

## **Title of Project:** Improving Organizational Climate & Culture of Two Departments

### **1. Briefly describe the project for which you are seeking funds:**

We are requesting funds to design and implement organizational culture and needs assessments in two departments. The purpose for two very different departments (e.g., Mechanical Engineering and English) is to examine whether and how our intervention works (or struggles) given diverse concerns noted in the SCSWF Priorities Survey, to inform the design of a successful program that can be replicated across the university. Additionally, the one department can serve as a control group for the other, offering an opportunity for research comparisons that provides data to seed future grants. The assessments will provide necessary detail for developing an intervention that targets issues impacting the overall culture, attitudes of faculty (TT and NTT), staff, and students, and an evaluation for determining future improvements and necessary follow-up actions. The funds will support culture assessment and intervention, skills-based communication training, follow-up coaching, and evaluation.

The SCSWF Priorities Survey identified six general categories of topics and asked respondents to rate them from lowest priority to highest priority in improving CSU for faculty, specifically female faculty. We have identified two high priority concerns that can be addressed without restructuring the current pay system or personnel leave policies: (1) climate/culture of lack of accountability and (2) overall climate/culture issues associated with gender. Based on comments provided by 601/1050 respondents, Byrne and Slade have identified at least two areas for intervention including a lack of interpersonal and institutional accountability and communication.

### **2. How does your project advance the President's goal of making CSU the best place for women to work and learn?**

We offer a starting project that can advance the goals by addressing initial issues identified in a campus-wide survey with a 57% response rate (considered very good!) using an empirically supported evidence-based application of scientific principles on culture change, and that incorporates opportunities for improvement and scalability. In addition, the project will obtain research-quality data that provides pilot-data for future grant applications (e.g., NSF Advance program), supporting the scalability of the project and opportunities for improvement. Moreover, by implementing a department-wide culture intervention, the likelihood of the project being successful is greater as all members of the department are exposed to the same change event and held accountable for behavioral change by their peers who now have the skills to hold them accountable and to promote and maintain a psychologically safe environment.

### **3. Described planned project activities including a project timeline.**

Entire project: 6-9 months

Time 1: A baseline assessment of both departments would be taken to capture the cultural components pre-intervention. In addition, readiness-for-change will be assessed to evaluate anticipated resistance.

Time2: Recruit two departments and form a steering committee.

Time 3: Based on the initial SCSWF Survey data we will provide training on:

- Managing challenging conversations as defined by high stakes issues, strong emotions, and opposing opinions in academic settings, and for holding other people accountable for commitments, violations of social norms, disrespectful language and behavior, and communications generally considered inappropriate.
- Coach key and influential individuals within the departments.

- Skill development in persuasion, negotiation, mediation, self-leadership, and team skills in individualistic environments.

Time 4: A post-intervention assessment to evaluate immediate impact of change, unresolved challenges, and assess research-based constructs.

Time 5: Follow-up sessions 2-3 months afterwards. Post-intervention assessment for comparison across the departments to identify meaningful differences that may impact scalability.

**4. Describe specifically how the requested funds will be expended. Attach a short budget summary at the end of the proposal.**

See below

**5. How did you identify the need for this project?**

We reviewed data from the SCSWF Priorities Survey, which clearly indicates a need for an intervention to address numerous concerns raised by of 601 respondents from a survey, which was sent to 1,050 faculty members. That is a 57% response rate, and majority of the surveys were completed and returned within two days! This is further evidence of the need for some action to be taken to address these issues on campus. Colleagues on campus have interviewed the university President, Provost, Vice Provost, COO, etc. They all agree that now is the time to address the issues identified the survey.

**6. Who will be involved in the implementation of the project? Does the success of your proposed project require involvement or support of any person or division/department?**

The proposed proposal will require involvement and support from a number of individuals and divisions/departments. These may include, but are limited to the head of the mechanical engineering department and the head/chair of the second department, the dean of the engineering college and dean of the second college. Dr. Frank, members of his cabinet, key faculty members, student leaders, other advisors brought in as needed, and finally rank and file faculty, especially female faculty.

**7. How will we know the project is successful? Are there any measures of success you would propose?**

We would propose many measures of success, and key project indicators. These will include a pre-assessment survey of all faculty, students, and administrators from the recruited departments. Additionally, we will measure participant satisfaction with the intervention once completed. We will also measure the overall success once the project is completed. Assessments will be made using a variety of methods, including surveys, observations, and interviews. Surveys will be administered online and maintain anonymity and confidentiality. Finally, a follow-up survey will be offered at eighteen months following the completion of the program to ensure long-term success. All research data will be obtained with IRB approval.

Other ideas we may wish to include would involve numerous individual raters completing confidential, online surveys. These surveys may be completed on any individual who would be offered professional coaching, and would be administered before the first session, and following the completion of the coaching relationship.

## **Budget Summary (Examples of types of expenses)**

<b>Salaries</b>	Approximately \$35,000
<b>Fringe Benefits</b>	Parking pass for Slade
<b>Stipends</b>	7 month GRA (10hr/week, includes fringe but not tuition): \$6000
<b>Supplies</b>	Approximately \$900 for miscellaneous supplies for workshops (books, paper, handouts)
<b>Printing Costs</b>	N/A
<b>Distribution Costs</b>	N/A
<b>Travel</b>	Approximately \$200 mileage expenses for consultants
<b>Training Costs</b>	Included in salaries and supplies
<b>Evaluation Materials</b>	Approximately \$1500 (360 degree feedback forms)
<b>Equipment Rentals</b>	N/A
<b>Food/Drinks</b>	Approximately \$500 for training sessions
<b>Other</b>	N/A
<b>Total Estimated Costs</b>	<b>\$44,100</b>