WISELI's Celebrating Women in Science & Engineering **Grant Program: Evaluation Report, 2002-2009**

Bradley Kerr, Jessica Winchell and Christine Pribbenow
WISELI Evaluation Staff
October 11, 2010

This material is based on work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 0123666. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Contents

Background

In the original proposal to the National Science Foundation, the authors of UW-Madison's Women in Science and Engineering Leadership Institute (WISELI)[1] identified the ***Celebrating Women in Science and Engineering Seminar Series*** as one of the new initiatives to "increase the representation and advancement of women in academic science and engineering careers, thereby contributing to the development of a more diverse science and engineering workforce."[2] This new initiative was described as the following:

> *Outstanding women scientists will be hosted each semester of the granting period (a total of 10 series). Funds for these have been contributed by the six deans who are administrative partners in the Institutional Transformation initiative. When these women scientists are at UW-Madison, WISELI will sponsor trans-departmental receptions, and schedule special sessions with graduate students and postdoctoral fellows. (p.13)*

To implement this series, WISELI PIs and staff developed a grant program in 2002. The ***Celebrating Women in Science & Engineering Grant Program*** provides funding to departments, centers, or student groups wishing to create new workshops, symposia, lecture series, or similar events in line with the goals of WISELI: to promote participation and advancement of women in science and engineering. Applicants may use funds to invite a prominent woman in science or engineering to present her work at a departmental seminar, invite an officer from a major funding agency to discuss the importance of diversity issues to the agency, create a special one-day symposium to educate a department/center on the issues of women in science and engineering, or similar event.

Grant Implementation

WISELI staff members solicit applications for the grant program through the WISELI website, listserv and e-mail announcements to deans and department chairs in the natural and physical sciences, and through word-of-mouth. WISELI expects that invited speakers will promote the advancement of women in science and engineering by contributing to the scientific discourse in various departments, increasing the visibility of women in science and engineering, and serving as role models and potential mentors for female students. The program also encourages departments to routinely include women among its seminar/colloquium speakers. Applications are vetted by a team of reviewers and evaluated on the basis of their congruence with WISELI's goals for this program. Recipients are required to submit evaluations of the effectiveness of their speaker in advancing WISELI's goals (see Appendix A for post-event evaluation form).

---

[1] NSF SBE – 0123666, $4.75 million provided from January 1, 2002 to December 31, 2006; the ADVANCE Program is subtitled "Increasing the Participation and Advancement of Women in Academic Science and Engineering Careers."

[2] NSF-ADVANCE program proposal solicitation.

WISELI awarded a total of 45 grants between 2002 and 2009, although not all were used at this point. Grants were awarded to a number of departments in the biological sciences, physical sciences, and engineering. Grants were also awarded to the Graduate Women in Science student organization and the Committee on Women in the University and the Women Faculty Mentoring Program (jointly). Thus, the awardees spanned various science and engineering fields and cross-college organizations (see Table 1).

Biological Sciences	Engineering	Physical Sciences	Other
◦ Comparative Biosciences ◦ Dairy Science ◦ Forest Ecology & Management ◦ Medical Microbiology & Immunology ◦ Neuroscience ◦ Nutritional Sciences ◦ Population Health Sciences	◦ Biomedical ◦ Chemical & Biological ◦ Civil & Environmental ◦ Engineering Learning Center ◦ Society of Women Engineers	◦ Atmospheric & Oceanic Sciences ◦ Chemistry ◦ Computer Sciences ◦ Physics ◦ Statistics ◦ Women in Computer Science	◦ Graduate Women in Science ◦ Committee on Women in the University & the Women Faculty Mentoring Program

Table 1: Distribution of "Celebrating Women" Grants across UW-Madison's Colleges

The majority of the grants were awarded to faculty, staff and students in Letters and Science (42%), followed by Engineering (18%) and CALS (16%). In total, $66,411 in grants were awarded, with $59,494 (90%) actually spent (see Table 2).

