Attendance

- Eighty five individuals attended and 65 completed evaluations.
  - Five (7.7%) reported being staff, 50 (76.9%) faculty, six (9.2%) as administrators, and two (3.1%) as students.

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

**My understanding of stereotype threat has increased as a result of attending this lecture.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**My understanding of ways in which we activate and ameliorate stereotype threat in our undergraduate classrooms has increased as a result of attending this lecture.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I will be able to implement new strategies to assess student learning in light of readily activated stereotype threat as a result my participation in this lecture.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I would recommend this lecture to others**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form

1. What questions do you still have after attending this lecture? Please list any areas and/or topics that you would like to receive additional information about or that need further clarification.
   - How do you approach stereotype threats coming from the students in a class?
   - It doesn’t appear that there is empirical proof that any of the listed suggestions impact ST [stereotype threat]. The only empirical evidence is that UCB & NDSU re: values statements. What about non-STEM? So is there one thing we can do? Really no proof.
   - How do you motivate girls to enroll for engineering?
   - Is there any data for chemistry? As a chemistry faculty I would be very interested in knowing about this aspect.
   - Impact of FORWARD grant on student perceptions.
   - Since most of the presenters were female, perhaps their students at Colorado had males as instructors.
   - Wasn’t clear on ideas – “How to decrease stereotype issues in classroom.” Also, wasn’t sure how to use affirm value and how these affect/influence student learning.
   - Did not understand what the problem was at NDSU with respect to gender, understood other issues.
   - Any other suggestions for instructor implementation other than small group and random calling.
   - How do you deal with classes where men are in the minority?
   - Nitty-gritty about UC Boulder study ‘drive-by’ wasn’t enough.
   - Does your study refute the Boulder study? If so, what next? Is stereotype threat a myth?
   - Wondering how this plays out outside STEM.
   - The idea of stereotype threat is interesting. I am a little concerned w/ your statements about the NDSU situation based on your research. I would seriously question there not being an achievement gap in ND (NDSU being part of it).
   - Great job!
   - STEM vs. AHSS courses/content.
   - I would like to learn more. I missed the beginning due to a time conflict.
   - Are there stereotypes that are present that you are not considering? i.e. new stereotypes.
   - More suggestions for strategies in the classroom.
   - Give us more concrete strategies.
   - Still unclear about whether this is even a problem at NDSU, and if so what I should do about it.

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the lecture you attended today?
   - Reinforced group discussions, group projects can also help ameliorate gender threats.
   - The data.
   - The section about how we commonly activate stereotype threat in our classes without even knowing about it.
   - Energetic presentation.
   - How to avoid stereotyping.
   - The discussion.
   - Giving an idea to faculty about an aspect that we do not give a great deal of thought about.
   - Concrete activity I could use in class.
   - How to ameliorate stereotype threat.
   - Try a little harder to make sure I don’t stereotype.
   - Thoughtful reflection on what might make us a “different” campus than UCB.
   - Discussion of strategies to avoid stereotype threat in larger classes.
   - Exercise to reduce threat by getting focus on student values.
   - Just making me think about the issue.
   - Gained new idea: stereotype threat.
   - Identifying stereotype threat that is intentional.
   - Understanding the UC Boulder study.
   - Conversation at table.
   - The small group discussion.
   - Considering stereotypes I had not thought of.
   - Interaction.
   - Introduction to the idea of stereotyping in classrooms.
3. What is one thing you will do differently as a result of attending this lecture?
   - Random calling.
   - Attend to ways I might interject bias.
   - Think about how what I say in class is activating stereotypes.
   - No name calling or show any gender bias.
   - I would be interested in collecting some gender-based data on our program, evaluating department environment, teacher attitude, student club experience, etc. on their attitude.
   - Not be so overt about addressing difference.
   - Have a more interactive class.
   - Be mindful to avoid activating urban/rural stereotype threat.
   - Try to organize small groups better and try to ask more questions without placing values on the answers.
   - Be more conscious of instruction techniques.
   - Be aware stereotype threat.
   - There’s no achievement gap here, according to the study, so there’s no need to do anything different, right?
   - Try to make more of an effort to learn my students’ names.
   - I’ll be increasingly careful about data.
   - Rethink conversations about race, class, and gender.
   - Be more sensitive to diversity in my classes.
   - Be more conscientious of teaching strategies.

4. How could the FORWARD lecture series be improved to be more beneficial to you? What recommendations do you have for future lectures?
   - Similar lectures – including creating enthusiasm among students.
   - Academic dishonesty and disruptive behavior in classes. How to build good rapport with student, provide them a sense of accomplishment and preparation for life after University.
   - More often.
   - You are already doing a nice job, keep it up!
   - Good as is!
   - How to deal with discrimination in Departments based on national background in combination with gender.
   - Don’t require questions to go to microphone – may discourage some from asking questions.
   - More evidence based bet practices.

5. Please provide any additional comments you have about today’s lecture and/or the FORWARD program in general below or on the back of this page.
   - Please use sexual orientation or gay – instead of “homosexual” in your studies.
   - I enjoyed learning from those at my table.
   - If the last speaker can expand on his presentation that would be a great topic many of us would be interested in.
   - Very interesting work.
   - Have your speakers/panelists use the microphone as well.
   - Data? Is there benefit to stereotyping?
   - Perhaps that perceived difficulty and rigor of physics eliminates those not prepared for the subject, thus reducing the learning gap? I’m not sure the UC study was accurate as the ‘control’ group was not really a control but a ‘negative affirmation group’.
   - Great topic to research and discuss.
   - What do you do with the answers to 7-10? Is it summarized/ presented somewhere?