

Year-End Report of the Boston University NSF ADVANCE PAID Initiative

WIN: Women in Networks, Building Community and Gaining Voice

Year One: September 1, 2008 to August 31, 2009

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Project Team.....	1
3. Programs.....	2
Pre-tenure mentoring.....	2
Welcome receptions.....	4
Sponsored Colloquia.....	5
Erskine Grants.....	6
4. Synergistic Activities.....	7
5. Network research.....	7
6. Data analysis.....	8
7. Publications.....	8

Appendices:

A. Pre-tenure panelists' talk summaries.....	9
B. Pre-tenure panel evaluation questionnaire.....	11
C. Pre-tenure mentoring pair matches evaluation questionnaire	12
D. Welcome receptions evaluation questionnaire.....	13
E. One-page description of WIN programs.....	14

1. Introduction

Summary: Boston University's WIN initiative was designed to increase the work satisfaction, retention, and advancement of women faculty in the sciences and engineering at Boston University by enhancing women's professional networks, and to analyze the ways in which network-building can contribute to women's satisfaction and success in academic science and engineering. The WIN programs were adapted from successful programs at other ADVANCE schools and include pre-tenure mentoring, welcome receptions, sponsored colloquia, and grants to tenured and tenure-track women STEM faculty to enhance networks and promote new research initiatives. Repeated surveys will document changes over time in faculty networks. All WIN programs and research efforts include faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), the College of Engineering (ENG), and Sargent College for Health and Rehabilitation Sciences (SAR). Several WIN programs are open to men as well as to women faculty members.

Context: Boston University applied for and received its NSF PAID grant during a period of active efforts to promote the advancement of women faculty in the sciences and engineering and following efforts at self-study by the university administration. In fall, 2004 Prof. Sheryl Grace, now co-PI of the NSF PAID grant, founded Boston University Women in Science and Engineering (BU WISE), an organization devoted to the advancement of women science and engineering faculty at Boston University. In the fall of 2006 newly arrived university president Robert Brown created the Council on Faculty Diversity and Inclusion (CFDI) to make recommendations to promote the hiring, retention, and advancement of women faculty and those from underrepresented minority groups. Deborah Belle, Sheryl Grace, and Carol Neidle, the leadership team of the current NSF PAID grant, served on this committee. On the recommendation of the CFDI, the university carried out a Faculty Climate Survey during the 07-08 academic year and also participated in a COACHE survey of all junior faculty members. The CFDI's final report was published in the fall of 2008 and it called for the creation of two new university positions, an associate provost for faculty diversity and inclusion and an ombudsperson. The university accepted these recommendations as well as other recommendations from the CFDI and began formal searches to fill both positions in the spring of 2009. Deborah Belle was asked to serve as interim director of Boston University's Women's Studies Program for academic year 2008-2009, the first year of the NSF PAID grant. Her roles made possible a helpful synergy between WIN efforts and the Women's Studies Program.

Accomplishments: Over the course of the first year of the WIN grant the PIs established the project team, hiring a program administrator and a research assistant, fielded several new programs, evaluated the immediate impacts of these programs, fielded a baseline survey of faculty networks, created a website, and instituted procedures to track benchmarks in faculty hiring, promotion, retention, compensation, and resources.

2. Project Team:

Deborah Belle, Professor of Psychology, served as Principal Investigator, providing oversight of program design and implementation, program evaluation, and other research.

Sheryl Grace, Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering, served as Co-PI, with responsibility for the design and implementation of all WIN programs.

Carol Neidle, Professor of Romance Languages and Linguistics, took responsibility for analyzing faculty benchmark data.

Khalima Bolden, graduate student in Psychology, served as the WIN Program Administrator, with responsibility for assisting in the implementation and evaluation of all WIN programs.

Lauren Groves, graduate student in Psychology, served as the Research Assistant responsible for the implementation and analysis of the WIN Faculty Network Survey.

3. Program Activities:

To guide the implementation of WIN programs the leadership team worked with an oversight committee composed of faculty from CAS and ENG, and including faculty members at all ranks, and both men and women. An initial two-hour meeting with the entire group was followed up with a smaller meeting focused on one program and with email correspondence to resolve final details of other programs. The WIN leadership team also received valuable ideas from the WISE advisory board and from the WIN Steering Committee, which included Provost David Campbell and Deans Sapiro (CAS), Lutchen (ENG), and Waters (SAR).

3.1 Pre-tenure mentoring

3.1.a Lunch panel discussion

During the fall semester WIN held a luncheon and panel discussion on tenure and career issues, bringing together tenure-track STEM faculty from CAS, SAR, and ENG with senior faculty members who had recently served on tenure and promotion committees at the college or university level. The program was designed to provide career guidance to pre-tenure faculty and to enhance the networks of pre-tenure faculty by connecting them to senior colleagues across the university who could continue to provide guidance, and to other pre-tenure faculty members with whom they could share peer support. Nearly half of all eligible junior STEM faculty members (26 out of a possible 57) participated in this event, including 17 women and 9 men.

On December 11, 2008, these 26 junior faculty members and 13 senior faculty members came together over lunch. Table assignments were arranged so that junior faculty members sat with senior faculty members. To get conversations going, a series of discussion topics were suggested. After lunch, four of the senior faculty members gave brief prepared talks, offering career and tenure advice to their junior colleagues. The panelists were chosen to represent a variety of disciplinary backgrounds and colleges and to include both men and women. The talks were followed by a question and answer period and general discussion. This year's senior faculty panelists were:

- Irving Bigio, Biomedical Engineering
- Dan Clemens, Astronomy
- Lena Lundgren, School of Social Work
- Melanie Mathies, Sargent College for Health and Rehabilitation Sciences

Summaries of these talks are given in Appendix A of this report and are available on our website.

We distributed an evaluation questionnaire at the event, which is available as Appendix B to this report, and after several reminders we received written evaluations back from all but two of the junior faculty participants. Virtually all assessed the event as extremely valuable.

When asked whether they had gotten out of the mentoring panel meeting what they had hoped to get, 20 out of 24 said that they had, with several emphasizing the point: "Absolutely," "Yes!," "Yes—more than I ever expected," "Yes—I did. It was extremely helpful." One respondent left the question blank and 3 respondents gave qualified answers: "Partly. It gave some answers to my questions, but I wish there was more time to talk to and questions and answers from junior faculty," "More or less," and "In large part—of course, the standards/norms in each field vary, but I got a general feel for what comes into consideration."

All of the respondents said that they had learned at least one thing that they think will be helpful to them as junior faculty members. The ideas they listed included the need to set limits on service, time management suggestions, and advice on which conferences to attend, keeping the CV up to date, the importance of writing the tenure application with non-experts in mind, and getting "big-wigs" in the field to know you and your work. Several mentioned that simply seeing the tenure application was helpful.

All but 4 respondents said they had met at least one person at the workshop they could call on in the future if they had questions or concerns, and most of these were senior people, including the panelists.

When asked what were the best things about the meeting, answers frequently pointed to the multiple perspectives offered. One person said there was a “very helpful variety of perspectives, with core consistency in message, from the panel.” Respondents valued the bringing together of senior and junior level faculty for interaction and gaining perspectives from outside one’s own department. Hearing about balancing work and family life was also valued, as was hearing people talk about the tenure process explicitly. Respondents praised the honesty of comments and the well organized panelists.

When asked about the least successful aspects of the meeting, 18 out of 24 respondents gave no response or said explicitly that nothing was unsuccessful. Two respondents elaborated: “Nothing. It was terrific. Thank you!” “Nothing, this was great.” One respondent would have liked more one-on-one networking time (which already had been planned as the spring semester portion of our pre-tenure mentoring program). One wanted more time to ask questions, another more time for discussion, and another would have preferred a shorter program. One complained of vague strategy advice, and one hated the food.

When asked how such a meeting could be improved in the future, there was interest expressed in hearing from people who had just received tenure and people who had encountered trouble with the tenure process. Several people wanted the meeting to be longer to allow for more informal discussion, although one person thought it should be shorter, “so we have more time to go back to our office to write those papers and proposals necessary for successful tenure.” One person suggested breakout groups and perhaps “someone to walk us through the basics.” Another would like to see more comments on family/work balance. Greater frequency of meetings was also suggested. “This is the first time that I heard of/attended such a meeting in 4 years.” “I wish this existed years ago when I, personally, needed it most. Please keep this going into the future. Information is empowering to promote success, lessen fear, and put a plan into place to achieve this goal.”

3.1.b Pre-tenure one-on-one mentoring pair matches

The one-on-one mentoring sessions facilitated by WIN took place beginning in March, 2009. Twelve junior faculty members, including 6 men and 6 women, chose to participate in this part of the program. Most of these junior faculty members had also participated in the fall pre-tenure mentoring panel event. Responses to the evaluation questionnaire (available as Appendix C) were received from ten of the twelve junior faculty participants, and these responses were overwhelmingly positive.

When asked to what extent their expectations for their one-to-one meetings with senior mentors were met, virtually all stated that their expectations were met and, in many cases, exceeded. “It was great, all my questions were answered and I learned more than I expected to.” “They were absolutely met and I feel comfortable calling on my mentoring partner in the future.” “I had a very productive meeting with my mentor!” The only negative note was sounded by a junior faculty member who wrote, “I was somewhat disappointed that I was paired up with someone inside (my own) college. At the same time, I was pleasantly surprised at how useful the meeting was.”

Junior faculty cited several important things they had gained from their one-on-one sessions, including a better understanding of the level of expectation for receiving tenure, an unbiased opinion of their current status, suggestions on how to make their work better known, ideas on setting priorities and on networking to promote themselves in their fields, learning details of the review process from the perspective of the reviewer, and gaining advice on how to be useful and important in the department “without being completely overburdened.” One participant stated that “the piece of advice that most resonated with me was to somehow define myself within my department. I was already aware that I need to define myself as a good teacher and as a top-notch researcher in my field, but I hadn’t really thought that I should also fill an important role within my department.” Another said, “I have another contact that I can turn to. He is outside the department, can give me an objective opinion, and can give me advice and resources.” Another said, “My mentor was able to guide me on making my application cogent without being effusive, and how to present my material well even to those outside my area.” One mentor/mentee pair has met on other occasions after their initial pairing, a second reported that her tenure mentor offered to meet again another time to follow up, and one mentor/mentee pair have decided to pursue a grant together.

One junior faculty member learned she had similar research interests to her mentor and reported that when they attended the same research working group, her mentor introduced her to his colleagues and “that helped break the

ice.” She was the only female and the youngest faculty member in a research working group teleconferencing with a group in another country. “It was a bit intimidating at first, but ... when there was an opportunity that I could join in the discussion, my mentor turned to me and said ‘I think this is your topic of interest, would you like to say something?’ I know that I could have stood up for myself but being the new, young, and the female faculty in this working research group, it was difficult for me to say something. But right after my mentor gave me the spotlight to talk, I talked about my ideas and research interests, and my thoughts about a grant opportunity. Shortly after that research group meeting, the leader of that working group contacted me directly to ask for my CV.”

Most participants reported no disappointments with their sessions. One did say, “I am a relatively junior person so my application wasn’t as full as I would have liked, so it made it somewhat difficult for my mentor to critique it.” Another stated that the mentor was “not in the technical sciences, so it limited questions I could ask. At the same time, it was a strength because I was curious as to how a member of the university-wide tenure and promotion committee that was not a member of my college would evaluate my application.”

All of the participants said that they would advise a friend to spend the time to attend such a meeting, with many emphasizing they would do so “definitely,” “or “absolutely.” One said, “I would. As I mentioned, it was surprisingly helpful.” Another said, “If nothing else, it’s a nice way to meet more people at BU, and most likely it will be a much more valuable experience than that!” One commented, “I know that many of my colleagues always say that they are too busy to attend these personal/professional development workshops, and would rather focus on research. I think that their thinking is short-sighted. I believe that small talk leads to big talk. I think these types of workshops and activities are an essential part of career development.”

When asked how we could improve these pairing sessions in the future one person suggested mentoring groups, in which three mentors and their mentees might meet once or twice a year to touch base. “It would widen the network.” Another suggested that junior faculty should be encouraged to bring along a CV to the sessions, and to read the tenure application form before meeting with the mentor. A third suggested having such sessions earlier in the career of junior faculty members. We were also encouraged to have a mentor award or mentor certificate by nomination. “This may get more senior faculty involved, and if a mentor has more than one mentee, there is some kind of recognition of their services.”

3.2 Welcome receptions for new faculty

WIN hosted receptions for new faculty in STEM disciplines to help them make or deepen connections with their STEM colleagues, particularly those in other departments. In the fall of 2008, WIN hosted welcome receptions for the nine newly hired tenured or tenure track STEM faculty, including five men and four women. The first welcome reception was held on October 21, 2008. All faculty from the College of Engineering, and from the Physics, Math, Computer Science, and Cognitive and Neural Systems Departments of the College of Arts and Sciences were specifically invited to attend. The second welcome reception was held on October 28, 2008. Invitations were extended to College of Arts and Sciences faculty in Biology, Earth Sciences, Geography, Chemistry, Psychology, and to faculty in Sargent College.

New faculty welcomed at these receptions were:

- **Karen Allen**, Associate Professor of Chemistry
- **Lorena Barba**, Assistant Professor of Mechanical Engineering
- **Franco Cerrina**, Professor of Electrical Engineering
- **Colleen Dalton**, Assistant Professor of Earth Sciences
- **Robinson Fulweiler**, Assistant Professor of Earth Sciences
- **Angela Ho**, Assistant Professor of Biology
- **Samuel Isaacson**, Assistant Professor of Mathematics
- **Michael Smith**, Assistant Professor of Biomedical Engineering
- **Adrian Whitty**, Associate Professor of Chemistry.

All STEM faculty were invited to attend one or both of these receptions, and BU WISE women were particularly encouraged to attend. The invitations to attend the receptions in and of themselves increased the visibility of new faculty members by making all faculty in STEM disciplines aware of each new faculty member's arrival and areas of expertise.

As a way of expanding professional networks further the nine new faculty members were also encouraged to invite Boston area colleagues and potential colleagues to their receptions. Two new faculty members provided WIN with the names of individuals they wished to invite to their receptions.

The receptions were well-attended by senior BU administrators, with visits from President Bob Brown, ENG Dean Ken Lutchen, and SAR Dean Gloria Waters. However, faculty attendance at both receptions was poor, with fewer than 20 faculty members appearing, beyond the nine being welcomed. Evaluations by those who did attend were mixed, with many mentions of the poor attendance at these events. Everyone who returned a written evaluation found the receptions at least somewhat useful but many evaluations were not returned. Some attendees met others who shared their own research interests. Some have kept in touch with those they met at the receptions. New faculty and other attendees generally thought the receptions were a good use of their time. Many remarked on the enjoyable atmosphere and the valuable opportunity to speak with others outside their own departments. When asked how to improve the receptions for next year, raising attendance was the major recommendation.

In conversations with many colleagues and in a meeting to discuss the successes and problems of the past year with members of the BU WISE advisory board, the problem of poor attendance at the welcome receptions was addressed. The consensus was that the fall period when the receptions were held is also a particularly busy time on campus, with many other welcoming and orientation events. New faculty were rushed to prepare for the receptions and particularly had inadequate time to think of local colleagues and potential colleagues to invite to the receptions. Other faculty on campus may have attended another welcoming event around the same time and believed that our event was redundant. We decided, therefore, to hold a reception this coming year during the spring semester instead of during the fall, and to define the reception not as a welcoming event, but rather as a professional networking opportunity. We were also invited by Dr. Beverly Brown, member of the BU WISE advisory board, life scientist, and wife of Boston University president Robert Brown, to hold our reception next year at the president's house, as a way of conveying the significance of this event and its importance to the university. Sheryl Grace has met with Dr. Brown and her assistant to choose a date and to discuss ways to enhance this event when it is held next spring. We believe that the new location alone will be a great boost to attendance and will especially be helpful when we extend invitations to those outside Boston University whom our incoming faculty would like to meet or to get to know better. The setting of the event will help to convey that it is an honor to be invited and that it will be a rewarding opportunity to attend this event.

3.3 Sponsored Colloquia

To increase the visibility of women in STEM departments, strengthen the networking and career opportunities for women in the STEM disciplines, and bring new ideas to BU from industry and other ADVANCE schools, WIN offered two sponsored colloquium programs. The Women in Industry colloquia bring women scientists and engineers in non-academic careers to Boston University in order to provide faculty and graduate students with additional female role-models and mentors while providing information on industry agendas and networking opportunities for all faculty. The Women of ADVANCE series sponsors visits from female faculty who are active with ADVANCE programs at their home institutions. Each visit includes a research as well as an ADVANCE related seminar or discussion during which WIN participants can learn more about the initiatives and outcomes of ADVANCE at the visitor's university. Each colloquium take place as part of an ongoing series within a college, department, or center.

WIN can sponsor up to four Women in Industry colloquia each academic year and supplies an honorarium of \$250, up to \$200 for a reception, and additional support for publicizing the event. WIN sponsors up to two Women of ADVANCE colloquia, offering travel funds in addition to funds for honoraria and receptions. Given the timing of the selection process this year only one seminar occurred in the spring of 2009. The remainder of the 2008-2009 speakers have been scheduled for the fall of 2009.

For the 2008-2009 academic year, the successful nominations were

- **Dorre Grueneberg** from Ariad and Augusta Pharmaceuticals, nominated by John Celenza (Biology)
- **Beth Marcus**, founder of Bedford startup Zeemote Inc., nominated by Stan Sclaroff (Computer Science)
- **Susie Wee**, Director of Hewlett Packard's Mobile Systems Lab. Nominated by Janusz Konrad (Electrical Engineering)
- **Claire Rinnac** of Case University, nominated by Glynn Holt (Mechanical Engineering)

To provide more time for departments to organize colloquia, the 2009-2010 colloquium solicitation has already been sent out. To date one industry and one ADVANCE colloquia have been scheduled.

- **Jennifer Tour Chayes**, Managing Director of Microsoft Research New England, nominated by Stan Sclaroff (Computer Science)
- **JoAnne Powell-Coffman** of Iowa State, nominated by John Celenza (Biology)

We are pleased that those nominating colloquium speakers include men as well as women and represent a range of disciplines. Because we are already seeing the same departments nominating more than once while other departments have not made nominations, we will intensify our outreach to those who may be overlooking this opportunity.

3.4 Erskine Grants

Mary Erskine WIN Faculty Grants are designed to enhance the research and professional networks of women faculty members. Applicants must be female faculty members with tenured or tenure track appointments in science or engineering. There are two types of grants offered by this program. Type I Awards are small (up to \$3000) and quickly available sums of money designed to cover expenses such as travel, conference fees, child care, and hosting collaborators. Proposals for these awards are accepted on a rolling basis. Type II Awards are larger awards (up to \$20,000) intended to seed new areas of research and foster new collaborations. The funds can be used for equipment, graduate student support, partial teaching release time, summer salary, travel to research sites, specialized child care to permit research activities, etc.

Professor Mary Erskine was a long time member of Boston University's Biology Department. She came to Boston University in 1985 as a research assistant professor and made the transition from a self-supporting non-tenure track professorship to a tenure track appointment in 1990 when she was appointed the Clare Boothe Luce Professor of Biology. She was then promoted to full professor in 1999. She was a founding member of the Women in Biology program at BU and she played a crucial role in the creation of BU WISE. Mary died at the age of 61 in December of 2007 following a long battle with breast cancer. The WIN PIs received permission from Mary Erskine's son to name these grants in Mary's honor.

The solicitation for both award types was released in January, 2009. To date, four Type I awards have been funded. They are:

- **Catherine Caldwell-Harris**, Associate Professor (Psychology), to support an undergraduate researcher to assist in the collection of pilot data for a new study of children with Asperger's Disorder.
- **Kee Chan**, Assistant Professor (Health Sciences and Epidemiology), to attend a summer institute in public health genomics.
- **Linda Doerr**, Assistant Professor (Chemistry), to support her travel to Oxford University to work with Professor Jennifer Green on the calculation of the electronic structure of molecules, particularly those with transition metals.
- **Joyce Wong**, Associate Professor (Biomedical Engineering), to host Yvette Madrid, a specialist in global health, in order to begin work that will lead to a collaborative NIH grant application on the topic of HIV/AIDS detection.

Thirteen Type II Award applications were received. Applications came from faculty at all levels (assistant, associate, and full professor) and a variety of CAS departments and one SAR dept. These applications were reviewed by a panel of senior faculty members in the sciences and engineering using a review procedure modeled on NSF research proposal reviews. All faculty members who did not receive funding in this round were given feedback about the strengths and weaknesses of their proposals and many were encouraged to revise their proposals accordingly and to apply again. The three grants that will be funded are:

- **Rosina Georgiadis**, Associate Professor (Chemistry): “A new collaborative seed project to investigate nanoparticle protein interactions.” The funding will provide partial support for a female graduate student and cover some travel costs.
- **Ulla Hansen**, Professor (Biology): “Relevance of transcription factor LSF to metastatic melanoma: initiation of translational studies.” The funding will provide summer support for a female graduate student and an undergraduate student as well as some laboratory supplies.
- **Cheryl Knott**, Associate Professor (Anthropology.): “New study of wild orangutans in Indonesia.” The funding will be used to cover travel expenses for the PI and multiple collaborators. In addition, the funding will pay for travel and childcare expenses for the PI’s children in Indonesia.

Further details about each of the successful proposals are available on the WIN website:
http://www.bu.edu/win/programs/grants/past_awardees/past_awardees3_index.html.

4. Synergistic Activities

Deborah Belle and Sheryl Grace worked closely with BU WISE chair Margrit Betke to implement several programs during the 08-09 year.

- Symposium on Faculty Mentoring and Networking , featuring talks by Lotte Bailyn (MIT), Abigail Stewart (University of Michigan), Susan Staffin Metz (Stevens Institute of Technology), Mary Dean Sorcinelli (U. Mass., Amherst), and Virginia Sapiro (Boston University)
- Workshop on mentoring with Beverly Brown
- Lecture on Women and Leadership by Linda Carli (Wellesley)
- Lunches with leaders: Margaret Bailey (RIT), Barbara Liskov (MIT)
- Professional development workshop for women STEM faculty on Communication Excellence, led by Susan Morris.
- Lecture by Renee Bergland (Simmons) on the 19th century astronomer Maria Mitchell and the change over her lifetime in the cultural meanings of science and of gender

In addition, Sheryl Grace met with department search committees to discuss the new BU search handbook adopted by the CFDI. Deborah Belle met with many department chairs to publicize the WIN network research and WIN programs.

5. Faculty Network Survey

All full-time faculty in CAS, ENG, and SAR were invited to participate in a web-based survey concerning their professional network ties within their own departments, outside their departments but within Boston University, and beyond Boston University. The survey was designed to take no more than 15-20 minutes. Confidentiality was protected, and all survey procedures and questions were reviewed for the protection of human subjects by the Charles River Campus Institutional Review Board. Before fielding the survey Deborah Belle met with over half of all department chairs whose faculty would be invited to take the survey, explaining the rationale and procedures of the study and urging them to encourage their faculty to participate. Reminders were sent out after the survey was

initially fielded, and faculty members were offered a further encouragement to participate in the survey in the form of a raffle for cash prizes. The survey closed with an acceptable participation rate of 52%. Analyses of the survey data are ongoing.

6. Benchmark Data Analysis

A series of meetings between the WIN team and appropriate people within the Provost's office and the Office of Analytical Research have been held to orchestrate the analysis of ADVANCE benchmark data, with the goal of providing a report on at least ten of the critical twelve indicators by the end of the summer of 2009.

7. Publications

A web page was developed in order to publicize the WIN programs. It also supported the review of the Erskine proposals.

A one-page program description was created for Department Chairs to help publicize the WIN programs (see Appendix E)

A newsletter was created to inform the WISE advisory board and the WIN steering committee of the program outcomes for the 08-09 year. The newsletter can be found at http://www.bu.edu/win/WIN_summary_fancy2.pdf.

Appendices:

A. Pre-tenure panelists' talk summaries

Melanie Matthies: The role of the UPT is to be very vigilant. With this in mind your Part II's should be filled out carefully, concisely, and honestly. With regards to your letters of recommendation, unfortunately, you have no control over these. The department chair solicits letters from tenured professors at other institutions in your field and they ask them if you would get tenure at their institutions. However, there are things you can do to aid in this process: (1) try having a list of senior faculty you've encountered that are "arms length" from you (2) You should go to conferences and events in your field to increase your visibility. Channel your inner "Britney Spears." By this I mean you need to sell yourself and ask for feedback. You should work towards establishing national recognition. Do some committee work (one time short investments, no policy or curriculum committees). Don't ever agree to anything on the spot, always give yourself time to think it over and get back to them. With respect to teaching; email is bad, Courseinfo is good. Don't answer every email, post answers to frequently asked questions on the discussion board of Courseinfo. Talk to your colleagues about department expectations (for teaching) like readings, etc. You should keep your course valuations. Also, utilize the Center for Excellence in Teaching and your senior faculty members in your department for feedback. Be aware of stress and respond to it appropriately. Don't let it build up.

Dan Clemens: First point I would like to discuss is time management: Do it all; attend to all facets of your job and learn how to cut corners when and wherever you can. Read your emails and respond in a timely manner, and follow instructions. If people take the time to write up and point out the guidelines they expect them to be followed. The facets of your career, teaching, scholarship, and service must all be attended to appropriately. Cutting corners safely: touch any document only once. Be a "thirties manager." When you pick up a document give it your full attention, make a decision on it if it requires one, and move on. You should respond to emails in a similar fashion and always assume that your email will be published. Use your day efficiently: Know whether you are a morning person or an evening person. Find out when you are most productive during the day and organize your daily work load accordingly. Effectively use your time and utilize your TA's, discuss grading papers and exams with them. Answer your mail. As for your applications, your Part II's you be succinct. Remember, K.I.S.S. – Keep It Simple Silly. Do not attempt to BS the committee. Follow instructions and do not get emotional when answering comments. Get advice from senior faculty in your department.

Lena Lundgren: I will discuss two things today. The first will regard the committee and how to write towards those not in your field. The second will discuss parenting and tenure. The committee is not only made up of those in your field, therefore, don't write about your teaching and research in an overly specific way. Do it like you would write up a course description. It is fine to use nomenclature specific to your field but understand that someone from the arts or humanities may have to read and understand this, so write with that audience in mind as well. Parenting: One major concern of parents is traveling to conference. Try to choose conferences wisely, conferences where the key people in your field are. Make decisions wisely, i.e. whether you will give a lecture, advise a certain person, etc. This is a major factor in avoiding guilt. Also, in regards to avoiding guilt, make sure you have flexible time. Don't think there is a "bar of achievement." There is no threshold that you have to hit and then you can coast, you need to be perceived as a leader and as someone who will continue to lead even after the pressure of achieving tenure is gone.

Irving Bigio: The university regards you as a long term investment and because of this they want you to succeed. The University is family friendly; they are very supportive and provided extra time to the "tenure clock" when time is taken off for starting a family, so don't be afraid to do so before you reach tenure. Develop a relationship with a senior faculty member with whom you get along with well and have similar interests. You can start to build the Part II and show your mentor to receive feedback. You can't do everything, technically. So you have to choose wisely. Service: You should participate in committees but not at the expense of your teaching or research. If service keeps getting dumped on you by your department chair talk to your dean. Talk to recent tenured professors. Invite a senior member who is well known as a good professor to come to your class and evaluate you. Grad students: Invest time in your grad students. Help them succeed and this will reflect well on you. Grad students count more than post docs and cost less too. Undergrad students are valued as well. Don't write your Part II's as you did when you applied for the initial position or for grad school. Write it as though you already have tenure. It's a style thing; show it to your mentor to get feedback. Be productive: It is important to show you're working at your research.

Apply for many grants and take advantage of seed grants. Getting 1 out of 8 grants is better than 1 out of 2. It is ok to be a co-investigator and make collaborations, you don't have to jump straight to being a PI. Try to travel but stay away from the big conferences, instead go to a specialized conference where you increase your visibility and chances of networking.

B. Pre-tenure panel evaluation questionnaire

Pre-Tenure Mentoring Panel December 11, 2008 Evaluation

1. What did you expect to get out of today's meeting?

2. Did you get from today's meeting what you hoped to get?

3. To what extent was today's discussion redundant with what you had already heard?

4. Did you learn at least one thing that you think will be helpful to you as a junior faculty member? What was that?

5. Did you meet at least one person you could call on if you have questions or concerns in the future? Was this a junior or a senior person?

6. What were the best things about the meeting?

7. What were the least successful things about the meeting?

8. How could we improve such a meeting in the future?

Thank you!

C. Pre-tenure mentoring pair matches evaluation questionnaire

Mentoring Pair Matches Evaluation Questions

1. What did you expect to gain from participating in the mentoring session with a senior colleague?
2. To what extent were your expectations met?
3. What were the most important things you gained from the session?
4. What were the greatest disappointments about the session?
5. Would you advise a friend to spend the time to attend such a session?
6. How can we improve these sessions in the future?
7. Did you also attend the fall semester Pre-Tenure Mentoring Panel Discussion?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Not sure
8. Do you have additional thoughts on this that you would like to share?

D. Welcome receptions evaluation questionnaire

WIN welcoming reception evaluation questionnaire

1. At the reception you attended did you meet at least one person with whom you shared research interests?
2. Did you meet at least one person you could call on if you have questions or concerns about professional issues?
3. Since the reception have you spoken to or corresponded with anyone you met at the reception?
4. Did you find the reception valuable? (1=not really, 2=somewhat, 3=very much)
5. Did you find the reception enjoyable (1=not really, 2=somewhat, 3=very much)
6. What were the best things about the reception?
7. What were the worst things about the reception?
8. About how much time did you spend preparing for the reception?
9. When you consider the time you spent preparing for and attending the reception, would you say it was a good use of your time (1=not really, 2=somewhat, 3=very much)
10. How can we improve such receptions in the future, or should we discontinue such receptions in favor of other programs for new faculty?

Thank you again for your help! Your responses will be very valuable to us.

E. One-page description of WIN programs

WIN: Women in Networks
 Part of the NSF ADVANCE Program
 64 Cummington St., Rm. 116
 Boston, MA 02215
 Deborah Belle and Sheryl Grace, Co-PI's
<http://www.bu.edu/WIN>



Summary of BU WIN programs

Programs are open to all STEM faculty in CAS, ENG, and SAR (unless otherwise noted).

<p>Faculty network study.</p> <p><i>Ongoing.</i></p>
<p>Mary Erskine WIN Faculty Grants</p> <p>Type I awards (up to \$3,000) to cover expenses such as travel, equipment, conference fees, child care, and hosting collaborators. Proposals accepted on a rolling basis.</p> <p>Type II awards (3 up to \$20,000) to seed new areas of research and foster new collaborations. Next deadline TBA, early fall 2009.</p> <p><i>Available to STEM faculty women</i></p>
<p>WIN Colloquia to bring distinguished women scientists and engineers to campus to give technical seminars within ongoing department or center seminar series</p> <p>Women from industry Women from other ADVANCE schools</p> <p><i>Solicitation for 2009-2010 academic year participants open again in August.</i></p>
<p>Pre-Tenure mentoring activities for pre-tenure STEM faculty</p> <p>Fall semester—pre-tenure mentoring panel luncheon (<i>held Dec. 11, 2008</i>) Spring semester—focused mentoring partnerships</p> <p><i>Next event fall 2009.</i></p>
<p>Lunches with Leaders for STEM faculty women (<i>occasional and ongoing</i>)</p>
<p>New faculty networking reception (<i>to be held in spring 2010</i>)</p>
<p>WISE/WIN discussions with female faculty candidates in STEM (at the request of Departments)</p>