School or College	Number of Grants	Grant $ Awarded	Grant $ Used	Department	**Applicant**
Medicine and Public Health	5	$2100	$2100	Medical Microbiology & Immunology	Assistant professor
		$1500	$1500	Medical Microbiology & Immunology	Assistant professor
		$1500	$1500	Population Health Sciences Student Organization	Graduate Student
		$1000	$1000	Medical Scientist Training Program	Medical Scientist Training Program Student
		$600	$600	Center for Women's Health Research	Professor
		$6700	**$6700**		
Veterinary		$1400	$1400	Comparative Biosciences	Professor

School or College	Number of Grants	Grant $ Awarded	Grant $ Used	Department	**Applicant**
Medicine	2	$1100	$1100	Comparative Biosciences	Professor/Chair
		$2500	**$2500**		
Agricultural and Life Sciences	7	$550	$399	Dairy Sciences	Professor
		$700	$656	Nutritional Sciences	Professor
		$2000	$2000	Forest Ecology and Management	Assistant Scientist
		$1587	$1087	Forest Ecology and Management	Associate Professor
		$1500	$1500	Genetics	Graduate Student
		$1000	$1000	Genetics, Evolution Initiative	Assistant Administrator
		$3000	$3000	Horticulture	Assistant Professor
		$10,337	**$9642**		
Pharmacy	1	$2000	$0	Pharmacy	Assistant Professor
		$2000	**$0**		
Letters and Science	19	$1500	$1500	Statistics	Professor/Chair
		$2000	$2000	Computer Sciences	Assistant Professor
		$1000	$0	Physics	Professor
		$2600	$2600	Atmospheric & Oceanic Sciences	Assistant Professor
		$1200	$1200	Chemistry	Graduate Student
		$2720	$2720	WICS & SWEGA	Research Assistant
		$1300	$1300	Graduate Women in Chemistry	Graduate Student
		$3000	$3000	WACM	Research Assistant
		$1000	$1000	Entomology	Graduate Student
		$2000	$2000	Astronomy	Graduate Student
		$1000	$1000	Mathematics	Graduate Student
		$2000	$2000	Physics, Phenomenology Institute	Graduate Student
		$1000	$1000	Statistics	Professor
		$1500	$1500	Physics, Phenomenology Institute	Graduate Student
		$1000	$1000	Mathematics	Professor
		$800	$800	History of Science	Assistant Professor
		$1000	$1000	Physics	Assistant Professor
		$1740	$1740	Mathematics	Graduate Student
		$2087	$2087	Astronomy	Graduate Student
		$30,447	**$29,447**		
Engineering	8	$700	$490	Civil and Environmental Engineering	Assistant Professor
		$1500	0	Biomedical Engineering	Professor
		$2000	$2000	Chemical and Biological	Professor

School or College	Number of Grants	Grant $ Awarded	Grant $ Used	Department	**Applicant**
				Engineering	
		$3000	$2000	Biomedical Engineering	Graduate Student
		$200	$200	Engineering Learning Center	Director
		$1500	$1500	Biomedical Engineering	Graduate Student
		$1126	$1126	Society of Women Engineers	Research Assistant
		$150	$150	Society of Women Engineers	Research Assistant
		$10,176	**$7466**		
University Wide	3	$2538	$2538	Committee on Women	
		$1000	$488	Graduate Women in Science	Research Assistant
		$713	$713	Women Faculty Mentoring Program	
		$4251	**$3739**		

Table 2: Distribution of Number of Grants, Funds Awarded and Used, Department and Applicant by UW-Madison's Colleges and Schools

In general, award recipients typically used the WISELI grant to bring prominent women scientists to the UW-Madison campus. Most speakers gave research presentations, participated in question and answer sessions, and attended small-group luncheons or dinners. Some also lectured to one or more classes, met with student organizations, held one-on-one meetings with graduate students, faculty members, or post-doctoral students, or attended small-group discussions. The schedule of activities for one Celebrating Women in Science & Engineering Grant speaker is included to illustrate a "typical" visit (see Appendix B).

Summary of Grantee Evaluations

A formative review of this grant program was conducted in 2004.[3] For this review, evaluations completed post-event by each of the awardees were analyzed and categorized thematically. Results from this review indicate that the program was indeed meeting its intended audience and was having positive effects on its grantees and program participants.

Audience

The various activities that visitors participated in were intended to reach a variety of audiences on the UW-Madison campus. For example, research presentations were open to a wide range of interested persons, while dinner meetings often encouraged networking between women scientists by limiting attendance to women graduate students and faculty members, or focused on research by including only those with shared research interests. WISELI intended that each of these activities would serve the broad goals of the grant program.

[3] Winchell, J. (October 2004). *Celebrating Women in Science & Engineering Grant Program, 2002-2004.* Madison, WI: WISELI Evaluation Report.

