**Ally Training**

**Ohio State University**

**April 14, 2016**

Attendance

Twenty-two evaluations were completed.

* Fourteen (63.6%) participants identified as faculty members and eight (36.4%) as administrators.
* Two (9.1%) said a department chair encouraged them to attend the training, 15 (68.2%) said a dean, three (13.6%) said a colleague, seven (31.8%) said themselves, and three (13.6%) said and Advocate or an Ally.

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

**My knowledge of unconscious gender bias and its impact on the campus climate has increased after today's training.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Disagree | 1 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| 2.50 | 1 | 4.5 | 9.1 |
| Agree | 12 | 54.5 | 63.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 8 | 36.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 100.0 |  |

**I will be able to use the information that I learned today in my work.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Disagree | 1 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Agree | 9 | 40.9 | 45.5 |
| Strongly Agree | 12 | 54.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 100.0 |  |

**I will be able to implement new strategies to promote a more equitable climate for women faculty at my institution as a result of my participation in this training.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Disagree | 5 | 22.7 | 22.7 |
| Agree | 11 | 50.0 | 72.7 |
| Strongly Agree | 6 | 27.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 100.0 |  |

**The training was clear and well-organized.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Disagree | 2 | 9.1 | 9.1 |
| Agree | 14 | 63.6 | 72.7 |
| Strongly Agree | 6 | 27.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 100.0 |  |

**I would recommend this training to others.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Disagree | 2 | 9.1 | 9.1 |
| Agree | 6 | 27.3 | 36.4 |
| Strongly Agree | 14 | 63.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 100.0 |  |

**I am personally committed to addressing issues of gender bias and discrimination experienced by women faculty at my institution.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Agree | 1 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Strongly Agree | 21 | 95.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 100.0 |  |

**How would you rate the overall quality of this training?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|  | Average | 7 | 31.8 | 31.8 |
| Above Average | 12 | 54.5 | 86.4 |
| Excellent | 3 | 13.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 100.0 |  |

Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form

1. What questions do you still have about being an ally for gender equity after attending this training? Please list any areas of the training that you would like to receive additional information about or that need further clarification.

* More discussion of Eleven Actions. How to implement what was recommended
* Too much presentation on issues that I have already been aware of (implicit bias).
* There is a balance. If I accommodate female requirements (child care) am I treating them different or recognizing a cultural difference.
* More detailed statistical analysis of OSU data. Bar graphs are not convincing to this audience.
* How best to address gender equality issues. The presentation was more focused on data showing inequalities, not how to fix them.
* When does ally turn into patronizing?
* It would be useful to learn about (while maybe few) those situations of reverse bias.
* More statistically representative information for the most university and comparison to national trends.
* Where do allies go for support/guidance/advice?
* Strategies to detect and understand climate/culture issues in a department or organization. How to define what the issues are.
* What specifically do I need to do from this point?
* Specific, actionable items related to search committees, and retention. Strategies for responding to non-believers.
* More evidence/examples of gender inequity at OSU.

1. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the training you attended today?

* The discussion in small groups was surprisingly beneficial.
* Approach good. Include race and ethnic in data discussion or admit the numbers are not significant.
* Learning about bias in all aspects of academia. Understanding the bias may not be gender specific – men and women both have bias with respect to men and women.
* Seeing other OSU faculty participating!
* Exposure to resources for further training/implementation.
* Near the end of the ideas for specific actions to promote culture.
* List of actions.
* The implicit bias in letters of recommendation was eye-opening.
* Specific OSU data presented.
* Encouraging men to discuss this issue with other men.
* Discussion of attendees.
* Understand some aspects of bias related to gender in academia and society in general.
* Very valuable to “step back” and look at my own views/opinions with a more objective perspective.
* Listening to others experience in the context of the presentation.
* Meeting other allies.
* The conversations about why we are here and what we intend to accomplish.
* Evidence of gender bias🡪link to online rate my professor database.

1. What is one strategy you have learned today that you will be able to implement to promote a more equitable campus climate for women faculty?

* Reaching out to women to find informal settings that they enjoy. They may not want to “play around and golf” or “grab a beer.”
* Several helpful tips – redirecting discussions, reassessment of my own bias in letter writing, promoting balance.
* Listening, inquiring, including women faculty in all aspects of department activities.
* Be conscious of gender-biased terms.
* Ask women faculty at annual review at their perception of culture.
* Let women know I am an ally, not perfect, but an ally.
* See #11 [The implicit bias in letters of recommendation was eye-opening] and how we approach evaluation of job talks and interviews. Thank you!
* Watch evaluative terms in letters of recommendation for males versus females.
* Self-initiated leadership and advocacy, promote balance.
* Be more sensitive to how others are treated.
* Listen to and ask female faculty and graduate students on their experience.
* Examples of male privilege are very powerful.
* Make sure women faculty are heard at faculty meetings.
* Examine self-bias.
* Ask women about climate and then listen to the answer.
* Build cohort of allies.

1. How could this training be improved to be more beneficial to you?

* I enjoyed it; maybe having data disaggregated 1 more level would help engage a large audience.
* Language-use terms of African American, Latino, Native American, Indian, LGBTQ more often. Using URM can feel non-inclusive. It may imply the person’s identity does not count. The track record for racial diversity in Advance is questionable.
* Extended sessions with examples – perhaps videos of bias examples.
* More scenarios and discussions (group).
* More interaction.
* Needs to be longer, more than one day/seminar, follow-ups, professional development is a continuous process. Not one time action.
* Less eating and introduction time and more time spent on task.
* More discussion on strategies we can use to improve gender equality.
* More situation specific examples, cases, and/or role playing.
* Spend more time on discussions.
* More detailed information concerning gender inequality in the most institution, more time for discussion between participants.
* Smaller room and layout to aid communication.
* Take-home action plans.
* More small group discussion and a bit less on history.