**

   The techniques found to be effective with STEM faculty—understanding privilege, intersectionality, practicing ally behaviors, and being part of a supportive community of faculty allies—are hypothesized to be effective in related disciplines.

3. **What is the impact on the <u>development of human resources</u>?**

   By equipping faculty and administrators with the knowledge and skills needed to enact allyship and inclusive leadership—and by changing or creating more equitable policies and practices— we anticipate that our program will improve the organizational climate of STEM units and lead to improved rates of retention and career advancement, especially among those who are women faculty and/or faculty of color in STEM and SBS disciplines. In addition, our training programs complement and extend the current collection of human resource training for those in science, engineering, and technology.

   A PhD student in Higher Education & Student Affairs, Jody Kunk-Czaplicki, served as a Graduate Assistant for the ALLIES project in Spring 2019. A second student, Blaze Campbell, will take over this role for Year 2 of the project. These students will bring their experiences in developing allyship and inclusive leadership training for STEM faculty with them when they move into academic faculty and/or administrative positions upon graduation.

4. **What is the impact on <u>physical resources that form infrastructure</u>?**

   Nothing to report

5. **What is the impact on <u>institutional resources that form infrastructure</u>?**

    Nothing to report

6. **What is the impact on <u>information resources that form infrastructure</u>?**

    Nothing to report

7. **What is the impact on <u>technology transfer</u>?**

    Nothing to report

8. **What is the impact on <u>society beyond science and technology</u>?**

    Many faculty participants discussed the transferability of ally concepts to their teaching, and the potential impact that creating classrooms with greater respect for gender equity and other minoritized groups would have as their students graduate and influence society at large.

Changes/Problems

1. **Changes in approach and reasons for change**

   A few changes were made to the project personnel in Fall 2018. Ogawa had been listed as Lead PI and Yacobucci as the Project Director and co-PI on the NSF proposal; however BGSU's Grants Accounting office requires that the person responsible for day-to-day fiduciary responsibilities be the Lead PI. Therefore, after discussing it with the NSF-ADVANCE program officer, we switched Ogawa to co-PI and Yacobucci to Lead PI. Also, Dr. Rachel Vannatta, who was to lead the internal evaluation team, had to step away from the project; Dr. Stacey Rychener, who was also on the original team, took Vannatta's place as leader of the internal evaluation team.

   In the BGSU ALLIES proposal, we described "peer facilitators" as faculty leaders who would work with the team in Years 2 and 3 of the project. To better align with NDSU's Advocates and Allies model, we renamed these positions as "Faculty Advocates." We had originally planned to work with six STEM Faculty Advocates in Year 2 and six SBS Faculty Advocates in Year 3, but given the momentum and enthusiasm of our Year 1 participants, we decided to use all 12 positions in both years, splitting the Advocates' budgeted stipend over Years 2 and 3.

2. **Actual or Anticipated problems or delays and actions or plans to resolve them**

   Due to NSF's definition of "STEM," departments in STEM-related clinical disciplines (such as Communication Disorders, Nutrition Sciences) and professional programs (such as Architecture, Construction Management) were not included in our targeted academic units, as faculty participants would not be eligible to receive NSF funding. We have received a handful of complaints from faculty members in several of these programs, questioning why they are not eligible for the funds the BGSU ALLIES project is offering to their colleagues in other departments. We have offered to have these faculty attend our Faculty Allies training without the funding support, not an ideal situation. We have also spoken with the relevant College Deans about the problem. It may be possible for the Colleges to provide the financial support for interested faculty in these units to become Faculty Allies; we will be pursuing this option in Year 2.

   In the BGSU ALLIES proposal, we described an incentive system whereby Faculty Allies and Advocates would receive professional development funds for their participation in the project. These funds were to be transferred from the grant into each faculty member's departmental professional development account. The faculty member could then use the funds to be reimbursed for approved professional expenses (e.g., conference travel, minor research-related expenses). However, BGSU's Office of Grants Accounting took the position that transferring grant funds to departmental accounts would violate federal rules and therefore was not allowable. Initially, they suggested the funds instead be disbursed as supplemental pay, processed through Payroll and treated as compensation for faculty members' time and effort committed to the project. Subsequently, Grants Accounting disallowed this option as well. The

ALLIES team asked NSF's post-award staff and Office of Policy for advice about the situation; NSF's position was that it is a matter of institutional policy and therefore not something on which they can comment. At the time of this report's submission, a tentative solution has been identified, whereby Faculty Allies can submit requests for reimbursement for professional development activities directly to the grant account.

The BGSU ALLIES project team members with 9-month faculty appointments were supposed to receive course releases to provide time to work on the project. When we received the grant in September 2019, the university did not have a funding source in place for these course releases and the Fall 2019 semester's teaching schedule was already set. Lead PI Yacobucci was provided with one course release in Spring 2019 but the rest of the team put in many hours in Year 1 with no release time. Happily, co-PI Ogawa (who is BGSU's Vice President for Research) has been able to locate university funds to cover replacement costs for course releases for the team's 9-month faculty in 2019-2020.

Finding suitable office space for the BGSU ALLIES project has proven challenging. The project was assigned office space in late 2018, then re-assigned to a different space in January 2019. Neither space had the right combination of size, configurability, and visibility to best support the ALLIES project. At the time of this report's submission, the team is still seeking a more suitable space, with hopes that ALLIES will be settled in that office by the start of the 2019-2020 academic year.

3. **Changes that have significant impact on expenditures**

   Nothing to report

4. **Significant changes in use or care of human subjects**

   Nothing to report

5. **Significant changes in use or care of vertebrate animals**

   Nothing to report

6. **Significant changes in use or care of biohazards**

   Nothing to report

Special Requirements

Nothing to report