Attendance numbers for sponsored speakers' activities were very good. Lectures drew the largest audience, with an average of 97 people in attendance at each (n = 41). This indicates that the Celebrating Women grants reached a sizeable campus audience. The make-up of the audiences, which covered a wide-variety of campus populations including men and women undergraduates, graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, and assistant to full professors, indicates that that the grants reached a diverse audience. Together these facts indicate that the program has a wide 'reach.'

There is also evidence that the program had a 'deep' reach, particularly for graduate students and assistant professors. This is illustrated by the large number of one-on-one meetings and small-group research discussions in which speakers engaged (one visitor met individually with 11 faculty and graduate students!) The prevalence of these meetings suggests that the grants not only fostered a significant amount of scientific and professional interaction, but also expanded professional networks for graduate students and assistant professors.

Evaluation by Grantees

Each grant recipient was required to complete an evaluation of his or her program. Grantees solicited feedback on their program through questionnaires or informal discussions, and then presented their findings in an evaluation report. The evaluation focused on the impact of the Celebrating Women program on participants and on its contribution to the goal of advancing women in science and engineering.

Evaluation questions focused on three main issues: participant reactions, promotion of women in science and engineering, and best practices.

On the first issue, the awardees were asked to provide general feedback on the audiences' experiences: what they thought of the speaker, what they learned, and how the program affected their outlook. Responses to this question were overwhelmingly positive, with every evaluation indicating that the audience learned a lot from the speakers and felt that the events were beneficial. Several major themes emerged within these positive responses. In general, audiences felt that the speaker(s) were:

- **Interesting** ("lively discussion," "wonderful insight," engaged audiences asked multiple questions, "among the best seminars [participant had] ever attended")
- **Encouraging** ("extremely open and encouraging," "provided direction for future plans," "helpful guidance," good suggestions on pursuing science & engineering careers)
- **Inspirational** ("supplied them with an example of success," "encouraging thoughts," sparked interest in a new research area or career choice, engendered enthusiasm)
- **Informative** ("learned new information," gained insight into a scientific problem, learned about a new technique, "provided a broader perspective," "offered concrete advice on proceeding forward in academia")

On the second issue, the awardees were asked to indicate how audiences' experiences and the program overall helped to support women in science and engineering. Responses indicated that invited speakers helped support women in a variety of ways. Several of the most common themes included:

- **Providing a role model** ("clear demonstration that women can and do flourish [in science]", "opened eyes to the relevance/competence of women in [science]," "inspirational," "example of someone [women in engineering] could 'look up to'")
- **Addressing career/family concerns** ("made it seem more possible to manage a career in science and also have a life," "specific advice on becoming successful and tenured while beginning a family," "I think the talk will help me to find a balance")
- **Speaking to climate challenges women face in science and engineering** ("good to hear about how people have dealt with the politics of being female in a mostly male world," "good to get a variety of perspectives on what it's like to be a female academic")
- **Suggesting alternative career paths** (new ideas about non-academic scientific careers, "insight into career options and opportunities")
- **Providing research support** (presentations and small group discussions allowed for research feedback and suggestions, "in depth discussions about everyone's research," "[speaker provided] a good suggestion specific to my research project that I hadn't thought of before")
- **Leadership and networking opportunities** ("helped me understand networking," "great ways to network," encouraged publishing efforts, suggestions on how to maximize mentoring relationships)
- **Mentoring** ("learned a lot about techniques to get where I want to go," "more direction for future plans," "advice useful for any career path in science," "addressed many questions that are important at a transitional phase in a person's career")

Finally, the grantees were asked to provide feedback on what they would do differently if they were to organize the same program again and what WISELI could have done differently to help make their program a success. For the most part, most respondents indicated that they would not change anything in the planning, organization, or implementation of their speaker program. Most noted that they appreciated WISELI's support of the Celebrating Women grants and that they felt WISELI had provided all needed assistance. A few grantees stated that they would want to advertise their program more effectively if given the chance to plan it again. They also indicated that WISELI could provide "promotional assistance." Additionally, a sponsor indicated that an opportunity for guest speakers to meet with a member of WISELI to learn about the program and about UW-Madison women scientists might be beneficial.

Current Review

An evaluation of the Celebrating Women in Science & Engineering Grant program was completed in summer of 2010 to complement the review conducted in the initial two years of the program's implementation. This evaluation was conducted in two parts—first, a number of grantees were identified from across UW-Madison (CALS, L&S, Engr, Vet, and SMPH). From these colleges and schools, six departments were identified to reflect "typical" recipients that were awarded grants in the previous five years. The second phase included interviewing the individuals affiliated with these grants—the applicants, attendees, and the department chairs, when available. The interviews questions were designed to determine if the grant increased visibility of women, decreased feelings of isolation for women in the department, and to determine if it had other unintended effects (see Appendix C for interview protocol).

In total, twelve people representing six different grants and departments were interviewed. These interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. The resulting transcriptions were uploaded into Atlas.ti to allow for qualitative analysis of the data gleaned from the interviews. Analysis consisted of categorizing interviewees' responses to questions posed by the evaluators. These "codes" were combined into themes to answer the following evaluation questions: Do the grants increase the visibility of women scientists and engineers? Do the grants decrease isolation of women in the departments that receive them? What are other unintended effects of the grants?

<u>Grant Increased Invisibility of Women</u>

The interviewees indicated that the program(s) funded by the grant did indeed increase the visibility of female scientists and engineers. This was especially the case in departments in which there was a small minority of female faculty or in fields in which there were relatively few women in leadership positions. In these instances, the programs and events provided role models for graduate students, faculty and post docs.

One of the applicants described her intentions and why she chose whom to invite with the grant funds:

> *I think we wanted to focus on bringing in big names because of inspirational value. I was writing the grant and conducting the program… I thought it would be really useful for me and hence, through my experience, other graduate students. I thought this would be useful to see women who were very successful in the professional field and also have a very fulfilling personal life. And for them to share that experience… I think it's hard to find those examples very frequently.*

At the same time, the applicants noted that both women and men would find these discussions valuable:

Anytime one can have a program or an event that focuses on the need for balance in discussing men and women in leadership roles and showing women in those roles is positive…that's what you really need – a real live person behind the discussion.

She also noted that students need a "safe" venue for these discussions:

And what the students said is that it helps having a comfortable, supportive forum in which to voice their own concerns and to hear them echoed by successful women in science.

Another recipient described how she invited a Dean from a different university because UW-Madison has yet to have a female in this leadership role:

[Inviting her] shows an example of a real increase of woman leadership in the field. The majority of the students in this college are women, yet the leadership roles are still mostly filled by white males…Students mostly have male role models, but diversity is good.

All of the interviewees noted that the funded programs did increase the visibility of women. Moreover, they hoped that the event would increase the awareness of the lack of women in various fields. Karen, who was a graduate student when she planned the program, hoped her department would notice:

And the people in the department are very supportive. I can definitely say there is no bias of any sort, but there is also no enthusiasm to say, 'Okay, there are not enough women; we should actually try to increase that.' At least that was my perception. So, hopefully, this gave some sort of awareness that that is not the case—that you need to think about why there are so few women. And when I left, there were four female faculty in the department. So, this definitely brought the issue to the front.

<u>Decreased Isolation</u>

Besides asking about the goal of increasing the visibility of women, the interviewees were also asked about whether or not the grant had the intended effect of decreasing the isolation felt by female graduate students, faculty and post docs in their departments. One recipient noted that it did not particularly meet that objective:

I don't think it really addressed that goal, but what it did was bring women speakers in that were scientists, and I think it was very helpful to graduate students, female graduate students in this department, to see that women really are in academia, that they have done good work, that it isn't just male dominated, that there are plenty of women scientists from all parts of this field.

Another recipient, who is a graduate student, noted that she personally does not feel isolated in her department, but recognizes that female faculty may:

I feel like some of the diversity issues are maybe more prevalent at the faculty level. So, as a graduate student in my program, it's pretty evenly split, fifty percent men, fifty percent women. So, I don't feel any of sort of the old boy's club sentiment as a graduate student, but I know in talking to some of the female faculty they often talk about how it's hard to break in because there are so few female faculty in their department. And I guess I notice that in our department, but it's a different feeling on my side.

A female graduate student expressed the same sentiment:

I don't think we ever felt isolated. We had a lot of women in our lab. I don't know about other women in other labs. I mean, I'm sure it helped because we got together, and it was a woman speaker and woman asking questions of the speaker, so it was kind of a woman thing. But I never felt isolated, so I guess I can't comment on that.

Clearly, not everybody has the same feeling about feelings of isolation—people have different perceptions even though they may be in the same department. At the same time, if there are very few females in a department, students may not have the opportunity to talk with others "like them" or they may feel uncomfortable bring up particular topics if a female scientist is brought in to discuss her research only. One recipient used the funds to provide a venue for these conversations:

The students found it was very useful to be able to talk women's issues with women speakers, which is something that doesn't often come up. We thought we could do this as part of a new grant program. Whereas if we just have a random woman speaker, then maybe we would try to block out half an hour and make sure the women graduate students have a chance to talk to her. But they might not feel they could raise career development issues or family issues, not women's issues at all. They might not have felt they could raise them if the speaker had not come in tagged as 'this is a program to help do something about women.'

Lastly, some of the recipients noted that the effects of this grant program are yet to be seen. Sandra noted that the outcome of the grant program may be the program, itself:

It's not like you do something and then there's an immediate flowering of wonderfulness. But I think it's always good to have high profile distinguished women come in, and I think that's a really good thing. And then giving the women in the department a chance to interact, I think that's also a really good thing.

<u>Other Unintended Effects</u>

None of the grant recipients was able to identify any negative outcomes due to receiving the grant or funds. In general, all of the recipients noted the receiving of the grant was positively received by their colleagues and peers. Examples of positive responses include:

It was great because it wasn't onerous, you know; the money was put to good use, and it enabled you to do things that really were good things. The whole thing was good, I thought.

******

These types of program are not common but can make a big difference—real life examples lead to positive benefits. I am a big fan of the WISELI program.

******

I think I want to just reiterate that we really appreciate the WISELI grant, not only because they've allowed us to bring in amazing women scientists from all different fields and to hear about their career paths and have them contribute to our colloquium schedule… Just having the existence of the WISELI grant application sends the message that this is something that is important to our university and important to the STEM disciplines, and that the larger organizations that provide support for our programs are placing importance on these issues.

******

I think it was a really positive experience, and I think a lot of people enjoyed that we had the luxury to have more speakers come in because we had this grant support.

One positive yet unintended effect mentioned by the interviewees was that it provided graduate students with potential places to apply for faculty or post doc positions. Laura is convinced that the grant is responsible for a graduate student's current post doc position:

I thought it was great for her, and since she was planning it, it made sense. In fact, I think because of it, she got a very good post doc job.

A graduate student considered different places to work because of the funded program:

I actually kept the contacts and applied for faculty jobs. And one of the places hiring—we had invited the Dean out to speak. I think it was [University name]. She came out and gave a talk, and I wouldn't have thought of applying to that university if it weren't for her.

The presentations also provided students with different career options:

We got speakers from lots of diverse areas. One of the women had done some congressional work, and one of the women had done lots of industry work; so, there were sorts of jobs I had never thought of. It was fascinating, I thought. So, I really enjoyed it.

In general, the greatest effects seemed to have been felt by the graduate students who planned and attended the events:

The fact that graduate students were leaders, that was a positive thing. It was something that rose from the students and from the faculty who were involved in the planning. It wasn't something that was imposed upon the department in any way. So, when you have something like that, that usually always gets you a more positive outcome because that's something people want to do and want to have.

******

And the event for lunch or dinner was for graduate students who usually don't get invited to go for lunches or dinners with the seminar speakers and the colloquium speakers. So, that was a first thing. And that was a very good experience for all the people who went.

******

I went to them, and the student lunches were really nice. I felt like the women really opened up and talked about how it was to hold a major faculty position and to juggle life and everything that goes along with it…I think they were told that they should try to talk about those things, and be open to questions because it was really nice. Sometimes when we get other speakers in, they kind of shy away from that.

Conclusions

The Celebrating Women in Science & Engineering Grant Program offers funding that enables sponsors in the physical and biological sciences, and engineering to bring prominent women speakers to the University of Wisconsin-Madison campus. The program aims to expose students and faculty to accomplished women scientists and engineers and to advance women in science and engineering on the UW campus. While on campus, invited speakers are able to contribute to these aims in a variety of venues, including research talks, small-group discussions, and one-on-one meetings. Evaluations from the first seven years of the program indicate positive outcomes of the program and successful effects in supporting women in science and engineering, such as:

- Increasing the visibility of women in a variety of science and engineering disciplines;
- Inviting additional speakers to ongoing departmental symposia;
- Providing role models in departments and fields in which the number of females are low;
- Career options and potential faculty and post doc positions for current graduate students; and
- Leadership opportunities for graduate students who plan and attend the events.

Although the grant did not lead to additional sources of funding for the interviewees, they did feel that the program was worthwhile and that they would apply for future funds to plan similar events. Furthermore, there were no negative outcomes identified by any of the recipients, rather, only positive reactions to the recipients' ability to plan programs to benefit their departments and increase the visibility and need for greater representation of females in the sciences and engineering.

Appendix A: Required Evaluation Form

Name of Grant Recipient:
Title of Program:
Name of Speaker/s:
Date of Event/s:

Event/s Held:	**# Attendees**
Lecture	
Brown Bag Presentation	
Dinner	
Reception	
Other:	
Other:	
Other:	

1. Please provide a brief description of the program and all events held. Please include a description of the topics discussed at each event, the audience each event attracted (e.g., faculty, post docs, graduate students, etc.), and how the speaker/s interacted with those who attended the event/s.
2. Please describe your assessment of the reactions/responses of event attendees to the speaker and/or events held:
3. Please describe the ways in which the speaker and the events held helped to promote the participation and advancement of women in science and engineering.
4. What were the best aspects of the speaker/s visit?
5. If you had the chance to plan this program again, what would you have done differently? What could WISELI have done differently?

Appendix B: Typical Schedule for a "Celebrating Women" Guest Speaker

Guest Speaker: Dr. Kathy Spindler, University of Michigan Medical School

Sponsoring Department: Medical Microbiology & Immunology (MMI)

January 29
3:30 – Arrival
4:15 to 5:00 – Meet with Stacey Schultz-Cherry, Asst. Prof. of MMI
6:30 – Dinner with Stacy Schultz-Cherry & Paul Lambert, Prof. of Oncology

January 30
early – Breakfast with Dr. Bruce Klein, Prof. of Pediatrics, Internal Medicine, and MMI
9:00 to 9:30 – Meet with Robert Striker, Asst. Prof. of Medicine (Infectious Diseases Section) and MMI
9:45 to 10:15 – Meet with Laura Knoll, Asst. Prof. of MMI
10:30 – 11:00 – Meet with Christina Hull, Asst. Prof. of MMI and Biomolecular Chemistry
11:15 – 11:45 – Meet with Donna Paulnock, Prof. of MMI
11:45 – 1:00 – Research presentation to Journal Club in Microbial Pathogenesis and Host Responses (open seminar)
1:00 – 2:30 – Lunch with MMI graduate students and post-doctoral researchers
2:30 – 3:00 – Meet with Curtis Brandt, Prof. of MMI and Ophthalmology & Visual Sciences
3:15 – 3:45 – Meet with Rebecca Montgomery, Asst. Prof. of Biochemistry and Molecular Virology
4:00 – 4:30 – Meet with Paul Ahlquist, Prof. of Plant Pathology, Molecular Virology, and Oncology
4:45 – 5:15 – Meet with the Stacy Schultz-Cherry lab (1 post doc, 3 grad students)
6:30 – Dinner with Laura Knoll, Robert Striker, Rebecca Montgomery, and Stacey Schultz-Cherry

January 31
early – Breakfast with Rick Gourse, Prof. of Bacteriology
10:15 – Departure

Appendix C: Interview Protocol for Grant Proposal Writer

Part A: Did the grant increase visibility and decrease isolation in the department?

1) What were visibility and isolation for women like in your department before your receipt of the Celebrating Women in Science and Engineering Grant?

2) What were your primary reasons and secondary reasons (if there were any) for applying for the grant? Were these achieved?

3) Did the events hosted by your department through this grant change visibility and isolation for you on an individual level? If so, how?

4) Do visibility and isolation appear to have changed for other women? If so, how?

5) Has the degree to which you are satisfied with your department changed as a result of your participation in the grant program?

6) Are there other changes that have occurred or that are occurring now as a result of participating in this program?

7) Were there any negative consequences of the event your department put on?

Part B: Did the grant mobilize the department to invite additional women speakers?

8) Did your department match the funds provided by the Celebrating Women in Science and Engineering Grant?

9) Since using the Celebrating Women in Science and Engineering Grant, has your department applied for another?

10) Since using the Celebrating Women in Science and Engineering Grant, has your department funded more women speakers to speak within your department?

11) Has visibility been increased? If so, how? What was visibility like in your department before and after these visits?

12) Has isolation been decreased? If so, how? In what way did you feel isolated/do you suspect other women in your department feel isolated before and after these visits?

13) Were there any surprise consequences, good or bad, that resulted from visits by women speakers that have been planned by your department?

Part C: Overall Remarks

14) Are there any other remarks you would like to make relating to your department's Celebrating Women in Science and Engineering Grant event?