

APPENDIX E
WEPAN Group Sessions' Minutes

MEETING NOTES FOR THE ADMISSIONS ACTION GROUP
WEPAN Conference 1994

Marilee Jones, Associate Director of Admissions MIT
Admissions Action Group Chair

The Admissions Action Group, made up of Admissions professionals and others at universities who are associated with their school's admissions work, met at the WEPAN conference to plan our strategy for '94-'95. As a part of our ultimate goal to increase the number of admitted to engineering programs, we plan to generate a list of admissions personnel in private and public colleges/universities. Using e-mail, we will use this core group to share ideas and to develop programs.

Items to be addressed are:

- * information about the changes in standardized testing, such as the recentering of the SAT.
- * electronic applications and testing.
- * information about new math/science magnet high schools, including names of teachers.
- * opportunities for joint recruitment travel.
- * pre-college programs and funding sources.
- * recruitment strategies.
- * institutional research about admissions policies.
- * financial aid- which schools offer aid based upon gender.
- * successful gender centered recruitment procedures.
- * possibilities for outreach, using the media.
- * increase enrollment into WEPAN.



FACULTY ACTION GROUP

June 5, 1994
Washington, D.C.

Mary Anderson, Associate Dean of Engineering and Applied Sciences at Arizona State University, presided. Faye Boudreaux-Bartels volunteered to take the minutes.

She reviewed the objectives for this past year:

- (1) to identify the women engineering faculty in the country, in order to aid Universities in recruiting and hiring women, and to help new graduate students looking for positions,

To this end, a list has been started of the names and addresses of women engineering faculty in WEPAN and efforts will be made to extend this list to all women engineering faculty. It was suggested that this list be sent to private, government, and professional organizations who might be looking for women to serve as panel members on grant reviews or to serve on a professional or industry board. Many job openings are being advertised directly on the WEPAN e-mail network.

- (2) to examine issues related to Promotion and Tenure for women faculty, and
- (3) to hold at least one session related to academia at the upcoming WEPAN conference.

Prof. Anderson was pleased to report that the 1994 WEPAN conference had two such sessions: one on Reflections of Female Engineering Deans and another on Academic Culture--Views from Faculty.

Helpful information available to women faculty was discussed, including:

MIT Women's Faculty Network Brochure, which is a brochure for all young faculty. This has been modified and is being used by Karen Watson at Texas A&M University, who will be happy to send anyone a copy who requests it.

ASEE puts out an Engineering Educators Workbook.

SWE sends out to each Dean of Engineering a list of women engineering faculty, regardless of whether or not they are members of SWE. This is a comprehensive list, sorted by name, school, field of study.

ASEE published a Women in Engineering issue.

The question was asked whether universities were hiring more adjunct woman's faculty. The consensus of the group was no. However, it was pointed out that the adjunct faculty position may be a way of recruiting more women professors from industry.

There was discussion of "grow your own" programs. Some universities give graduate assistantships to women or minority students who promise to come back to their host university and to teach once they've completed their doctorate.

Different types of mentors were discussed. The point was made that the mentor should be a strong advocate for the young faculty person, not a "grader," and that there is a need for everyone to have several mentors, e.g., one each in administration, research, proposal writing, teaching, etc...

Whether there is a good balance between evaluation of teaching and research performance in tenure decisions was discussed.

It was recommended that if there are any "unusual" conditions or some understanding about your academic job while you're in the tenure review process, then you should be sure to get it in writing. The person who is your current chair or Dean may not be the person who will be chair/Dean when you come up for tenure review. In addition, an inappropriate request will be signaled by the chair's refusal to put it in writing.

At some schools, it is possible to negotiate or to delay the tenure clock when you have children or some family crisis.

Goals for next year that were discussed are:

Get more women faculty to serve on important review boards.

Find organizers of panels or sessions at upcoming conferences.

Generate a more comprehensive list of women engineering faculty.

At the next conference, in addition to the general interest session on women faculty, there should be a special session for junior faculty and a special session for senior faculty. While the two groups have many interests in common, they often have special needs that are related to their job level, e.g., junior faculty are focused on tenure; senior faculty may become more interested in administrative issues.

Attendees:

Phil Alexander
Mary Anderson
Faye Boudreaux-Bartels
Kris Brown
Carol Burger
Sherita Ceasar
Judy Cezeaux
Karen Chou
Richard Foote
Harry Greenleaf

Xiaowei He
Janice Margle
Betty Preece
Lynn Roberts
Carla Schwartz
Janice Trautner
Karan Watson
William Wells
Gayle Yamasaki

**Action Group on Research, Evaluation, and Dissemination
Minutes of Meeting
June 5, 1994**

Chaired by Dr. Emily Wadsworth
Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana

1. Introductions were made. Present were 32 WEPAN members.
2. Emy Wadsworth described the structure of AGRED. It is made up of 4 subgroups, each with two co-leaders. (See below for listing.)
3. Copies of the First AGRED Annual Report, the 1993 WEPAN meeting report, AGRED definitions (see last page of this report), and the College Classroom Climate Resource Book were distributed. Suggestions or comments regarding the definitions were solicited. Further additions to the Resource Book were requested from those present at the meeting and should be submitted to Emy Wadsworth by July 15, 1994 for this year's publication. Anyone should feel free to submit references to Emy Wadsworth for future editions.
4. A brief overview was given of the presentation to be made on Tuesday, June 7 (see elsewhere in these *Proceedings* for the session papers). The purpose of the presentation is to show how AGRED subgroups can work to support its mission and scope, which are:

Mission

The mission of the Action Group on Research, Evaluation and Dissemination is to 1) advocate and support research and evaluation of projects and programs, and 2) to disseminate findings and recommendations based on model programs.

Scope

The Action Group on Research, Evaluation and Dissemination will encompass research, evaluation and dissemination about:

- Women in Engineering and Science
- Recruitment/Admissions/Retention/Curriculum Programs
- Pre-Kindergarten through Professional Career Education
- Climate (classroom, campus, workplace) Issues
- Faculty Development
- Administration Development
- Programs and Systems

5. Irene Mikowaz, co-chair of the dissemination sub-group, discussed their progress and ideas for this year. Ideas included the establishment of an internet list of abstracts about research, evaluation, dissemination, and funding, and a central clearinghouse at the University of Manitoba for gender issues in teaching. A draft form for abstracts to be listed on the internet was distributed.



OMEN IN ENGINEERING CONFERENCE: EFFECTING THE CLIMATE

1994 WEPAN National Conference

6. The meeting was opened up for suggestions or comments from the floor. These included:
- A suggestion that programs that have received funding and whose project leaders are willing to share proposals be listed in the resource book .
 - A request for a list of questions or guidelines to consider before or during evaluating a program.
 - A request for a list of ethnographic software that can analyze open-ended questions, especially as used in research and program evaluation. The package Ethnograph was mentioned as one such package.
 - A suggestion to publish the names and e-mail addresses of AGREd members on WEPAN-L.
 - A suggestion that the Resource Book be available over e-mail.
7. A discussion of leadership was held. It was determined that Emy Wadsworth would continue to chair the action group.
8. The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 PM.

Michele D. Fish, Recorder
(mdf6@cornell.edu)

AGRED EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Chair:

Emily Wadsworth, Purdue University—emw@ecn.purdue.edu

Recorder:

Michele Fish, Cornell University—mdf6@cornell.edu

Research Subgroup Co-leaders:

Jan Carpenter, Penn State University—cjc6@psuvm.psu.edu

Laura Kramer, Montclair State College—kramer@apollo.montclair.edu

Evaluation Subgroup Co-leaders:

Meg Bland, University of California at Davis—mmbland@ucdavis.edu

Nina Brown, Old Dominion University—phone (804) 683-3787

Dissemination Subgroup Co-leaders:

Carol O'Connor, University of Louisville—caocon01@ulkyvm.louisville.edu

Irene Mikawoz, University of Manitoba—mikawoz@ccu.umanitoba.ca

Funding Subgroup Co-leaders:

Nancy Holland, Texas A&M University—phone (409) 845-7008

Parveen Wahid, University of Central Florida—pfw@engr.ucf.edu

WEPAN AGREED Definitions

The following definitions provide WEPAN members with a foundation—a common base of understanding—about what certain words and terms mean when we use them in our professional endeavors.

RESEARCH

Research is the systemic, empirical, and critical investigation of hypothetical propositions about the presumed relations among social phenomena. Qualitative/naturalistic and quantitative/experimental methods represent alternative forms from which researchers can choose. Different research methods are appropriate for different research situations.

EVALUATION

Evaluation is the systematic collection and analyses of information about the activities, characteristics, and outcomes of intervention programs, personnel, products, or processes. Evaluations are utilized by people to reduce uncertainties, improve effectiveness, and make decisions with regard to what intervention programs, personnel, products, or processes are doing and affecting.

DISSEMINATION

Dissemination is the process of communicating information and exchanging ideas about research investigations and evaluation programs for the purpose of training people in various fields of endeavor and facilitating them in making professional choices. Dissemination activities include seminars, workshops, exhibits, publications, presentations, videotapes, and telecommunications.

WOMEN IN ENGINEERING PROGRAM

A Women in Engineering Program is a specific activity or spectrum of activities over a sustained period of time that has the goal of increasing the recruitment and retention of female students studying and completing degrees in engineering.

WOMEN IN ENGINEERING PROGRAM STUDIES

Women in Engineering Program Studies is the systematic approach to investigating the types, numbers, and characteristics of Women in Engineering Programs and to assessing the factors and issues surrounding the shortage and under utilization of females in engineering careers.

The following individuals contributed toward the development of these definitions:

Suzanne Brainard

Fred Kerlinger

Michael Patton

Jane Daniels

David Mack

Jane Weyant

John Ergermeier

Indira Nair

Emily Wadsworth



