

Resource Equity at Case Western Reserve University:

Results of Faculty Focus Groups

CWRU Equity Study Committee

3 March 2003

Committee members:

Diana Bilimoria, Organizational Behavior

Patricia Higgins, Nursing

Eleanor Stoller, Sociology

Cyrus Taylor, Physics

Contact person:

Patricia Higgins, pxg3@po.cwru.edu

(216) 368-8850

Introduction.....	4
Study Design and Data Collection.....	7
Results.....	13
Faculty Careers are Gendered	13
The Nature of Research Universities:	14
Numerical Under-representation and Token Dynamics	14
Lack of Women Faculty at all Levels.....	14
Token Dynamics.....	15
Everything is Negotiable	17
Side Deals.....	17
Negotiations of Options at Hire.....	17
Unequal application of rules, procedures, and practices.....	19
Shifting Sands.....	20
Issues of Mentoring and Professional Development	20
Inadequate Socialization.....	20
Role Expectations of Senior Women Faculty.....	21
The Experience of Senior Women Faculty As Mentors.....	22
Hierarchical, Elitist Structure	22
Rank Privilege.....	23
Too Few Women in Top Academic and Administrative Positions.....	23
Interaction of Rank and Gender.....	25
Interlocking Inequalities: The Interaction of Gender with Race, Sexual Orientation, and Socioeconomic Status.....	25
Experience of Faculty Differentiated by Gender	26
Women Faculty’s Formal and Informal Interactions.....	27
Everyday, Routine Procedures that Are Detrimental to Women’s Experiences.....	31
CWRU Culture Experienced as Exclusionary Towards Women	31
Unwelcoming Community for Women.....	32
Marginalizing and Discounting of Women.....	33
Invisible and Backstage Work.....	34
A Double Standard For Male and Female Faculty.....	35
Women Constantly Seen as Falling Short.....	36
Structural/Organizational Issues	37
Dimensions of Inequality: Unfair/Unequal Access to/Allocation of Resources	38
Work/Family Integration	40
Outcomes	44
Everyday Experience.....	44
Leaky Pipeline.....	45
Resource Inequities.....	46
Solutions Suggested by Focus Group Participants	47
Individual-Level Solutions.....	48
System-Level Solutions.....	48
Positive Comments	50
Recommendations.....	52

Appendix 1. CWRU Equity Study Committee Charge	56
Appendix 2. CWRU IRB Application: CWRU Gender Equity Study	56
Appendix 3. CWRU IRB Application: Summary of the Study	59
Appendix 4. CWRU IRB Application: Draft Letter to prospective participants.....	63
Appendix 5. CWRU IRB Application: Informed Consent form	64
Appendix 6. Demographic Information Card	66
Appendix 7. Selected Demographics for all Contacts	67
Appendix 8. Schedule for Focus Group Meetings.....	70
Appendix 9. Sample Introductory Script for Focus Group Moderators	72
Appendix 10. Focus Group Note Card Data.....	74
Appendix 11. Descriptive Codes for scoring focus group transcripts	76

Introduction

Resource Equity Study

The Resource Equity Study committee was commissioned by the University Provost at the recommendation of the Faculty Senate and convened in January, 2000. Its charge was to design and implement a study to investigate the academic resources available to faculty on the CWRU campus. Committee members include Diana Bilimoria (Organizational Behavior), Patricia Higgins (Nursing), Eleanor Stoller (Sociology), and Cyrus Taylor (Physics). Sara Debanne (Epidemiology and Biostatistics) served on the committee from its inception until December 2002. Two other members participated in the early stages of the committee work: Joyce Jentoff (Office of the Provost) and Katherine Wisner (Medicine).

The committee used several approaches in the preparation and implementation of the study. For example, committee members met with Nancy Hopkins, who conducted a similar study at MIT; they familiarized themselves with CWRU documents and findings from other academic institutions; and they conducted extensive, multiple rounds of discussion that determined the study's direction and scope, a conceptual framework, and its design and methodology. The committee also developed goals and objectives, which were incorporated into a formal statement of intent and accepted by the President and Provost as the Charge for the committee:

Case Western Reserve University seeks to foster the full development, professional advancement and recognition of all members of our community.

The CWRU Equity Study Committee will develop and implement methodologies for determining the extent to which these goals are realized, and perceived to be realized. These methodologies and studies will address issues of resources, including salary as well as other factors such as teaching assignments, space allocations and other environmental resources. The Committee's studies will also address other issues of faculty structure, welfare and effectiveness such as professional activity, community service, diversity, recruitment and retention.

While particular emphasis will be given to issues of possible gender bias at the faculty level, it is expected that the methodologies and studies can be used as the basis for the analysis of other diversity issues on campus.

In order to maximize the utility of the Committee's work, the CWRU Equity Study Committee will report to the President, the Provost, the President's Advisory Council on Women in the University, and the Faculty Senate, and will consult with other bodies as appropriate.

Thus the Committee has undertaken a two-part investigation of the resources available to faculty on the CWRU campus. The first part of the study (A) involved focus group interviews with faculty concerning their perceptions of (1) the distribution of departmental and university resources by gender and (2) barriers, both formal and informal, that faculty encounter in their careers. The second part (B) will analyze quantitative data, such as salary data, informed by the findings of the first part of the study.

The following preliminary report provides the findings from Part A. It includes a discussion of the methodology of the study, results, and conclusions and recommendations.

Because of the sensitive nature of the subject matter, we have gone to great lengths to maintain the confidentiality of the focus group participants. Since these procedures may be of interest to other groups seeking to conduct similar studies, we include our application for IRB approval (which defines the design of the study in great detail) as well as our detailed schedules and scripts for the conduct of individual focus groups.

In all, 47 people participated in six focus groups: two focus groups composed of Senior Women Faculty, one of Junior Women Faculty, one of Male Faculty, one of Mixed-rank and Mixed-gender, and one composed of Chairs and Administrators. The

result was approximately 9 hours of tapes, yielding 179 closely-spaced pages of transcribed text.

We have analyzed the focus group transcriptions by first reading them to identify distinct comments, used these to construct a keyword list and categories, then used these to code the text. The process was iterated several times until the list of categories appeared to be complete. Our results are organized in terms of the categories that we identified. Within categories, we quote typical comments, seeking to allow the focus group participants to speak for themselves, but more concisely and less redundantly than in the raw focus group transcripts.

The results reflect a wide diversity of experience and opinion, but all describe an institution with great promise but also enormous challenges if it is to live up to the goal of fostering “the full development, professional advancement and recognition of all members of our community.”

One final note may be of importance. The focus groups reported on here took place in late spring 2000. The time that has passed is reflective of the enormous work that has gone into the analysis of the data reported here. But in that time, CWRU has gone through many major changes, including a variety of positive changes in the some of the areas discussed in this report. While the University can take pride in the many accomplishments in this time, this cannot be the basis for complacency in addressing the deep-rooted challenges identified in this report.

Study Design and Data Collection

In this section we review the study design and the process of data collection. We pay close attention to the process by which the study was designed and conducted, including as Appendices key documents that, beyond their immediate importance for this study, can serve as templates for future, related studies.

As noted in the introduction, much of the first year of the Committee's work was spent reviewing previous work at CWRU, work elsewhere, and defining the scope and goals of the Committee's work. This culminated first in the preparation of the Committee's Charge (Appendix 1.)

The Committee then defined a two-part investigation. Part 1, presented in this report, involves focus group interviews with faculty concerning their experience and perceptions of resource-related issues at CWRU. Part 2, which will be presented in a later report, will analyze quantitative data such as salary information.

While the second part initially seemed to some members to be relatively straightforward, it gradually became clear that a qualitative study really needed to come first, both as a means for understanding the general environment at CWRU as well as for identifying specific issues for further, quantitative investigation. Experience elsewhere, such as at MIT, certainly provides support for this approach.

As the Committee began work along these lines, it became clear that no institution had attempted as comprehensive a study as presented here. (The MIT study, for example, was effectively confined to senior women faculty in the natural sciences.) We thus recognized that the present work should be of interest as a model beyond CWRU.

The Committee also recognized at an early stage that, because of the potentially sensitive nature of the inquiry, it is essential that participants in the study feel free to express their thoughts without fear of retribution. Ensuring confidentiality of the participants was thus of critical importance in the design of the study.

The design of the study was formally defined in the documents we submitted for IRB (Institutional Review Board) approval of this study as human subjects research. The IRB approval process provided oversight of our study design, was legally necessary for the dissemination of our research, and provided formal guarantees of the confidentiality of the participants. This last point appeared to be an important consideration for some subjects in agreeing to participate in the focus groups. Indeed, some faculty members were concerned that these protections would not provide them with adequate protection and declined to participate for these reasons.

Appendix 2 is the text of the IRB Application for this study. This describes the identification and recruitment of subjects, the rationale for the study, steps taken to ensure confidentiality of the participants, potential risks to participants, and potential benefits of the study.

Appendix 3 is the text of Appendix B of the IRB Application and provides more detailed rationale for the study, additional details on the research design and subjects, additional detail about the procedure for the conduct of the focus groups (including the specific questions used to guide the discussion) as well as a summary of the procedures for data analysis.

Appendix 4 contains the letter to prospective participants, Appendix C of the IRB Application. This letter explains to prospective participants the rationale for the study,

the structure of the focus groups, the other information (consent form and demographic sheet) that was requested of participants, and steps taken to ensure confidentiality.

Appendix 5 is the Informed Consent Form participants were asked to sign. This form was Appendix D of the IRB Application. Appendix 6 is the Demographic Information Card Participants were asked to complete.

Appendix 7 provides selected demographic information for all people contacted about possible participation in the study. Appendix 8 includes demographic information for all participants in the focus groups.

It is interesting to note that of the 90 people contacted about possible participation, 68 replied, and 55 replied indicating their willingness to participate. Forty seven of these faculty members actually participated in focus groups.

It is important to note that we sought to “use nonprobability purposive sampling designed to select key informants (faculty members) who are known to be aware of and/or interested in gender equity issues on the CWRU campus. Every effort will be made to include faculty from all ranks and all management centers and one group will be composed of minority faculty.” Ultimately, the response rate of self-identified minorities was not large enough (1 person) to support a minority focus group. Also, while all management centers were represented, only one participant was from Engineering, and one from Nursing.

A total of six focus groups were conducted in late Spring 2000: two focus groups of Senior Women Faculty, one of Junior Women Faculty, one of Male Faculty, one that was composed of faculty members of Mixed Rank, Mixed Gender, and one of Chairs and Administrators.

Appendix 9 provides the interview protocol the moderators used to guide the meeting. Appendix 10 is the introductory script moderators used to introduce each Focus Group. (This particular sample is from one of the Senior Women Focus Groups.)

Each focus group consisted of six to eight participants, small enough to facilitate full participation but large enough to provide diversity of perspectives. Focus group conversations were audio-recorded. Participants in these groups were encouraged to act as Key Informants, relating not only their own experience but also that of colleagues at CWRU. The goal of the focus groups was to identify the range of experiences rather than document the prevalence or distribution of any particular experience. Members of the Resource Equity Committee were trained in the facilitation of focus groups by Eleanor Stoller, Ph.D., a committee member who has conducted focus groups in previous research investigations. For each group, a second committee member served as a facilitator, who recorded observations regarding group dynamics and monitored recording equipment.

The interview guide for the focus group sessions consisted of five questions:

1. How do you think the experience of being a faculty member at CWRU is different for women than it is for men?
2. Does gender make any difference in access to resources for faculty at CWRU – things like salary, travel money, teaching loads, committee assignments, lab space, access to clerical or other support, institutional research funds, sabbatical or other leaves?
3. Do you think gender makes any difference in everyday interaction among faculty, between faculty and administrators, or between faculty and staff? Do people notice gender when they talk with one another?
4. Does the impact of family life differ for men and women faculty? Do women and men face different issues in balancing work and family demands?
5. Do you think the issues facing women faculty change across the academic career – as we/they move from assistant professor to full professor?

After completing the interview guide, the moderator concluded the session with two concluding questions, each of which was asked in a round-robin manner. (1) Suppose you had one minute to talk to President Auston about how to improve the situation for women faculty at CWRU. What would you say? and (2) Have we missed anything? Is there anything we should have asked but didn't?

At the end of each focus group, each participant was provided with a note card which asked that they “Please summarize your experiences as a CWRU faculty member in one word or phrase.” The responses are included as Appendix 11. The focus group participants represented a broad spectrum of the university faculty, with a wide range of experiences, and this is reflected in their notecard responses. These responses range from “Gratifying” (Senior Women) and “Challenging!!! And stimulating” (Junior Women) to “Degrading” (Senior Women) and “It has eaten me alive.” (Men- mixed rank). Many participants appear to have conflicting experiences, with one noting “Such mixed feelings: richness of community, loneliness and isolation.” (Junior women).

The focus groups were tape recorded, resulting in some 9 hours of tape. These were transcribed. The transcripts were then analyzed using standard methods of content analysis. We began by reading the transcripts to identify distinct comments, then used these to construct a keyword list and categories, and finally used these categories to code the text. The process was iterated several times until the list of categories appeared to be both parsimonious and complete. Appendix 11 is the final descriptive codes used for scoring the focus group transcripts.

In the next section, we used this coding scheme to organize our narrative. The actual narrative is largely comprised of illustrative quotes from the various focus groups. To the extent possible, we try to allow the participants to speak for themselves.

Results

A number of participants pointed out the isomorphism between the external academic environment and the climate and structures at CWRU. Certain experiences of faculty at CWRU were seen as reflective of women's and men's academic careers in general, and of research universities in particular.

Faculty Careers are Gendered: Participants noted the gendered nature of all faculty careers: faculty jobs are developed and structured with male careers in mind, the tenure track schedule is an institution engineered for men, the ideal academic worker is conceptualized as male, and career paths for women and men faculty differ. One participant likened the academic life to “being in a monastery” and “working like a monk” (Junior Women FG), another referred to her Dean extolling the example of a faculty member who “puts in fourteen hours a day” (Senior Women FG), while another participant summarized the academic career model as a “heterosexual, white, male model, and it does not fit other kinds of people very well” (Junior Women FG). Faculty jobs were seen to be

structured to promote certain kinds of bodies. Those bodies tend to not have nurturing or care-taking responsibilities ... They have ... wives taking care of these things full time for them. Those are the kinds of bodies that are going to succeed in this structure the way it is set up, and I don't see much flexibility in this structure. I can say, well I'm going to choose to step off the tenure track because this is so overwhelming and I can't be a good parent if I want to try to go for tenure. But I think that's a false choice (Junior Women FG).

Another participant summarized that “I think the whole tenure track schedule is engineered for men ... It has nothing to do with women” (Senior Women FG). Male

participants also recognized women are still at a disadvantage in academia, “All in all it’s been much tougher for woman to survive in this world. Now it’s improving.

Regulations. Changes in university regulations, as well as federal, are helping. But it’s clearly difficult” (Men FG). Participants also questioned the general academic attitudes and perceptions facing women faculty members who might choose part time or other nontraditional career paths: “Is a woman who ... takes part time going to be taken seriously as a researcher or a scholar or a professional?” (Mixed Gender, Mixed Rank FG).

The Nature of Research Universities: The nature of world-class research

universities was also seen to influence the everyday experience of faculty at CWRU.

Reflective of the larger world of research universities, teaching at CWRU is trivialized and devalued, and the tenure process is a grueling, unfriendly, “all-or-nothing system” (Junior Women FG) where “old-boy networks” are thriving (Senior Women FG).

Several participants noted that the larger academic culture is unnecessarily “combative” (Mixed Gender, Mixed Rank FG) with one participant calling the journal review process “a blood sport” that is particularly detrimental to women (Mixed Gender, Mixed Rank FG).

Numerical Under-representation and Token Dynamics

Lack of Women Faculty at all Levels: Participants in various groups referred to the lack of a critical mass of women faculty and the consequent token dynamics that emerge at CWRU. One senior woman faculty member said, “The only reason I’m asked to do X, Y, or Z is because I’m a woman, and it’s very hard, especially here, because the critical

mass for women is so critically low, that it's just tiresome" (Senior Women FG).

Another pointed to the lack of women in engineering: "[In] one of the schools in particular, the Engineering school, there aren't enough women to have statistics" (Senior Women FG). Another said, "This is obviously a male institution, and I think that is part of the difficulty we face. We are in the minority. We are an underclass, and so in addition to discrimination due to our gender, there is this added problem, that we do things differently than they do and they are the ones setting the standards. We have to deal with that" (Senior Women FG).

Token Dynamics: The dearth of women faculty at all levels results in pervasive token dynamics of the following forms. First, because of their relative paucity, women faculty members are sometimes seen as representative of their whole gender group, becoming a symbol or stand-in for all women. One senior woman faculty member said that "I often feel as if I'm not representing myself, I'm representing women" (Senior Women FG). Second, token women with nominal power may blind themselves to the existence of gender issues or act as apologists for the status quo. One participant said, "Just because you have a sexually-identified female in the department, does not give you any sense of assurance that that person has the same feelings about gender issues, or responds the same way to gender, that we're talking about here" (Senior Women FG). A male participant noted that for his female chair, "her view of the world is more that it doesn't matter whether you're a man or a woman, it's how hard you try. So I think she resists all things gender" (Men FG).

Additionally, when token women who have achieved a certain status within the system step out of their prescribed roles, the system subtly censures and even scapegoats them: “Isn’t it too bad that when push comes to shove, the head that roles is the woman that the guys were using as a buffer?” (Senior Women FG). A male participant said, “... I think I sometimes see gender playing an important role. Not always an official role. Kind of more subtle, in terms of the kinds of judgments that get made about women faculty, or what women faculty can or can’t do, or how much they should or shouldn’t do. It’s not always explicitly expressed, but I think it’s there” (Men FG).

Third, numerical under-representation is particularly detrimental to women because this contributes to their perception that they constitute a secondary and even underprivileged class. One participant indicated that, “we are still thought of being secretaries, or something lower than faculty” (Senior Women FG).

Fourth, token dynamics play out in the social exclusion of women from informal male networks. One participant referred to the informal socializing among men as “the urinal connection – that’s a time that guys can stand around and talk, but women don’t get in there” (Senior Women FG). Another participant said, “I’m not saying this is exclusive at Case Western, but if there’s a group of men and a single woman, the conversation will often be from man to man, rather than including the woman in the conversation. If somebody’s asking questions, they will often address it to the man first. If they have time, they will address you” (Senior Women FG). Paradoxically when there are too few women, they concurrently stand out (are extremely visible and constantly scrutinized) while being overlooked (excluded from power networks).

Everything is Negotiable:

A frequently mentioned characteristic of CWRU's internal climate was that "everything is negotiable," as manifested by the following aspects.

Side Deals:

A number of participants indicated that secret side deals are pervasive throughout the university. "And the only thing that I've learned that could be done, is that if you end up bringing in vast amounts of grant money, and you can somehow pay more of your salary in the College of Arts and Sciences, then you can go around the Chair and negotiate with the Dean to get more of a salary increase. That's not really right" (Men FG).

While these side deals were usually viewed as negative, this was not always the case. For example,

It's not all negative. I would say that in my case, there have been experiences where I have gone to my Chair, this is a previous Chair, actually, and I've said, "My office is not appropriate for me. I am an advisor for a lot of students, and I think you need to do something about this." And I was pretty surprised, he said, "Okay. Here's a budget." I was able to do that, and I would say nobody else in the department had that kind of remodeling done, and they were all shocked that someone had asked for it, and, sort of, gotten their request. So, I think you're right. Everything is negotiable. A lot of times people just don't think to ask, and sometimes there are resources and things available to you, but you just don't ask for them. You don't think to ask for them, or you never think anyone would agree to that." (Senior Women focus group)

Negotiations of Options at Hire: A frequently mentioned situation was the negotiation undertaken at the time of hire. "So there are a lot of issues, but I think that basically the process, the whole negotiating process in the beginning definitely can be a lot more open, in terms of the types of things that are reasonable to ask for, and types of salaries that are reasonable to ask for" (Men FG).

Several participants pointed to differences in the negotiations undertaken at the time of hire by male and female faculty. “And what I found, looking at the junior faculty, is that definitely men get more protected time. They come in with more protected time. I don’t know if they know how to negotiate better than women do, or they’re coached better, or mentored better, but I just find that when I look at some of my physician colleagues as they come in, they are just loaded down with clinical time” (Senior Women FG).

Several participants pointed to women’s own role in not receiving the advantages of side deals, *viz.*, that women don’t negotiate effectively, and that women are neither taught nor mentored about how to successfully negotiate for better deals. “Women typically are not taught the art of negotiating. You don’t learn it through childhood, and you don’t necessarily have anybody teaching you how to do this ... I think women often feel uncomfortable doing it ... I don’t feel like I have the resources to necessarily do something like that” (Mixed Gender, Mixed Rank FG). One female participant said “Perhaps we are not as successful at negotiating and back off too soon ... I’d say our hit rate to being successful is nowhere near as good as the hit rate for men” (Senior Women FG). Another noted that “I think women, by nature, are less apt to negotiate. And having less women around, you don’t get feedback from what other women are doing, that they are negotiating, ... and so I think that women are the last to think about negotiating, until you really look at yourself in a situation.”

Unequal application of rules, procedures, and practices: Several participants observed that university procedures, rules, policies and practices are unclear or not applied with equity.

One of the things that I hear all of us ... maybe I'm not supposed to say that as a participant, but ... is that there is a distinct lack of rules and guidelines that this university has in effect. So there is no way of understanding how space is divvied up. How resources divvy up. How do we make certain types of decisions? What's the rules for dealing with people in these situations? There nothing. It's just catch as catch can. I feel that there's a certain level that the administration feels, that if everything is kind of amorphous, there's no actual rules that you can put your finger on, then it gives them power, because everything becomes mystified. So I feel that the sands are shifting beneath your feet, because there's nothing to hold on to. It's like the rules for promotion and tenure. I think they are very poorly laid out, at least in the ____, to manage. They say that we're trying to be fair, so that we don't have these rigid standards. But you have to have some standards and some rules, so that people know what they are aiming at, so that when they are denied, they can figure out what happened. If you don't have it, they can say, well but it was this case and that case, and you really can do whatever you want. You can do whatever you want because there are no rules. And I think that is what goes on at this university. That's why this university is so much worse than a lot of other universities. Because there are no rules"(Senior Women FG).

Additionally, participants referred to the existence of "a double standard" (Senior Women FG). In describing the qualifications necessary for promotion, one participant remarked: "And I think that speaks to what you were saying about promotion ... I can see the same qualifications for men and women, and yet somehow the man is viewed as much more mature and ready for promotion. Women are more [immature] in terms of saying you're not quite ready yet. You don't have quite enough publications. You don't have quite enough experience. And I think it is quite demoralizing" (Senior Women FG).

One story revealed how normative practice sometimes supersedes written policy:

I had a young woman faculty come to me and was very concerned, because, although there is a provision at the ____ school, that a woman can have a year's extension, (as also) for the whole university, when you had a baby. She felt the

environment was so non-accepting of that, that if she asked for the year's extension, she would be viewed in a negative way. And so, just because something is on the books, doesn't mean that the environment supports using that. And I think that's real important. Just because it's on the books, doesn't mean it's used in the way it's supposed to be used. (Senior Women FG)

Shifting Sands: In addition to rules and policies being negotiable, standards sometimes are perceived as changing as women advance. One participant said “There was one particular directorship that I had been involved in starting the program, and really wanted to move into the directorship. When I became associate professor, it became open, so I applied for it. And all of a sudden they said, no that's only for full professors. So everything that used to be open to associate professors with tenure, now are only open to full professors with tenure, because there was one woman with tenure who was an associate” (Senior Women FG).

Issues of Mentoring and Professional Development

Focus group participants spoke about the lack of mentoring and professional development received by women faculty members on the CWRU campus, and the nature of the complex mentoring relationship among junior women and senior women faculty.

Inadequate Socialization: As discussed earlier, women participants at all levels addressed the lack of mentoring and socialization with respect to receiving inadequate information about unspoken rules, not being taught how to negotiate or engage in self-promotion, and the lack of awareness of or being excluded from side deals. “I feel like there's this system that is more likely to take these men under their wings. I've seen it.

They take men under their wings, and they give them the inside scoop, and they ‘Mentor them’, tell them what they need to have to do or put you on this paper, and I just don’t see that happening with the women” (Junior Women FG). Additionally, some participants felt that the different styles that men and women have of relating to others can serve as an obstacle to mentoring and learning (Admin. FG).

Role Expectations of Senior Women Faculty: The role expectations held of senior women faculty to serve as mentors to junior women, and the complex relationship between senior and junior women, was brought up in multiple focus groups. Junior women faculty commented on the lack of women in senior positions to serve as mentors for juniors. Others viewed senior faculty women as “anti-role models ... women who had survived such a brutalizing system that they ... were crusty. They had war scars” (Junior Women FG). One junior woman, referred to senior women as being completely overworked and overwhelmed by service and teaching responsibilities after receiving tenure, and hence, that they were not positive role models for a balanced life:

But the other comment I would like to make about the few full professor women that I know, and one of my colleagues is one of them, and she’s wonderful, is I think they get terribly overwhelmed and it scares the heck out of me because I look at what I do now as an assistant professor and I think, God, if I do get tenure, look at all the extra work that you then have to take on. And maybe at the full level, especially because there are so few women at the full level, I think they need a representative, and if you’re a minority, you know for God’s sakes, you’re going to end up on every single one where they need a minority perspective at a full professor level. I worry about that – that the workload gets just astronomical ... And maybe that’s why they don’t reach back and make common cause with other women because they’re just so freaking overwhelmed by all of the other responsibilities. (Junior Women FG)

The Experience of Senior Women Faculty As Mentors: While senior women in the administrative focus group and in both senior women focus groups reported that they feel overloaded and overburdened with service responsibilities, they revealed that they feel an obligation to serve as mentors to junior women,

I've been around the university quite a few years, and when I started there were very few women to mentor me. And I really feel like the male faculty had opportunities to talk about how to plan their life. What issues would come up. I think that for women the issues are very different, and even though I may have had some ... there may have been some men who could have some of that, they could not be helpful. And some of the men didn't even know how to be helpful. They didn't know how to begin some conversation. So you must have senior women in order to mentor junior women. (Senior Women FG)

One senior woman said that, "junior women in my field are mentored mainly by other women, although there are some men who reach out to them" (Senior Women FG).

Senior women also pointed to their own lack of mentors: "As we said before, we don't have a lot of senior mentors, and some of us who are now senior, didn't have female mentors. Or just didn't even have mentors" (Senior Women FG).

Hierarchical, Elitist Structure

Focus group participants described CWRU as a hierarchy-driven and elitist institution. The elitist nature of the institution was brought out by participants in the following ways: the existence of a pervasive deference to rank within the hierarchy; too few women faculty members at the full professor rank and in high level administrative positions; rank privilege accrues to male faculty but not to female faculty; and diversity is not valued.

Rank Privilege: Participants referred to the deference given to high-ranking members: full professors have inordinate power and influence. Rank was determined to be more (or as) important a factor as gender in faculty-staff interactions and other university practices (Admin. FG). The university was described as a “star system” with privileges being lavished on “senior stars” (Junior Women FG). Adjuncts and non-tenure-track instructors, who are often women, are treated as a secondary faculty group: “I think there is also a use of instructors ... an instructor kind of no-movement job, and those tend to be women. My experience is that they tend to be women, and so there is not opportunity for promotion, unless of course you would compete for a tenure track job” (Senior Women FG).

Too Few Women in Top Academic and Administrative Positions: Participants in almost every focus group pointed to the lack of senior women and the consequences of this dearth. “The senior woman faculty person is a rare animal. We know particularly in our university we have more women as a percentage, but over the years the percentage of senior faculty persons, women, has decreased. So they’re rare” (Junior Women FG). Another participant described her school as having “zero full women” (Junior Women FG). In one interchange, junior women professors were asked, “How do you see senior women? Do you see them as mentors?” Their responses to this question were, “Do you see them at all?” and “We saw them at lunchtime for a little while, if only at a table next to us” (Junior Women FG).

The university itself was described as follows “This is a gendered hierarchy. The bottom of the hierarchy is more heavily feminine and the top of the hierarchy is much

more masculine. And what happens is the benefits and resources accrue to those who have the quote/unquote real positions” (Junior Women FG). A senior woman faculty member said,

In my department, we have a number of women at the associate level, and very few at the full professor, so I think you get stuck in a way, at the associate level. And part of that is that they could be worn out from getting to that point for a year or two. I think that it also, then, is that you end up having more responsibilities ... Many more things that come to your plate. You don't have that same type of support structure, or review structure, or mentorship structure. And I thought that was very helpful. But very few women get promoted to full professor, in my experience, in my department. Maybe it's more amorphous. It's vaguer, it's more vague as to what you need to do to get to that [full professor] point. (Senior Women FG)

The struggle to find senior women mentors and senior women to serve on committees, particularly “senior committees” such as promotion and tenure committees, was also noted in the Administrative FG.

Additionally, participants pointed to the dearth of women in senior administrative positions within the university.

It feels just a little bit intimidating to go to a meeting and look around, and on the walls there is not one woman's picture. When you look at all the high-ranking people who have been in this room before. Then you wonder, what am I doing here, and will there ever be a picture up there of somebody who looks like me, and represents my gender? And it doesn't look like it, the way I look at this university. (Senior Women FG)

Another participant explicitly referred to the lack of women in top administrative positions as follows, “We need more female administrators, We need deans that are women. We need [a female] administrative provost” (Senior Women FG).

Interaction of Rank and Gender: Participants indicated that the intersection between gender and rank magnifies inequalities (Admin. FG). One junior woman faculty member said, “It’s hard for me to separate gender and position except that a male colleague who came in with very similar credentials to mine in terms of experience in the community has been treated very differently” (Junior Women FG). There is a disproportionate segregation of women in instructor positions (Junior Women FG, Senior Women FG). Women faculty members also referred to the conflation of status and gender when they described frequent attributions being made of their looking too young, or being mistaken for students (Junior Women FG).

Interlocking Inequalities: The Interaction of Gender with Race, Sexual

Orientation, and Socioeconomic Status: CWRU was described by some participants as an academic environment characterized by pervasive racism, heterosexism, and classism. CWRU’s historical pattern of not being open to studies of equity was noted in the Administrative FG. The lack of formal organizational mechanisms for sensitivity training of faculty members and top administrators was remarked on in the Senior Women FG. Other participants expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of diversity at the university, and the lack of appreciation of diversity, on many fronts. “There is just a lack of diversity on the campus as a whole and among the faculty, and there is just no feeling that it needs to be addressed. It’s the same-old, same-old all of the time (Senior Women FG). “I think there is rampant racism on campus, subtle and unsubtle, and it takes many forms. Actual differences by race, ethnic background, whether you are an immigrant or

not. If you are an oriental or not, and these things are felt in blatant ways, in subtle ways. They're very debilitating as well" (Senior Women FG).

One faculty member spoke to the issue of racism, "I feel that I'm one of the oppressed by virtue of not only my sex but my race here at the university. And that's not been my experience in all the other places that I've ever lived ... Maybe my style of communicating isn't as respected across the university" (Junior Women FG). The pervasive heterosexism at CWRU was brought out by a focus group participant who pointed to the ongoing situation and demands facing lesbian faculty members

I'm lesbian and one of the things I feel very clearly here is that it's not a safe place for lesbians to talk about being lesbian and to me that when you ask about questions of "is gender noticed?" for me it is about both those things. It's about being a woman and being lesbian and what that means. And in my own school I feel there's some flexibility around that but even there I'm the designated lesbian which means that if somebody needs to hear from lesbians, they call on me. (___ FG)

Finally, the university was described as having a distinct

class-orientation, very stratified. I don't know if it's because Case Western Reserve University has a huge endowment and a huge dependency on its development, but I've always felt that, and maybe it's that I'm in the area I'm in. Also that there's a weight given to status, a weight given to money, a weight given to those kinds of power that sometimes good hard work and intelligence can't balance out. And I think women are often hard to come to that, unless you are born to it or married into it, you have to work twice as hard sometimes to obtain it. (___ FG)

Experience of Faculty Differentiated by Gender

Focus group participants were candid in sharing that their everyday experiences at CWRU were influenced by their gender, as follows.

Women Faculty's Formal and Informal Interactions: In general, women faculty reported that they felt an ongoing burden “to be more, maybe, care taking in your relationships with your colleagues or your staff or your students” (Junior Women FG).

With Male Faculty: Women focus group participants reported feeling excluded from the professional and social community of male academic members at CWRU.

You don't know the ground rules. You can't play in the game until you know them. And that's a lack across all these that I think women don't have the same access to the mentoring as someone to give them the heads up and to say, you know, This is our system, sister. Don't rock it or do rock it. If you rock it, rock it in this way. And so it puts us at a disadvantage in a lot of circumstances. (Junior Women FG)

One female participant addressed the insidious nature of exclusion in the following story,

I'm the only woman in the department, and I have several times found out, it sounds sort of paranoid, that my male colleagues will go out to lunch together, or they have all had dinner together. Which they have every right to do, but that means that the [number deleted] of them have gone out and I haven't, and the only reason I hear about it is that, in another meeting they'll say, We decided that you're gonna do this, and you're gonna ... Not about me, but about each other. They've cut up the pie already, and there's none left. I say, Guys, maybe sometime when you have lunch, I could come? They say, Oh sure. We didn't know you wanted to have lunch. But then they never ask, and I really hate to creep around the halls to look and see who's going out. You can legislate who people have lunch with, but there's a lot of pal-ing, or you know strengthening ... male bonding that goes on without [women]. (Senior Women FG)

With regard to exclusion from the social community, a participant said, “I know of at least two women who have left the university because it was like a monastery, because it was so unfriendly, and the environment ... they didn't fancy wanting to be in a job where it was so completely unsocial. They were so completely uninvited” (Junior Women FG). Going on to describe the situation of another woman faculty member, who

on first being in the job held a couple of dinner parties at her home and invited all the male faculty, this participant said,

after that, the men just didn't know how to deal with that. Some of them didn't show, of course, to the parties. She had a couple of parties that they just didn't show, men didn't show to, of course, right from the beginning. And she wasn't subsequently invited to parties that the men, you know dinner parties, they would invite the assistant professor males to dinner parties with their wives, you know, but she was never invited ... There was no sense of community whatsoever. And I think that part of that is because it's so male. You don't necessarily get invited into the male community. (Junior Women FG)

In describing their daily interactions with male colleagues, women faculty members described an environment where they were afraid to speak out until they received tenure, for fear of being “viewed as ungrateful” or “labeled as troublemakers” by their male colleagues (Senior Women FG). Additionally, they reported their interactions with male faculty as being characterized by “very discounting behavior” and “intentional exclusion” (Senior Women FG), “male unreasonableness wins” (Senior Women FG), incivility, lack of respect, and rudeness by male faculty toward women faculty, including “pitch fits, screaming and yelling” (Senior Women FG).

With Students: Women faculty members reported feeling differentially treated by students as compared to their male colleagues. Many reported that male faculty members get instant respect from students, whereas female faculty members don't. As one participant said,

It never fails to surprise me how often the residents will say to a male faculty member, Doctor, to a female faculty, first name. I think there's something very telling in that. Now, when I called out a resident on that once, using my first name, he said, “But, I think of you not just as a faculty, but a friend. Well, yeah, but I don't think so.” I think [he was] much quicker to feel that the male has a little bit more authority, or just wouldn't presume to call that male by his first name” (Senior Women FG).

These feelings of differential expectations from students were supported by a member of the Administrative FG, “I’ve read course evaluations in which, for the women, they would put ‘she shouldn’t wear sleeveless dresses,’ and I’ve never seen somebody make a comment on attire to a male, even some of the more slovenly dressed of our male colleagues.”

Women faculty recognized that students expect nurturance from women faculty and are upset when they don’t receive it, resent high standards from women faculty, subject women faculty members to more criticism, from grades issued to clothes worn, and are more aggressively confrontational toward women faculty than toward male faculty. One participant said,

What I find is that if I treat them in a nurturing way, they respond to me better. And it undermines the sort of professional things. You know, I was working with another woman in my department, and she wasn’t willing to play the game. She insisted they call her Professor X. I let them call me F, by my first name and it created a whole different dynamic. And yet, they respond very well to me and not so well to her. And it was huge, well, that’s all I have to say. But I saw right in front of my eyes what demanding respect from men could do. It was a huge lesson for me in my first years here – that if you just would be like them, buddy-buddy, you could get along, but if you demanded respect, demanded that you be called Professor F, demanded high standards, etc., etc., like I feel the men can do ...” (Junior Women FG).

One participant said, “If you don’t play into it [a nurturing role], you’re a bitch” (Junior Women FG), while another noted that “Students are far less challenging of senior faculty, particularly male senior faculty, who speak with louder voices ...” (Junior Women FG).

Still another participant acknowledged,

I feel like students treat me differently, and it took me a while to figure out the role that I was supposed to play in the classroom, how I was going to get the teaching ratings that I knew that I had to get. I don’t find that I have initial respect right off the bat like I believe that I’ve seen students treat the male assistant professors. And I think that they expect this nurturance. I have a lot of

students come to my office and argue with me about grades in a sort of threatening manner. And I am certain that they're not doing that with the assistant male professors. And if you're not willing to play that role, I don't know how – my fantasy is that post tenure I don't have to play that role any more. And I look forward to that” (Junior Women FG).

Women students place a particular burden of expectations on women faculty members, expecting them to be their confidants and champions.

With Staff: Women faculty members reported preferential treatment of male faculty by support staff. One participant shared a story of the unequal application of a service offered to male and female faculty by departmental secretaries,

... for example, we were told we had to go to the bookstore ourselves to get our materials, whereas the secretaries went for men. It wasn't until two years later when we discovered that the secretaries were doing this, that we demanded this power as well, and have to coach junior women, because it's basically, not told to them before, that they were doing that, and so there is this lack of communication of the norms. (Senior Women FG).

Another participant addressed this issue as “I think female faculty often get treated differently by secretaries [than male faculty]. I've seen secretaries [say], ‘I'm not doing it for her'. Her. It has something to do with women, I think, women being competitive with women or something. They'd be much happier doing it for him” (Senior Women FG).

One participant also reported inappropriate treatment of staff by male faculty, including observing the “abusive”, “trivializing” and “demeaning” treatment of support staff by male faculty members without any reprisals or sanctions for this unacceptable behavior (Senior Women FG).

Everyday, Routine Procedures that Are Detrimental to Women's

Experiences: Focus group participants described the gender-specific application of routine procedures that were detrimental to their everyday experiences as women faculty members. For example, gender-unfriendly scheduling of classes is problematic for women with young families (Junior Women FG), women are frequently assigned to committees that are not helpful for tenure and promotion (Junior Women FG), and promotion and tenure rules are vaguely defined and poorly explained to women (Junior Women FG, Senior Women FG).

CWRU Culture Experienced as Exclusionary Towards Women

Focus group participants experienced the overall climate at CWRU to be exclusionary (Junior Women FG, Senior Women FG), unfriendly (Senior Women FG), marginalizing (Senior Women FG), separated (Senior Women FG), tough and isolating for women (Admin. FG), unwelcoming (Junior Women FG), silencing (Senior Women FG), insidious (Senior Women FG), tense (Men FG), and psychologically debilitating (Senior Women FG). They described the environment as one where women's issues are invisible (Senior Women FG), where a double standard exists (Junior Women FG), and which is characterized by a pervasive sense of fear (Junior Women FG, Senior Women FG). The treatment of women was described as unintentional (passive) discrimination and benign neglect (Senior Women FG). Women faculty described themselves as disconnected (Junior Women FG), outsiders (Junior Women FG, Senior Women FG), and survivors (Senior Women FG).

Unwelcoming Community for Women: The university was described as a “techie, male-dominated, male-oriented, medical kind of place” (Junior Women FG). One participant spoke about her treatment vis-a-vis another male faculty member, “what I see right now is the image of a man who is my peer at our school who has kids, whose wife is a full-time homemaker. He, by the way, is in a department which has outright said, (it’s not a million miles away from my department), outright said, ‘We don’t like women. We don’t like hiring women because it would bring the salary down’” (Junior Women FG).

The championing of women’s concerns by women faculty was seen to be unfavorably regarded by those in authority.

I really do think there is a need to be able to meet more women across the faculties, to learn more about the strategies that women use to be successful. I’ve always felt that of all the institutions I’ve been at, Case is a very, very difficult one to have that happen. There seems to be things that are said about not getting together with women. Messages that come from different departments, that I’ve heard people say ... the lack of encouragement of women to women dialogue, I think, gets in the way.

This same person gave the following story about her participation on women-related university committees,

You just reminded me that back in 1990, I was appointed to the President’s Commission on the Status of Women, and I did that, and was active on the Women’s Faculty Association. And when I came up for my third year review, my department chair wrote in my letter that he was advising me that I should remove myself from those kinds of activities on campus, because it’s creating a perception of the kind of woman I was, that would not fit well in the image of the others in the school, and he didn’t see where that was in my best career interest. He was really saying, in a way, he was trying to help me hear what he felt I needed to do, because he was a supporter of mine. It was just sad that I was being told that if I keep being labeled as being involved with things about women, that in fact, it would have a detrimental effect on my being able to get tenure. And I did withdraw from those things until I got tenure, and then getting back to them again, after. But unfortunately, I had to lose my sole feeling of being understood and social support through connection with very interesting women from the medical school, from history, from theater, from wherever, that made me feel ...

not about activism or radicalism, but being a human being with a different set of life circumstances. But I was only in my third year, and I really did want to stay, and so I did what it took to be able to stay. (Senior Women FG).

Sometimes women faculty are slapped down for standing up for themselves:

At a departmental Christmas party, they put up a cartoon of me as Lucy Van Pelt, and I think that was sort of a classic caricature of, you know, a female coming to an all-male department, and kind of standing up for themselves, voicing their opinions, and in my case, perceived that way. Whereas for a male, that might be the normal way to be, so to speak. I think it's changed in the time I've been there. We have a lot of women in my department, actually. I think we've seen it a lot in the university environment. Females who sort of just stand up for themselves sometimes also get slapped down for that. (Senior Women FG).

Marginalizing and Discounting of Women: Women faculty reported that their voices are not heard or valued by their male colleagues. One junior woman described her experience in faculty research forums as follows,

And I was treated very differently [than a male junior faculty member who joined the university at the same time]. But in faculty forums or in meetings where research was being discussed, there were at least differences I experienced in the receptivity of other faculty to the kinds of things that he would talk about versus what I had talked about and we both do qualitative research so it's not about that. It's just ... my experience is really a perception of difference. Whether it was a real difference, I don't know, but it felt real to me. (Junior Women FG).

Another participant commented,

I think women are marginalized. Our contributions are not given as much weight. This can be subtle and very unsubtle in faculty meetings, women are not recognized to speak as much as men. This can be in public seminars, in front of students, or if the woman says something, there isn't a [response] or a comment made back, so in a sense it is ignored. Anything we do somehow doesn't weigh as much as what men do, and I think that can be very psychologically debilitating for women. (Senior Women FG).

Yet another noted that the situation in some areas is extremely difficult for women at CWRU:

I'm glad that Participant H is here as a representative of a contingent of our university where there are particular problems for women. ___ is a particular department or school where women have over the years told very frightening, I hate to say, tales, recounts of things that have happened to them. There's a faculty woman there now, another [___ scientist], who has been treated truly disrespectfully, and she's not alone. She's just an example. (Junior Women FG).

A senior woman participant said,

Sometimes it is difficult to be that token woman on a committee. It is easy to discount one voice. It's often easier to discount a woman's voice. I think many of us have had the experience where we may make a statement, and then a few minutes later, a male on that committee will make that same statement, and that time it gets picked up. Now, very few other comments need to be made twice, but oftentimes, it's the female comment that doesn't get picked up the first time. So when you are, or when I am the only woman on a large committee, it is I think, a little more difficult. So I often feel as if I'm representing myself, I'm representing women. (Senior Women FG).

Invisible and Backstage Work: Women faculty are called on to undertake work that is largely invisible and unrewarded, including mentoring of students and junior faculty and certain service assignments such as attending open houses and serving on student committees. Women faculty were described as back stage, behind the scene, players (Mixed Gender, Mixed Rank FG). One participant said, "I think women do a lot more nurturing labor, a lot more behind the scenes, invisible work. Sometimes that's little stuff that nobody else wants to do, and that takes up a lot of time, and it doesn't get very rewarded" (Junior Women FG). Another participant said,

I think women faculty are asked to do things that men are not asked to do. And I think that it is often times visible verses invisible work. I think that women are asked to do a lot of invisible work that is crucial to the educational program, but results in nothing shiny that you can put in vita at the end of the year, for which you are promoted. And to me, that is one of the big differences to being a women faculty member than being a male faculty member. And they're often times small things, but the small things add up. So you find that you are chairing a lot of committees that maybe are important to the educational program, but are not big committees. They are not committees that will get you any kind of research

opportunity, or result in a publication or anything that has any transferability for tenure or promotion. [Senior Women]

Explaining why service work is attractive to her, one junior woman said,

There is one time when you do get a pat on the back and a smile from those people and that is when you take on this nurturing role and do the committee work. For example, I get huge strokes for taking on lots of doctoral students. My letter every year says, 'And you're just way beyond your years in the number of doctoral students you take on, the committees you're on, blah, blah, blah.' So those are the noticeable strokes I get. I think that the men don't necessarily get stroked for the same things but they get stroked. So what happens is that I tend to move in the direction of the strokes that I'm getting. You know, and I see this happening to the senior women, that, you know, senior in this case is the associate. They continue to move in the direction of the strokes they're getting, so 'Oh, you developed that new course. You took on that course overload.' It's the only time they get any pat on the back whatsoever, is when they're doing some service thing. So now you could say well they should say no to that service work. But then you're constantly not getting any strokes or any recognition for anything. And then, you'll really feel like you're in a monastery alone. And I know I'm exaggerating slightly but I'm just tired of people saying, 'Why don't you just say no to that' when you don't realize that it's such a lonely place and you want some affirmation. I'm a human being" (Junior Women FG).

A Double Standard For Male and Female Faculty: Participants described the existence of double standards in the treatment of male and female faculty. Women faculty report themselves as subjected to stereotyping. A pervasive stereotype of women faculty is the "nurturer" stereotype, as described earlier. One woman commented, 'they asked me to bake cookies last week. Really. For a conference' (Senior Women FG). Another said that being "forthright, outspoken, asks the difficult question" did not fulfill gender expectations, and resulted in attributions of being "too assertive and too aggressive in my behavior" (Senior Women FG).

Women faculty who don't fit a female stereotype are caricaturized, labeled, and disrespected. They are pressured to conform to the stereotype.

Do people notice gender? They ... make comments about particular kinds of women not being the right kinds of women. We don't smile enough, and usually that is a gender comment, about not smiling enough. We're supposed to smile, and so I do think it makes a difference in very subtle ways, but ways that make you feel marginalized outside. Invisible. Being seen as disagreeable, when we are merely trying to give a perspective that might be different cause you see some things that people don't see. So the ability to be heard, and have full voice, is often tempered, because you don't want to be ... you don't want to cause another problem" (Senior Women FG).

Participants also commented on the negative attitudes of male faculty toward working women. One participant said, "I've heard comments. I've heard anecdotal stories of things that male faculty have said to women faculty, about their lack of commitment. Just having them [kids] is perceived as a lack of commitment" (Senior Women FG). Another participant shared a story of her experience at a dinner with male faculty members and their wives, where working women were constantly put down (Senior Women FG).

Participants also brought out the notion that at CWRU, leadership seems naturally male, and that masculinity appears to lead to power, manifested in conscious and unconscious ways (Admin. FG).

Women Constantly Seen as Falling Short: Women faculty members are perceived as being judged more rigorously than men faculty are, and are seen as falling short. Women faculty members feel a general lack of affirmation and acknowledgement that they are progressing and that they have unique intellectual and other contributions to make. Additionally, as described earlier, women faculty are not seen as authorities or experts in their fields, by students or by their male faculty colleagues.

Structural/Organizational Issues

Focus group participants also attributed the negative experiences of women faculty to structural features of CWRU as an organization that is characterized by inertia and is not open to change. Lack of organizational responsiveness is aggravated by a salary and benefit structure that is below the national average of comparable institutions. As one participant warned, “It’s just a very unhappy atmosphere now, and with a lot of people it all relates to bitterness about the salary” [Men’s Focus Group]

Unsupportive administrators were described as another source of frustration, although concerns focused more on administrative culture and procedures than on characteristics of specific individuals. Some participants raised issues surrounding a lack of leadership and accountability, aggravated by little opportunity for redress when faculty encountered unfair practices. A participant in a Senior Women Faculty Focus Group explained that when “you go and you speak with the administrators, they shrug their shoulders, pat you on the back, and they do absolutely nothing. It really sends the messages that your complaints are trivial – deal with it.” Others spoke of collusion and information control among administrators, with a tendency to silence dissenting voices and unfavorable views. “All I’m told is well if you say something you’ll be out of a job,” one participant in the Mixed Rank, Mixed Gender Focus Group reported.

A number of participants believe that too little attention is directed toward faculty development. The administrative posture is described by a member of the Mixed Gender, Mixed Rank Focus Group as “How little can we give?” rather than “What does this person need to be happy and successful in their job?” Some participants suggested that lack of administrative support might also reflect a lack of understanding of the ways in

which gender structures everyday experiences and perceptions, a criticism that applies to some women well as some men. As one faculty in the Male Faculty Focus Group said, in describing a woman who chairs a CWRU department, “We have a leader who doesn’t think in those [gender] terms. I think there are some times where gender does matter, but she just doesn’t frame things in that way.”

Finally, the theme of secrecy within private institutions was raised again. Private institutions are seen as tolerating more discriminatory behavior under the guise of academic freedom. Flexibility in responding to what administrators perceive as unique situations is interpreted more negatively by some focus group participants as a lack of procedures guaranteeing equal treatment. As one participant in a Senior Women Faculty Focus Group put it, “The only thing that bothers me is that the university has no rules and regulations for people in power. They seem to be doing whatever they want. Nobody can stop them.” Several participants related incidents where faculty approached a member of the administration with a concern but reported getting what a member of a Senior Women Faculty Focus Group described as “this blank look, ‘Oh, it’s all confidential.’” Another member of the same focus group responded, “It’s the attitude, that it doesn’t matter what people do, it’s just more trouble to deal with it than not, so let’s not deal with it.”

Dimensions of Inequality: Unfair/Unequal Access to/Allocation of Resources

An important dimension of inequality that emerged across the focus groups was unequal and unfair access to and allocation of resources. A key aspect of resource

inequality involves salaries and compensation, but participants also described other areas in which resources were unfairly distributed, including purchase of library materials, assistance from teaching assistants, access to services from support staff, travel money, and “protected time.” Given the greater intrusion of family demands on women’s time, the lack of “protected time” within the university context is particularly problematic.

“Men definitely get more protected time,” a participant in a Senior Women Faculty Focus Group insisted. “They come in with more protected time. I don’t know if they know how to negotiate better than women do, or they’re coached better, or mentored better.”

Women faculty also described heavier workloads, including responsibilities that impinge on research time. A number of participants commented on teaching responsibilities. One senior woman faculty member described allocation of teaching responsibilities in her department in the following manner: “Women tend to do most of the teaching, especially a lot of the core courses. There are many students in these courses and they take a lot of hand holding, and it takes an incredible amount of your time.” In departments with graduate programs, male faculty often have greater responsibility for graduate courses, while female faculty “specialize” in undergraduate teaching. (Admin. FG)

Expectations of informal advice from both undergraduate and graduate students produce an advising overload for women faculty. In part, this situation reflects the fact that the number of women is “so critically low.” In addition, women feel that they carry a disproportionate share of the committee work, although committee assignments reflect a gendered process in which women are assigned to less powerful and less visible committees. Untenured women in particular find it difficult to refuse administrative and

service responsibilities when asked by senior faculty or administrators, even when they realize that accepting these responsibilities will detract from the time available for their research. “Women do the skut work,” several participants observed, further describing their service responsibilities as invisible and undervalued (Junior Women FG). In response to a request to summarize her experience at CWRU in one word, one participant in the Junior Women Focus Group responded: “You asked us to summarize in one word – overworked, overworked and underpaid, maybe uninvited, maybe unwelcome.”

Work/Family Integration

Questions about integrating work and family responsibilities generated a number of concerns among focus group participants. Some issues surrounded responses by colleagues, but discussions of work-family conflict most often emphasized university policies and academic culture. A number of participants argued that family responsibilities undermined their academic careers. As one Senior Faculty Woman Focus Group participant observed, “The whole tenure clock is developed with male careers in mind. It has nothing to do with women.” Or, in the words of a participant in the Mixed Rank-Mixed Gender Focus Group, “the system doesn’t allow you to take time off to have children... and then come back.” This situation applies to fathers who wish to be involved with their families as well as to mothers, although women more often assume primary responsibility for the work of caring for young children, spouses and elderly parents. Men “help,” but women are responsible for seeing that the work of maintaining the household and caring for dependent family members gets done (Senior Women FG). Although family responsibilities are most prevalent in the early (pre-tenure) years of an

academic career, when families are most likely to be caring for very young children, demands for care continue across women's lives.

Family responsibilities pull from the time available to build a research career, at least a research career modeled after the "ideal worker" described by Joan Williams¹ (2000:1). She argues that professional careers implicitly assume a worker "who works full time and overtime and takes little or no time off for childbearing or child rearing." Competing with faculty who have no external demands on their time puts many women at a disadvantage relative to men whose partners manage family responsibilities, a disadvantage that slows women's productivity during key points in their career. As one participant observed that "If you decide to have other responsibilities and have children... you really get penalized from Day 1 because you've taken time out from your tracking for awhile." (Mixed Rank, Mixed Gender Focus Group]

As a result, women are selected out prior to tenure or, if granted tenure, miss out on early salary increases that accumulate across a career of percentage raises. Focus group participants reported that time spent with family is viewed as time away from research, and that pre-tenure women who have children are viewed as "not dedicated," and "lacking in commitment," or as "risk takers" [Junior Faculty Women's Focus Group & Senior Faculty Women's Focus Group] A participant in the Junior Faculty Women's focus group responded to such views in the following way: "It's not about commitment, it's not about personal motivation. I'm committed, I'm motivated, I'm talented, I think I'm pretty good. But you really have to have unlimited time [to be successful in this career.]"

¹ Joan Williams (2000). *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What to Do About It*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Participants acknowledged the availability of parental leave and delays on the tenure clock, although these benefits were cited as another area in which policies differed across management centers and across departments within the same school. Despite official sanction, many participants still believed that taking advantage of parental leave signaled lack of commitment to one's career. One participant in the Male Faculty Focus Group admitted that he would never consider asking for a parental childbirth leave. "Asking for a leave, I guess men are allowed, I wouldn't do it. Even if she were working. Because of the stigma, and the kind of signal it sends.... A signal of lack of seriousness, which is a dangerous signal to send." Several respondents observed that successful academic women are disproportionately single and childless or are more likely to have husbands who place their wives' careers first. In general, parenthood is viewed positively for male faculty but negatively for women faculty:

"When a woman's not here, because she had to take a child to the hospital because he broke a leg, they'll say something like, 'She's not setting her priorities right.'" [Senior Women Faculty Focus Group]

Or, " 'If she's going to be a mother, then she should make a choice. Is she a mother or is she a professional?'" And I've heard over and over again, where 'men are so wonderful because they're babysitting. They're helping their wife.'" [Senior Women Faculty Focus Group]

Managing work and family responsibilities is framed as women's responsibilities but also as individual choice. But, as one participant asks, what are the constraints within which women make these choices? Family responsibilities not only impede women's career progress; but work demands, particularly during the pre-tenure years, can strain

family relationships. “Almost everybody comes in at a junior level married,” observed one participant in the Administrators Focus Group. “The question is how many people at an associate level are still married? That number’s a lot less.”

Still, one participant did find some positive elements arising from competing work-family demands.

I will say, though, that my experience was that in having those [family] limits, it did make me focus my day in a much different way. And I knew that the day ended at five. And I knew that I had x number of things to do, so it was a positive thing, in many ways, in having multiple roles. I think it did mitigate some stress, but it still, there were a lot of times, when I thought if I had another hour, I could really get this paper finished. (Senior Women focus group)

Participants often pointed out that it is women who most often have to make choices between work and family demands. Many participants believed that CWRU reinforces this notion that family is an individual or private responsibility by framing family policies as “for women only.” Some women reported that asking for a year’s extension on the tenure clock because of childbirth was looked at negatively. Others feel that women whose tenure is reviewed at the end of seven rather than six years are expected to have an additional year’s worth of research productivity. “That extra year is counted, sort of, as extra time, and there’s more expectation,” a member of the Senior Faculty Women’s Focus Group explained. Furthermore, current family policies are viewed as inadequate, failing to address issues of equitable family care leaves, affordable childcare, improved family health benefits, and employment options for trailing spouses. Supporting faculty efforts to integrate work and family responsibilities has multiple benefits, as one participant explained,

I found myself in a situation of some family stresses and my department has responded admirably. I think they did it for the best of reasons and not just

humanitarian, but also because my department regarded me as an investment, and this was the best protection of their resources, with that investment in mind, so it can be done. But that was done on the department level, with a Chair who was sensitive to the issues. I think that is rare, unfortunately. [Senior Women's Faculty Group]

Although most primary parents are women and most department chairs are men, it is important to emphasize that awareness of the impact of gendered family responsibilities on career advancement is not a product of male administrators' failing to appreciate women's experiences. Men who are primary parents face the same career constraints as their female counterparts. And not all unsupportive administrators are men. One participant in the Male Faculty Focus Group facetiously suggested the university could endow a "Clarence Thomas Chair" for woman department chairs who argue that gender had no impact on academic career advancement. To assume that all women are supportive and all men lack sensitivity to work/family issues is to fall prey to what the sociologist Cynthia Fuchs Epstein refers to as a deceptive distinction, a difference that appears to be based on gender but is actually based on something else.²

Outcomes

Respondents believe that the issues they raised produced three broad categories of outcomes for women faculty: (1) Negative Everyday Feelings and Experiences; (2) a Leaky Pipeline at CWRU; and (3) Multiple Dimensions of Resource Inequity.

Everyday Experience. Focus group participants described the cumulative effects of everyday experiences, sometimes episodes of major discrimination but more

² CFE, *Deceptive Distinctions*, 1988, New Haven: Yale University Press

often the subtle, routine behaviors that sociologists describe as “microinequalities,” produces negative outcomes for many women faculty. Focus group participants spoke about feeling “isolated,” “unwelcome,” “belittled,” “marginalized,” and “demoralized.” (Junior Women FG & Senior Women FG). They feel like outsiders looking in, disconnected to the everyday life of their departments and the university.

Leaky Pipeline: Several participants reported hearing that the shortage of women in the senior ranks of CWRU faculty was a pipeline issue – that we need to wait for recently hired women to move through the pipeline to full professor rank. Several Senior Faculty Women responded that they had been hearing the same argument for over a decade, sufficient time to swell the ranks of senior positions. “Where did we lose them?” one senior woman asked. “Where have all the women gone?” Participants offered several explanations of the leaky pipeline: (a) difficulties in recruiting qualified women into the current campus climate, (b) problems with retaining women who are hired; and (c) slow promotion, with women faculty members often stuck at the rank of associate professor.

Poor retention was mentioned most frequently. Women leave CWRU, the committee was told – both junior and senior women. And this situation is likely to continue in what one senior woman described as a “yucky environment for women.” As another Senior Woman predicted, “If this university doesn’t create a better climate for women, than women will leave. They will just leave.”

Several participants believe that women are slower to be promoted to Full Professor than are men. One participant in the Senior Women’s Focus Group observed, “For some women, I can see the same qualifications for men and women, and yet

somehow the man is viewed as much more mature and ready for promotion.” Other participants in the same focus group characterized promotion criteria as a Double Standard. One added that women are not considered experts in their field and are still expected to show deference to male colleagues, a pattern that underplays women’s achievements. As she explained, “If you come into the situation with credentials as an authority, you’re still expected to make the guy think it’s his idea. That absolutely blows my mind.”

Resource Inequities. Participants identified multiple dimensions of resource inequities that they had observed at CWRU. Most agreed that women earn lower salaries than male colleagues with comparable records and levels of performance. Women more often have heavier teaching loads, heavier student advising responsibilities, and are assigned to more but less powerful committees. [Mixed Gender, Mixed Rank Focus Group] They are offered administrative opportunities that don’t lead to advancement:

A very interesting thing I notice is that more women tend to have extra paying jobs during the summer. On the first blush that looked good. Here they're having an opportunity to earn more money, but if you think about it, this is the kind of work that is scut work, administrative work that does not contribute to promotion does not contribute to papers and research, and they saddle women with that kind of work. Yes, they may earn a few more dollars, but in the long run, they do not have the opportunity to succeed the way that men do. So we may not be asked to fix the coffee and tea in the department, but the equivalent of those things are being asked of us. And it mounts up after time. [Senior Women Faculty FG]

Despite these heavier workloads, participants believe that women often receive fewer benefits and support resources. Women tend to enter the university with more limited start-up packages. [Mixed Gender Mixed Rank Focus Group] They receive less space, have less access to graduate student assistance, and get fewer services from

support staff. When hired from outside rather than promoted through the ranks, women are hired at lower rank and at lower salary than their accomplishments indicate.

Some participants argued that women faculty lack a sense of entitlement to resources that men take for granted, that they don't get the same level of resources because they don't ask or don't complain. But other women reported that they were reluctant to ask – that women lose if they ask for too much. “If you fight, then you're told to leave or your space is taken away,” one participant in the Mixed Rank-Mixed Gender Focus Group explained. As discussed above, the secrecy characterizing salary and other resource negotiations at a private university also contributes to gender inequities.

Solutions Suggested by Focus Group Participants

Focus group participants offered a range of solutions to the concerns regarding gender equity. Some were individual level solutions, suggesting that women need to change or adapt to the demands of academic careers and the organizational realities of a research university like CWRU. “There are systems in which power isn't given, it's taken, and we have to figure out how to take it ... if people don't take responsibility for their own careers and their own lives, nobody else is going to do it.” [Mixed Gender Mixed Rank.]

Other solutions focused on changing CWRU's organizational structure and culture. Some problems are localized within a particular department or school, whereas others permeate the culture of the entire university. Some of these system-level solutions have already been implemented and others are recommendations for future change.

Individual-Level Solutions: Individual-level solutions identify the source of gender inequality in the choices, skills, or other behaviors of CWRU faculty. Most participants offering individual-level solutions pointed to areas in which women faculty need to change.

- Participants recommended that women need to become better at networking and forging ties with other women.
- Women faculty are encouraged to become better at self-promotion and to learn not to internalize criticism.
- They also need to be better at negotiating and bargaining for resources, both when they are hired and at key points in their careers.
- Faculty need to realize when they come here that “everything is negotiable.... It’s just the way... it works. I think that most often women don’t come in with the idea that you have to be your own best advocate, because if you don’t ask for it, it’s not going to be offered to you.” [Senior Women Faculty Focus Group]

System-Level Solutions. Participants suggested a range of organizational changes that would enhance gender equity at CWRU.

- A major theme is the need to replace “secret side deals” with open policies that are applied uniformly.
- Another set of recommendations focused on resources – salaries that are competitive nationally, improved health care benefits for faculty and their families, and a tenure and reward system that incorporates family trajectories.

- A recommendation emerging from one focus group was to establish a separate fund to address inequities in salaries and other resources.
- Attention to the pipeline issues described above would address the reported need for more senior women to serve as mentors, more women in administrative roles, and more women on the board of trustees. One participant in a Senior Women's Faculty Focus Group suggested a campaign urging alumnae to withhold contributions until some of these goals were met.
- All members of the CWRU community need to make an effort to move beyond the stereotype that maturity and authority are male characteristics.
- Mechanisms for addressing perceived inequities need to be instituted. One participant in a Senior Women's Focus Group suggested an "ombudsperson," whereas another called for an "ethics officer with teeth."

In summary, administrators are encouraged to see faculty as an investment and to embrace approaches that value pluralism rather than force all faculty careers into a single mold. Several participants emphasized the point that supportive work environments can empower faculty to overcome obstacles to productivity:

It's a general faculty development issue.... I mean there are a variety of reasons why people stop being productive. We're as prone to marital problems, alcoholism and other stresses of life as any other professions, but if you go to Ford Motor Company, they have programs to deal with this.... Very, very few faculty will go to the employment assistance programs. It's not that we haven't built it in as part of our culture, we haven't acknowledged it. (Admin. FG)

Others also made the point that in many instances solutions should be framed as an overall faculty development issue. For example, in response to the question, 'If you

had one minute to talk to President Wagner about how to improve the situation for women faculty at CWRU, what would you say?' one participant said "I would like the president to focus on faculty development. I wouldn't focus on improving the lot of women. I think really we have to improve the lot of all faculty on campus, and the factors that we've identified that are hurting women, even if they don't directly affect men, are affecting all faculty on campus." (Admin. FG)

Positive Comments

While we attempted to frame the questions used to guide the focus groups in a neutral fashion, the discussion in all focus groups was largely devoted to areas in which CWRU falls short or needs improvement. One participant called attention to what she perceived as a lack of balance in the discussion, saying

I feel what has been missing is a positive note in here. I feel that I have been bellyaching more than I do normally. And this discourse, this victim discourse, is somewhat uncomfortable to me. At the same time, I know I'm looking to share problems because that's what we can look at. So I would like to just have it be noted that I feel more balanced, and I have a sense that that may be true of others, too, than I've been able to express. We've gotten more into problem mode. The questions have fostered that." (Junior Women FG).

This sentiment was not uniform, for this comment was immediately followed by another participant stating "I think I possibly don't feel that way. Possibly because I live with the exemplar of what I would love my professional life to be like, you know if I had the resources that were available to my husband."

And indeed, positive comments were made. For example, one participant noted that "My years really have been gratifying. And yet, we talked about a lot of negative things. I feel I've had a lot of blessings here." (Senior Women focus group) Another

respondent agreed with the above comment and said that many things have been done well and she believed that there have been attempts to make the CWRU environment “more positive”; eg, “there are many wonderful things that have [happened in my career] because of it [CWRU environment]” (Senior Women FG)

Another participant pointed out that it is important to distinguish between the University as a whole and its various components:

My comment would probably be to look carefully at the culture within the various departments on campus, because my feeling is that this university on a whole does a very good job with issues that have to do with women’s rights and benefits and that the problems that exist are localized in various problem cases. Those things need to be identified and dealt with. How I don’t know.(Admin. FG)

Other participants emphasized that the climate at CWRU is not static, but is changing for the better.

Looking back, I can say compared to 25 years ago at this university—just comparing today’s committee meetings with committee meetings 25 years ago—things are better. Twenty-five years ago, there were a lot of sexual jokes, inappropriate comments, incredibly Neanderthal-like behavior. It doesn’t happen today on university committees. I mean there are a lot of other problems, but the consciousness is really been raised. And at least in committee meetings, things are much different than they were, and so I think that should be recognized, too. (Admin. FG)

Changes for the better were also noted in regard to allocation of resources:

My observation today is that the junior faculty in our school get access to a lot of research money that is internally generated. You know they get initiation grants....there are two or three different grants they can get within our school, and actually more of the foundation money that’s brought in is brought in by the women junior faculty than even the women tenured faculty....I think there’s a lot of push by the research structure within our school to try to help with that (research) with junior faculty on the whole. And we’re nowhere near where we should be, but, of course, we’re a hell of lot further along than we were ten years ago. But I think just mentoring and coaching really helps and it’s hard to create. (Admin. FG)

Recommendations

The data presented in this report are rich in their implications for CWRU as community and as an institution. This is true at all levels, from that of the individual faculty member to the central administration.

As such, our first and major recommendation is for the widest possible dissemination and discussion of this report. Many of the negative experiences reported by focus group participants reflect lack of awareness rather than overt discrimination or hostility towards women faculty. We believe that increased awareness of the spectrum of issues raised by the focus group participants will in itself result in a significant improvement in CWRU's environment. This will happen in several ways. First, even a casual reading of the report makes it clear that many faculty members feel isolated and marginalized. Wide dissemination of the report should make it clear to many faculty members that they are not alone, and that the challenges they perceive are often generic, not personal. Second, the discussions reported here provide important glimpses into the way CWRU functions as an institution. Widespread dissemination of the report will thus empower individual faculty members by calling their attention to possibilities that it is clear many are unaware of.

Dissemination and individual reading of the report is not, however, sufficient. As a second recommendation, we encourage the widespread discussion of the report at all levels of the university. By promoting an atmosphere of awareness of how CWRU functions and is perceived to function, and an environment in which these issues can be discussed and addressed, the likelihood of unconscious or inadvertent discrimination, or

the appearance thereof, will be significantly diminished. Further, such discussion is likely to lead to additional concrete initiatives for improving the functioning of the University. We recommend that every academic unit (e.g. school, department, division) discuss the report and formulate a response, with recommendations, to be submitted to the Provost.

CWRU's response to this report needs, however, to go beyond dissemination and discussion. Many of the issues raised here are symptomatic of what appears to be significant under-investment in training both faculty and administrators for the positions they hold. Coaching and mentoring of all faculty, but particularly Chairs and Administrators, will improve CWRU's performance across the board, and will in particular provide increased sensitivity to and confrontation of the issues raised in this report. At the same time, there is a need for developing systems for holding administrators accountable for their actions.

It will also be necessary to identify the resources to implement such changes, as well as to support the various specific and systemic initiatives we expect to result from the widespread discussion of this document.

The focus groups reported reflect the perceptions of the participants, and many of the recommendations outlined above most directly address these perceptions. But there remains the question of to what extent these perceptions are rooted in reality. This can only come from detailed analysis of specific issues, which in the end will require both resources and time. Some of these will be addressed in the second phase of the Resource Equity Study, but it is essential that these and related studies be adequately supported.

We believe that this report provides a kind of snapshot of perceptions of CWRU as an institution and as a community. As we move forward in addressing the problems identified as a result of this report, it will be important to provide similar studies in the future, benchmarking the progress we make.

In closing, we note that many of the issues raised in this study are likely to be common to other major research universities. By responding to this report in a creative and pro-active manner, CWRU has the opportunity to take a leading role in creating an environment that fosters the full development, professional advancement and recognition, not only of all members of our own University community, but throughout academia.

Appendix 1. Equity Study Committee Charge

**CWRU Equity Study Committee
Charge**

Case Western Reserve University seeks to foster the full development, professional advancement and recognition of all members of our community.

The CWRU Equity Study Committee will develop and implement methodologies for determining the extent to which these goals are realized, and perceived to be realized. These methodologies and studies will address issues of resources, including salary as well other factors such as teaching assignments, space allocations and other environmental resources. The Committee's studies will also address other issues of faculty structure, welfare and effectiveness such as professional activity, community service, diversity, recruitment and retention. While particular emphasis will be given to issues of possible gender bias at the faculty level, it is expected that the methodologies and studies can be used as the basis for the analysis of other diversity issues on campus.

In order to maximize the utility of the Committee's work, the CWRU Equity Study Committee will report to the President, the Provost, the President's Advisory Council on Women in the University, and the Faculty Senate, and will consult with other bodies as appropriate.

1 February 2001

Appendix 2. CWRU IRB Application: CWRU Gender Equity Study

CWRU IRB Application: CWRU Gender Equity Study

1. Identification and recruitment of subjects. This 2-part study, commissioned by the Faculty Senate, will investigate the academic resources available to faculty on the CWRU campus. One approach involves analyzing faculty salary data to describe current characteristics and determine discrepancies and any systematic biases by gender; the second approach involves interviewing faculty about their perceptions of (a) the distribution of departmental and university resources by gender and (b) barriers, both formal and informal, that women faculty encounter in their careers as they move through the professorial ranks.

Enrollment of subjects varies according to the two parts of the study:

Part 1. Statistical analysis. For the approach involving the statistical analysis of salary data, data will be obtained for *all* faculty members from the Provost's office with the help of Phillip Brown, Assistant to the Provost. He will ensure that no names are attached to the data, but they will be identified by school, department, rank, race, gender, time of service, highest degree, and year of terminal degree.

Part 2. Focus groups. For the second part, in an effort to examine equity issues from an in-depth, yet varied perspective, the committee will use nonprobability purposive sampling designed to select key informants (faculty members) who are known to be aware of and/or interested in gender equity issues on the CWRU campus. Every effort, however, also will be made to include faculty from all ranks and all management centers and one group will be composed of minority faculty. The committee members will generate a list of key faculty with input from Margaretmary Daley, Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Women Faculty. The selected subjects will be contacted by letter, which will explain the purpose of the study, all procedures of the focus group and data analysis, the risks and benefits, and the voluntary nature of participation (Appendix). If the subject does not respond to the letter, a follow-up phone call and/or email will be used to ascertain the subject's ability/ willingness to attend the focus group. If the potential subject declines to participate, (s)he will be asked to provide an explanation, although this is not mandatory. This information will be incorporated into the design of future studies. Participants will sign the consent form prior to the beginning of the focus group session.

2. Special subject population to be used: CWRU Faculty.

3. Rationale for special subject population. CWRU faculty members are required subjects for this study. All co-investigators are current CWRU faculty members and all are sensitive to the risks to subjects in this study, particularly the participation in the focus groups. Yet the results of the recent Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) study (Attachment C) provide a compelling rationale for using focus group interviews. MIT found that salary data failed to adequately capture the experiences of women faculty members' access to academic resources; e.g., lab space, travel funds, and graduate students.

4. The study does not involve deception.

5. Confidentiality of data gathered through sound-recording devices. Confidentiality will be maintained in the following manner. All focus group sessions will be tape-recorded and personnel will be hired to transcribe the audio data to hard copy typed data. No identifying information will be included in the audio recordings. After transcription is completed, the moderator and facilitator, both of whom are members of the Gender Equity Committee, will add information about participants' schools, division, and rank. No other identifying information will be included in the written transcriptions. Maintaining confidentiality of the data will be handled in the following manner. 1) After consent is obtained and before beginning the focus group, the group's leader will instruct participants to avoid identifying themselves or other persons by name and to avoid other types of self-identification if at all possible. 2) Respondents will be instructed to keep confidential all information that emerges during the focus group sessions. Procedures for maintaining confidentiality during the transcription and analysis processes are described above. Focus group audio tape recordings will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the Primary Investigator's (PI) [Patricia A. Higgins] office until the research is completed. The tape recordings will then be destroyed.

6. Confidentiality of consent forms and all data. The PI will be responsible for storing the consent forms and all data. The signed consent forms and the data will be stored in the separate locked file cabinets. No personal identifiers will be included on the data files and all electronic data will be maintained in a secure computer file. The PI will be in charge of the electronic copies of both the quantitative (salary) data and the qualitative (focus group transcripts) data. Committee members will have access to electronic salary data files for the purpose of quantitative analysis. The PI also will store all hard copies of the qualitative data in a locked file in her office and REC members will have access to the hard copies of transcripts only for coding and analyzing the data.

7. Risks. The precautions in this study that will be used to minimize risk in the focus group sessions are described in the protocol and the letter to the subjects (Attachment C). Participant concerns about confidentiality of their comments will be minimized by the procedures for maintaining confidentiality described in this application. The nature of the project will be fully explained to all informants and any questions they have will be fully answered by the moderator. No individual will be subjected to any pressure to participate in the research study or to answer any questions they may not wish to answer. Informants may leave the focus group at any time without sustaining any adverse consequences.

8. Benefits. Several benefits will accrue from participation in the focus groups. Consistent with the results of the MIT study, we anticipate that participants who may have encountered gender-related barriers in their career development will benefit from hearing insights and experiences of other CWRU faculty. The opportunity to express any concerns in a secure and supportive environment is also a benefit of participation.

9. Summary. See Attachment B.

10. Written consent will be obtained from all focus group participants.

11. Consent will not be obtained from non-English speaking subjects.

12. Responsible Investigator: Patricia Higgins, RN, PhD; Co-Investigators: Sara Debanne, PhD; Eleanor Stoller, PhD; Cyrus Taylor, PhD; Kathy Wisner, MD. A 5th committee member will be named to replace Kathy Wisner when her resignation becomes effective Spring, 2001.

13. Written consent form. See Attachment D.

Appendix 3. CWRU IRB Application: Summary of the Study

Summary of the Study

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to describe the experiences of women faculty related to discrimination on the Case Western Reserve University (CWRU) campus. This 2-part study, commissioned by the Faculty Senate, involves 1) an analysis of faculty salary data in order to describe current characteristics, discrepancies and any systematic biases; and 2) focus group interviews of faculty members about their perceptions of the environment for women on the CWRU campus. Although CWRU graduate and undergraduate student populations include substantial numbers of women, and since 1987 recruitment of CWRU faculty has emphasized affirmative action efforts, an analysis of the gender composition of the faculty shows that the percent of women on faculty remains relatively flat or fixed (Jentoff, 2000). For the academic year beginning in Fall 2000, women represented 29% of the faculty, a percentage that is unchanged from 1998-99.

There is little published information about the discrimination of women in academia. Thus, this study is anchored in the findings of a previous study, 'A Study on the Status of Women Faculty in Science at MIT,' conducted at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), 1995-1999. Dr. Nancy Hopkins, Professor and chair of the first MIT committee (1995-1997), was responsible for much of the data collection and analysis and the final report. In her visit to CWRU in September, 2000, she met with numerous CWRU groups, including the Resource Equity Committee (REC). The gist of her findings are included the following points about women faculty in science (MIT, 1999, p. 4):

1. Junior women felt well supported within their department and most do not believe that gender bias will impact their careers.
2. In contrast to junior women, senior women feel marginalized and excluded from a significant role in their departments. Marginalization increases as they progress through their careers.
3. Discrimination against women scientists existed on many levels, including salary and access to resources (eg., space, resources for research, teaching obligations).
4. The discrimination is both conscious and unconscious.
5. These patterns of marginalization and discrimination repeat themselves in successive generations of women faculty.

The research questions for the CWRU study are:

1. Is there salary equity for women at CWRU?
2. Are there discrepancies between men and women faculty and their access to academic resources?
3. Are there perceived barriers that are embedded in the CWRU organizational culture and/or institutional practices?

Research Design and Subjects:

A cross-sectional, multi-method design will be used for this two-part study, in which 1) the most recent salary data from *all* faculty will be collected and analyzed and 2) for the focus groups, purposive sampling will be used to select subjects for one-time focus groups. In order to maximize discussion, but also represent a range of the faculty, the composition of each of the 5 focus groups will be determined by rank and gender: 1) tenured women faculty (\geq rank_Associate

Professor); 2) pre-tenure women faculty (\leq rank of Assistant Professor); 3) mixed rank, women faculty; 4) mixed rank, male faculty; 5) mixed gender.

Procedure

Part 1. Salary data. Salary data will be abstracted from university records for all faculty. To preserve confidentiality, Resource Equity Committee (REC) members will not directly verify any of the salary data (i.e., they will only have access to coded data). Data collected from this study comprise variables measured on continuous, ordinal and categorical scales. Univariate (e.g., frequencies, means, standard deviations) analyses will be conducted for descriptive purposes and to verify accuracy of the data set. Our multivariate statistical analysis of this data set will follow suggested guidelines in the *Higher Education Salary Evaluation Kit* prepared by the American Association of University Professors. Results will be reported in aggregate form only, in a manner that precludes identification of individual faculty, e.g., we will not report the salary of a female assistant professor in a department that includes only one woman at that rank.

Part 2. Focus groups. Each focus group will consist of six to eight participants, small enough to facilitate full participation but large enough to provide diversity of perspectives. Focus group conversations will be audio-recorded. Participants in these groups will be encouraged to act as Key Informants, relating not only their own experience but also that of colleagues at CWRU. The goal of the focus groups is to identify the range of experiences rather than document the prevalence of distribution of any particular experience. Members of the Resource Equity Committee will moderate focus groups. REC members will be trained in the facilitation of focus groups by Eleanor Stoller, Ph.D., a committee member who has conducted focus groups in previous research investigations. The format will follow that of Krueger and King (1997). For each group, a second committee member will serve as a facilitator, who will record observations regarding group dynamics and monitor recording equipment.

The interview guide for the focus group sessions consists of five questions:

1. How do you think the experience of being a faculty member at CWRU is different for women than it is for men?
2. Does gender make any difference in access to resources for faculty at CWRU – things like salary, travel money, teaching loads, committee assignments, lab space, access to clerical or other support, institutional research funds, sabbatical or other leaves?
3. Do you think gender makes any difference in everyday interaction among faculty, between faculty and administrators, or between faculty and staff? Do people notice gender when they talk with one another?
4. Does the impact of family life differ for men and women faculty? Do women and men face different issues in balancing work and family demands?
5. Do you think the issues facing women faculty change across the academic career – as we/they move from assistant professor to full professor?

After completing the interview guide, the moderator will conclude the session with two concluding questions, each of which will be asked in a round-robin manner. (1) Suppose you had one minute to talk to President Auston about how to improve the situation for women faculty at CWRU. What would you say? and (2) Have we missed anything? Is there anything we should have asked but didn't?

After convening the focus group and obtaining consent, the group's leader will instruct participants to avoid identification of self or others during the discussion. If a participant identifies her/himself or another faculty member during the group, the group leader will remind the group of the need for confidentiality and the typist will be instructed to delete names when preparing the transcripts. Trained personnel will be hired to transcribe the tape recordings (audio data) to print data. The Primary Investigator (PI) or one of the Co-Investigators will supervise transcription. The PI will save all consent forms for three years; after which time they will be destroyed.

Audio recordings of the sessions will be made, with the informed consent of the participants. A debriefing session between the moderator and facilitator, after each focus group session, provides an opportunity for the moderator and facilitator to share first impressions, summarize key findings, and compare each session with previous sessions. Tapes of the focus group and debriefing sessions will be transcribed. All names, both of participants and other people mentioned during the focus groups, will be deleted from the transcripts. Tapes and transcripts will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the office of the P.I., who is also the chair of the Gender Equity Committee. Tapes will be destroyed at the conclusion of the research.

Standard methods of content analysis will be applied to the transcripts and narratives. Coding will be limited to members of the Gender Equity Committee; no other persons will be given copies of the focus group transcripts. Line-by-line coding will yield a set of descriptive codes reflecting attitudes and experiences regarding the impact of gender on career experiences of CWRU faculty. We will use the constant comparative method of analysis to generate theoretically grounded constructs based on these codes. Transcriptions and narratives will then be recoded and summarized relative to these grounded constructs and associated codes. Theoretical memos will be generated as insights regarding the constructs and codes are elaborated. Illustrative segments of textual data will be attached to each code. These "chunks" of textual data will be used to devise questionnaire items for a future faculty survey designed to determine the prevalence and distribution of particular attitudes and experiences identified through the focus groups.

After all data are analyzed, a final report will be written and submitted to the Provost and the Faculty Senate. The report will include documentation of all findings, suggestions for policy implications, and recommendations for future studies.

References

American Association of University Professors. Higher Education Salary Evaluation Kit.

Krueger, R. A. & King, J. A. (1997). Involving Community Members in Focus Groups. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc.

Jentoff, J. (October 25, 2000). [CWRU] Faculty Progress Report for Affirmative Action Programs for the 1999-2000 Academic Year.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1999). A Study on the Status of Women Faculty in Science at MIT.

Appendix 4. CWRU IRB Application: Draft Letter to prospective participants

January 8, 2001

Dear Faculty Colleague,

Thank you for agreeing to review information about the CWRU Gender Equity study. The purpose of this study is to obtain your opinions about faculty resource equity issues at Case Western Reserve University (CWRU). We hope this information will help you decide whether or not to participate in a focus group. As a participant in a focus group, you will be asked to provide your opinion about such issues as salary equity and support for research; e.g., laboratory space, availability of graduate students, access to travel funds. You will also be asked about the informal campus culture and the impact of family life on career advancement.

The Resource Equity Committee (REC) is conducting this study for the CWRU Faculty Senate, which passed a resolution to investigate salary equity issues. The REC designed a two-part study. The first part includes statistical analysis of faculty salary data coded by the Provost's office to protect confidentiality; and the second, collection and analysis of data obtained through five focus groups. The REC members (listed below) will conduct all focus groups and data analysis for both parts of the study.

The focus groups will meet on campus at an undisclosed location known only to the group members. We anticipate that each group will have 6-8 participants and the meeting will last approximately 1-2 hours. To the extent possible, the discussions will proceed so as to permit the participants themselves to set the structure and content of what will be discussed. All focus group sessions will be tape recorded but your name will not be tape recorded and will not be known to the person transcribing the tapes. You will be asked *not to use* either your own name or the names of *any others* during the group sessions. Your name will be known, however, to the principal investigator and the focus group leader and possibly, to other faculty who are members of your group. You may decide not to participate in particular portions of the discussion, and you may withdraw from participation in the group at any time during the session.

You will be asked to sign a consent form and complete a demographic sheet about you and your employment status at CWRU. Completion of the demographic information is optional and it will be used in the final report to describe the composition of members of the focus groups in general terms. Consent forms and data will be kept in locked file cabinets in the office of the Principal Investigator, Patricia A. Higgins. A copy of the consent form is attached.

Sincerely,

The CWRU Resource Equity Committee

Patricia A. Higgins, Chair, Nursing
Sara M. Debanne, Epidemiology and Biostatistics
Eleanor P. Stoller, Sociology
Cyrus C. Taylor, Physics
Katherine L. Wisner, Medicine

Appendix 5. CWRU IRB Application: Informed Consent form

INFORMED CONSENT: CWRU Gender Equity Study

To Prospective Focus Group Participants

The decision to take part in this study is entirely up to you. The following description of the study is intended to give you a basis for making your decision.

This is a study conducted by the Resource Equity Committee and commissioned by the Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Women at CWRU. We are conducting five focus groups focusing on the impact of gender on the experiences of being a faculty member at CWRU. The focus group discussions will center on access to resources; informal interaction among faculty, between faculty and administrators, and between faculty and staff; the impact of family life on career advancement; and any changes in gender issues across the academic career (i.e., as people progress through the academic ranks). Finally, we will ask you to complete a brief questionnaire with demographic background information, which we will aggregate in reporting the characteristics of participants as a group.

If you do decide to participate in this study, you may change your mind at anytime. You can elect not to participate in any phase of the conversation, and you may leave the room at any time. The primary risk to subjects is a potential loss of confidentiality due to other participants in the focus group, who may ignore instructions to keep confidential any information that emerges during the focus group discussions. You can be sure that your name will NEVER be publicly identified with your responses in our report. After the study is complete, you will be entitled to a full explanation of our results. There also is the added inconvenience of a commitment of approximately 1-2 hours for participation in a focus group. The primary benefits of your participation are that you will have the opportunity to meet in a safe environment and define areas of concern related to CWRU equity issues related to the ultimate goal of the study, an improvement of the CWRU academic environment.

The interview is part of a Case Western Reserve University research project. If you have any questions about the project at any time, please feel free to contact Dr. Patricia Higgins, Chair of the Resource Equity Committee, at (216) 368-8850. If you would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s) about; (1) concerns regarding this study, (2) research participant rights, (3) research-related injuries, or (4) other human subjects issues, please contact Case Western Reserve University's Office of Research Administration at (216) 368-4510 or write: Case Western Reserve University Office of Research Administration 10900 Euclid Ave. Cleveland, OH 44106-7015.

All my questions regarding this study have been satisfactorily answered. I have read the above description and would like to participate in this study. I understand that I will receive a copy of this Informed Consent form for my records.

Participant's Signature

Date

I understand that the information obtained from this participant is confidential.

Moderator's Signature

Date

Appendix 6. Demographic Information Card

Demographic Information

1. Gender: Female Male

2. Ethnicity:
 - a. African-American Caucasian Asian Native American Pacific Islander/Other

 - b. Hispanic Non-Hispanic

3. Terminal degree _____

4. Rank: Instructor Assistant Professor Associate Professor Professor

5. Years in rank at CWRU _____ (count only full years completed)

6. CWRU years of service _____

7. Tenure status: Tenured Not tenured/in tenure track Non-tenure track

8. Department/School _____

Appendix 7. Selected Demographics for all Contacts

The following tables summarize aspects of the demographics of those invited to participate in the focus groups as well as the demographics of the actual participants. Participants were asked to provide this information on a short survey card distributed at the beginning of each focus group. In some cases, participants did not provide all of the requested information.

	Focus group participants (N=47)	All contacts (N=90)
	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)
GENDER:		
Female	34 (72%)	62 (69%)
Male	13 (28%)	28 (31%)
ETHNICITY:	(Per self-report)	(Data not obtained)
African-American	1 (2%)	
Asian	2 (4%)	
Caucasian	40 (85%)	
Missing/no response	4 (9%)	
UNIVERSITY CONTRACT:		
Pre-tenure	13 (28%)	15 (17%)
Tenured	29 (62%)	41 (46%)
Non-tenure track	5 (10%)	3 (3%)
Unknown		31 (34%)
MANAGEMENT CTR	(Per self-report)	
Arts & Sciences	14 (30%)	27 (30%)
Dentistry	0	2 (2%)
Engineering	1 (2%)	10 (11%)
Law School	2 (4%)	5 (6%)
Medicine	15 (32%)	28 (31%)
MSASS	2 (4%)	2 (2%)
Nursing	1 (2%)	3 (3%)
WSOM	8 (17%)	10 (11%)
Missing	4 (9%)	
Unknown		3(3%)
TERMINAL DEGREE	(Per self-report)	(Official data not obtained)
JD	3 (6%)	
MD	3 (6%)	
MD/PhD	2 (4%)	
DOCTORATE (Phd, ND, ScD)	37 (79%)	
Missing	2 (4%)	
ADMIN POSITION?		
Yes	5 (11%)	15 (17%)
No	42 (89%)	75 (83%)

	Focus group participants (N=47)	All contacts (N=90)
	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)
RANK	(Per self-report)	(Official data not obtained)
Instructor	1 (2%)	
Asst Professor	14 (30%)	
Assoc Professor	15 (32%)	
Professor	17 (36%)	
YEARS IN RANK (Completed)	(Per self-report)	(Official data not obtained)
0 - 1	3 (6%)	
2 - 4	15 (32%)	
5 - 8	19 (40%)	
9 - 11	5 (11%)	
12 - 17	0	
18+	4 (9%)	
Missing	1 (2%)	
CWRU YEARS	(Per self-report)	(Official data not obtained)
2 - 4	12 (25%)	
5 - 8	13 (28%)	
9 - 15	10 (21%)	
16 - 25	9 (19%)	
26+	3 (6%)	
RESPONSE (To request to participate in focus group)		
Yes		55 (61%)
No		13 (14%)
No response		22 (24%)
REASON FOR NON-PARTICIPATION (Volunteered)		
(Too) new in faculty position		1
No longer affiliated w CWRU		1
Other commitments		4
Concern about consequences		1

Appendix 8. Schedule for Focus Group Meetings

Schedule for Focus Group Meetings

1. Introductory activities
 - a. Consent forms
 - b. Demographic Information Cards
2. Call to order by moderator
 - a. Introduction of moderator and facilitator and explanation of their roles
 - b. Review of procedures: audio-taping, upholding confidentiality, time
3. Explanation of our goal: Solicit the broadest range of ideas on women's experiences: 1) techniques for survival in the current system; and 2) suggested approaches for changing the inherent gender bias built into the organizational structure; DO NOT SEEK to reach a consensus.
4. To get the group started, suggested first question:
 - a. Why did you choose to participate?
5. