Early Career Pathways
Corporate Program Meeting • April 10, 2019

Welcome & Opening Comments

Shelley Correll
Michelle Mercer and Bruce Golden Family Professor of Women’s Leadership
Director, Stanford VMware Women’s Leadership Innovation Lab
Welcome

Corporate Program Members
### Corporate Program Meetings 2014-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Keynote Speaker</th>
<th>Keynote Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Creating Inclusive Workplaces</td>
<td>Kenji Yoshino</td>
<td>New Frameworks for Workplace Inclusion: Uncovering Talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Creating Sustainable Change</td>
<td>Erin Kelly</td>
<td>A Framework for Organizational Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Debugging Meritocracy: Translating Research into Action</td>
<td>Emilio Castilla</td>
<td>The Meritocracy Paradox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>Debugging Meritocracy: Counterintuitive Solutions for Inclusion</td>
<td>Leslie Perlow</td>
<td>Thriving in Our 24-7, Global, Over Connected World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2016</td>
<td>Creating and Leveraging Change Agents</td>
<td>Sarah Soule</td>
<td>The Role of Social Movements in Accelerating Organizational Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>Beyond Bias Summit</td>
<td>Kathy Phillips</td>
<td>How Diversity Makes Us Smarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>Intersectional Leadership in the 21st Century</td>
<td>Ella Bell Smith</td>
<td>Intersectionality in the 21st Century Workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>Inclusive Leadership: Creating Cultures of Growth &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>Mary Murphy</td>
<td>Creating Growth Mindset Cultures at Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td>Inclusive Leadership: Diagnosing and Dismantling Masculinity Contest Culture in the Workplace</td>
<td>Jennifer Berdahl &amp; Peter Glick</td>
<td>Masculinity Contest Culture as the Root of Organizational Dysfunction and Misconduct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome

November 2017 Corporate Program Meeting: Intersectional Leadership

May 2018 Corporate Program Meeting: Organizational Mindset

November 2018 Corporate Program Meeting: Masculinity Contest Culture

Spring 2019 Corporate Program Meeting: Early Career Pathways

Welcome & Opening Comments

Sara Jordan-Bloch
Senior Research Scholar, Stanford VMware Women’s Leadership Innovation Lab
Defining Early Career

Early Career: A Working Definition

• The first five years of work after completing one’s highest degree (not including returning to the workforce after attaining a degree much later in life).

• Age is not perfectly correlated with one’s early career, but in general, early career individuals are ~22-30 years old.
We are talking about...

• More than “Millennials” and “Gen Z”.

• “Pathways”, not just “Pipelines”.
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We are talking about...

• More than “Millennials” and “Gen Z”.

• “Pathways”, not just “Pipelines”.

Who is in the Room?
You think about your first job fondly

You left your first job within the first five years of being there
You felt supported by your manager in your first job.

You were the only person of your gender or race on your team (or at your organization) in your first job.
You currently consider yourself in your early career

You currently manage someone in their early career
Diving a Little Deeper

Think about your early career...

• How would you describe this time?
• What, if any, opportunities did you have?
• What do you wish you had known then that you know now?

➢ Share with a neighbor at your table.
Goals of Today’s Meeting

Thank you, Kitchen Cabinet!

- Lori Barber, NetApp
- Amber Boyle, VMware
- Dawn Carter, Intuit
- Theodosia Cook, Dartmouth College
- Gloria Ho, NetApp
- Rene Kim, Charles Schwab
- Emily Kuo, Zynga
- Nicole Learn, Red Hat
- Krystal Martinez, Zynga
- Alison McMurray, Red Hat
- Kelly Nykodym, Sandia National Lab
- Mary O’Hara, Blue Shield of California
- Camila Ribeiro, AB InBev
- Meg Rodriguez, Lawrence Berkeley National Lab
- Larissa Shapiro, Mozilla
- Rebecca Siegel, PayPal
- Adina Sterling, Stanford University
- Alexis Yee-Garcia, Morrison & Foerster LLP
Keynote Address & Workshop

Adina Sterling
Assistant Professor of Organizational Behavior
Graduate School of Business
Stanford University

View Adina Sterling’s slides at http://tinyurl.com/EarlyCareerPathways
(must have an updated browser to view)

Lunch
We will resume at 12:50 PM
Introduction

Shannon Gilmartin
Senior Research Scholar, Stanford VMware Women's Leadership Innovation Lab

Program Artist

Abísola Kusimo
Mechanical Engineering, Ph.D. Candidate
Stanford University
Research Talk

Shannon Gilmartin

Senior Research Scholar, Stanford VMware Women’s Leadership Innovation Lab

What do early career pathways really look like?

An Early Career Pathway Analysis at “Tech Inc.”
Tech Inc.: Setting the stage

• A collaboration with the Women’s Leadership Lab to identify software engineering workforce patterns across a 5-year period (2013-2017) and design new approaches to D&I efforts.

• Recent launch of a new hire/early career program.

• Sizable growth in their software engineering workforce overall – doubled over a 5 year period.

Tech Inc.: Setting the stage

• For this presentation, we are focusing on all new hires in 2013 into Tech Inc.’s largest job rank in software engineering: “Individual Contributor Entry Level”.

• We call this group the “New Hire Cohort of 2013”.

• Who composes this Cohort, and where are they 5 years later?
Tech Inc.: Setting the stage

We will be analyzing early career patterns for 6 groups based on their self-reported gender and race/ethnicity:

1. URM women
2. URM men
3. Asian women
4. Asian men
5. White women
6. White men

URM: Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Minority (American Indian/Alaska Native, Black/African American, Latino/a/Hispanic, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander)

New Hire Cohort of 2013: Who was hired?

White Men

55
42%
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New Hire Cohort of 2013: Who was hired?

- **Asian Women**: 13 (10%)
- **White Women**: 8 (6%)
- **URM Women**: 0%
- **Asian Men**: 51 (39%)
- **White Men**: 55 (42%)

Comparison with the national picture:

- **Women**: 16% at Tech Inc., 18% nationally
- **Asian Men**: 39%
- **White Men**: 56%
- **URM Men**: 18%
- **Asian Women**: 2%
- **White Women**: 10%
- **URM Women**: 6%
**Comparison with the national picture**

**TECH INC. NEW HIRE COHORT 2013**

Tech Inc.:

In the New Hire Cohort, **Asian men** were overrepresented fivefold.

**ALL COMPUTING BACHELOR’S DEGREE EARNERS 2013**

Source: Corbett & Hill, 2015

---

**Comparison with the national picture**

**TECH INC. NEW HIRE COHORT 2013**

Tech Inc.:

In the New Hire Cohort, **URM men** were underrepresented nine fold.

**ALL COMPUTING BACHELOR’S DEGREE EARNERS 2013**

Source: Corbett & Hill, 2015

---
Comparison with the national picture

Among all degree earners, 6% were URM women, but no URM women were part of the New Hire Cohort at Tech Inc.

Source: Corbett & Hill, 2015

Early career pathways in Tech Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>% Promoted</th>
<th>% Attrited</th>
<th>% Sticky Floor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URM Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Women</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Women</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM Men</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Men</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Men</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percents do not sum to 100% because of individuals who moved to other areas of the organization outside SWE (i.e. R&D) over the five years. 12% of Asian men made such a move, and 2% of white men did.
Promotion by end of five years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>% Promoted</th>
<th>% Attrited</th>
<th>% Sticky Floor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URM Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Women</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Women</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM Men</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Men</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Men</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percents do not sum to 100% because of individuals who moved to other areas of the organization outside SWE (i.e. R&D) over the five years. 12% of Asian men made such a move, and 2% of white men did.

Attrition by end of five years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>% Promoted</th>
<th>% Attrited</th>
<th>% Sticky Floor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URM Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Women</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Women</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM Men</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Men</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Men</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### “Sticky floor” (same position) by end of five years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>% Promoted</th>
<th>% Attrited</th>
<th>% Sticky Floor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URM Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Women</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Women</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM Men</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Men</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Men</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percents do not sum to 100% because of individuals who moved to other areas of the organization outside SWE (i.e. R&D) over the five years. 12% of Asian men made such a move, and 2% of white men did.

### Early career pathways in Tech Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>% Promoted</th>
<th>% Attrited</th>
<th>% Sticky Floor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URM Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Women</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Women</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM Men</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Men¹</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Men¹</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percents do not sum to 100% because of individuals who moved to other areas of the organization outside SWE (i.e. R&D) over the five years. 12% of Asian men made such a move, and 2% of white men did.
Early career pathways in Tech Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>% Promoted</th>
<th>% Attrited</th>
<th>% Sticky Floor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URM Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Women</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Women</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM Men</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Men¹</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Men¹</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percents do not sum to 100% because of individuals who moved to other areas of the organization outside SWE (i.e. R&D) over the five years. 12% of Asian men made such a move, and 2% of white men did.

Early careers in real time

• Even within a short time, careers begin to diverge along lines of race and gender.
• At Tech Inc., white women were less likely to get in the door than were Asian women, but when they did, white women were more likely to advance than were Asian women.
• URM women and men rarely made it in the door at all.
Early careers in real time

• What meaning can we make of these trends?
• Which questions do they leave for us?
• How can researchers and practitioners together start to solve these very real early career differences?
what’s going on?

my own journey
What makes me interested in who becomes an engineer?

Engineering Enables Many Possibilities

https://www.census.gov/dataviz/visualizations/stem/stem-html/
WORKING IN ENGINEERING OCCUPATIONS

In 2015:

14.5% of those working in Engineering Occupations in the U.S were women.

Working in Mechanical Engineering it is even lower: 8.6%.

© Stanford University 2019. All Rights Reserved.

Percentage of women by highest degree, 2000-2013

© Stanford University 2019. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 1-5 Percentage of women by highest degree in engineering, 2000–2013. Sources: IPEDS Completion Survey 2000–2013, NSF Survey of Earned Doctorates 2000–2012.
**Academic-Industry** Partnerships in Support of Early Career Success

- What might overarching goals be of such partnerships?
  - Better support “the transition.”
  - Help individuals better prepare for their future roles.
  - Help individuals find greater “coherency” and “clarity.”

- How are School and Workforce Worlds different? How are they the same?
- What are the pro’s and con’s of such partnerships?

---

**Take a minute to jot down...**

- The ways in which your organization partners with the academy?
- Who in your organization is involved?
- How does this work get recognized?
- What are some of your most pressing questions that you would like to ask “the academy”? 

---

© Stanford University 2019. All Rights Reserved.
Types of Academic-Industry Partnerships

• **Type 1**: People Exchanges (beyond recruiting).

• **Type 2**: Knowledge Exchanges.

• **Type 3**: Knowledge Co-creation.

Type 1: People Exchanges (beyond recruiting)

Motivated by students being curious about...

**What professional work looks like.**

“What are the processes that real firms use to get work done?”

“Is a particular company a good fit for me?”

(tied #2 goals)
Type 1: People Exchanges (beyond recruiting)

Students are uncertain about...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction of plans</th>
<th>Type of organization to work for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43.8% have cross-field plans.</td>
<td>3:4 are uncertain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(APPLES, NBER Chapter, 2018) (EMS, Schadl, ASEE 2017)

Type 1: People Exchanges (beyond recruiting)

Students have lots of questions...

How to find my path when I’m “the only one” and my journey doesn’t look like anybody else’s that I know? How can I turn this situation in my strength?

How do you respond to male coworkers/colleagues who question your ability? How do you move past this?

Is it a good idea to switch jobs on regular basis to work your way up the ladder?

(Engr311a: 2018 & 2019)
Type 1: People Exchanges (beyond recruiting)

Examples of Exchanges

Industry Guest Speakers
- Technical (ME309: Finite Elements)
- Personal (Engr311a: Women's Perspectives)
- Organizational (Engr117/217: Expanding Engineering Limits—Culture, Diversity and Equity)
- Student Organizations (e.g., SWE)

Sponsoring “capstone” projects: Nature of the work, exposure to professionals.

Sponsoring student organizations.

Offering Fieldtrips, Serving on Advisory Boards, Internship Programs.

*Takes relationship building. May be different University-to-University.*

What is your organization already doing on this front?
What other ideas do you have to offer?
Types of Academic-Industry Partnerships

• **Type 1:** People Exchanges (beyond recruiting)

• **Type 2:** Knowledge Exchanges
  - Student Perspective.
  - Early Career Professional Perspective.

• **Type 3:** Knowledge Co-creation

**What motivates students to enter a field?**

**TOP:** Intrinsic (Psychological & Behavior*), Social Good.

**MEDIUM:** Financial.

**LOW:** Mentor & Parent Influence.

* Only motivator where women were lower than men.
Type 2: Knowledge Exchanges—student perspective

What factors are important to students in considering a company?

What are things you would want to know about an organization before deciding to work for them full-time?

62% said the work environment.

50% said the organization.

• Next are benefits & growth.

• Last were (surprisingly) job details.

© Stanford University 2019. All Rights Reserved.

Ford pre-intern survey 2018

Type 2: Knowledge Exchanges=student perspective

How prepared are students for career seeking?

• Career exploration skills (confidence)
  • Skills related to exploring different types of jobs.
  • The process of determining career options / interests.

• Job acquisition skills (confidence)
  • Skills needed to apply for a job and obtain a job offer (e.g., job searching, resume building, interviewing).

• Job performance skills (confidence)
  • Skills needed “on the job”.
  • Both technical and professional skills.

© Stanford University 2019. All Rights Reserved.

NSF PEPS Project (2018)
What factors contribute to career-seeking confidence?

Type 2: Knowledge Exchanges=student perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Career Exploration Skills</th>
<th>Job Acquisition Skills</th>
<th>Job Performance Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female (vs. Male)</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM (vs. non-URM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income Level</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Career Exploration Skills</th>
<th>Job Acquisition Skills</th>
<th>Job Performance Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes Covered Career Options / Skills in Eng.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Intern / Co-op</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Implications on knowing more about students?

for industry—and at various levels for the academy—and in various departments
Type 2: Knowledge Exchanges—early career professional perspective

What is the engineering work of these early career professionals like?

“Dimensions” present in Innovation Incidents of 35 Early-Career Engineers

- Action: 33%
- Social: 33%
- Cognitive: 16%
- Contextual: 10%
- Emotional: 8%

(PATHS, Klenk, Bjorklund, ASEE 2018)

Where do early career professionals learn key skills (particularly the social dimension)?

We identified top 5 Technical Knowledge & Skills, and Professional Skills

- Problem Solving (+81)
- Content Knowledge (+63)
- Modeling & Analysis (+46)
- Project Management Skills (+21)
- Time Management (+50)

- Communication Skills (+50)
- Information Finding Skills (+60)
- Equipment/Processes (+92)
- Organizational Skills (+100)
- Work Ethic (+100)

Learned Mainly In School
Learned Mainly On the Job
Learned Both

(Brunhaver, Korte, NBER, 2018)

© Stanford University 2019. All Rights Reserved.
Who is important in supporting them?

Early Career Engineers who perceive their Supervisor and Co-Workers as being supportive, are more likely to identify their work environment as being innovative.

Examples of supportive behavior:
- Receptive & Encouraging
- Supporting & Helping
- Providing Autonomy & Responsibility (supervisor)
- Organized Collaboration (co-workers)

(Furthermore, Nadya Fouad, in “Stemming the Tide” found that “Women engineers who had supportive co-workers and supervisors were least likely to consider leaving their organizations.”)

Implications on knowing more about early career professionals?

for industry
for the academy
Types of Academic-Industry Partnerships

• **Type 1:** People Exchanges (beyond recruiting)

• **Type 2:** Knowledge Exchanges

• **Type 3:** Knowledge Co-creation
  - Stanford VMware Women’s Leadership Innovation Lab Corporate Program.
  - Tech Inc. Study.
  - GM-WTO Collaboration in the 2000’s.

Type 3: Knowledge Co-Creation

The Internship Experience at Ford Motor Company...

- Pre-post Internship Surveys (2017, 2018)
- Post Internship Interviews (2017)
- Supervisor and HR Interviews (on-going)

“Exploring How Engineering Internships and Undergraduate Research Experiences Inform and Influence College Students’ Career Decisions and Future Plans.”


“A Mixed Methods Approach to Understanding How Colleges, Universities, and Employers Prepare and Support Undergraduates in Engineering Internships.”

The Internship Experience at Ford Motor Company is a joint investigation of their product development internship program to figure out:

• What is working (and what isn’t)  • How to make improvements

**Why did you accept this Internship Offer? (pre-survey 2018)**

Contextual & Environmental Factors seem more important to incoming women Product Development Interns, than incoming men.

**Would you accept a full-time offer? (pre-survey 2018)**

Large imbalance in response of women and men. Major work-assignment differences between those who would accept an offer, and those who would not.

---

Type 3: Knowledge Co-Creation

The Internship Experience at Ford Motor Company...

- Pre-post Internship Surveys (2017, 2018)
- Post Internship Interviews (2017)
- **Supervisor and HR Interviews to make findings useful (on-going)**
- **New FIE Conference Paper in preparation**

© Stanford University 2019. All Rights Reserved.
Academic-Industry Partnerships in Support of Early Career Success

• Motivated by students being curious about professional work.
• Students have a lot of questions.
• What motivates students to enter a field?
• What factors are important to students in considering a company?
• How prepared are students for career seeking?
• What factors contribute to career-seeking confidence?
• What is the engineering work of these early career professionals like?
• Where do early career professionals learn key skills (particularly the social dimension)?
• Who is important in supporting them?

AND MANY OTHER POSSIBLE QUESTIONS FOR EXPLORATION
Thinking about partnerships to support **early career success**. . .

**Diagnostic:**
- What are the current ways in which your organization partners with the academy around the early career?
- Who in your organization is involved?
- How does this work get recognized?

**Looking Ahead:**
- What are some of your most pressing questions that you would like to ask “the academy” about the early career?
- Which kinds of **future** partnerships would help to address these questions?
- How might you go about creating these partnerships?

---

**Break**

We will resume at 2:30 PM
Practitioner Panel

Panelists

Dawn Carter
Intuit Inc.

Rene Kim
Charles Schwab

Isaura Gaeta
Intel Corp.

Dereca Blackmon
Stanford University

Moderated by

Caroline Simard
Stanford VMware Women’s Leadership Innovation Lab

Q&A
Wrap-Up & Look Ahead

CORPORATE PROGRAM MEETING TAKEAWAYS: EARLY CAREER PATHWAYS

CRITICAL THEMES IN THE EARLY CAREER

- Recruitment & Hiring
- Internships
- Onboarding
- Task Assignment
- Career Management & Professional Development
- Promotion & the "Sticky Floor"
- Retention
- Workplace Culture

Insight
What is one new idea you had today? How will you keep exploring this idea?

Action
What is one new action you want to take after today? What will be your first step?

Prep:
- Reflect on the whole day and all you have learned. Sort ideas, and share with others.
- Capture your reflections in two areas: one new insight and one new action.
- Share with your neighbor at your table.
Program Artist

Abísola Kusimo
Mechanical Engineering, Ph.D. Candidate
Stanford University

One Word
Thank you for joining us!

Please complete the meeting survey in the meeting folder.

Keep in Touch

Twitter: @SVLeadershipLab

Website: womensleadership.stanford.edu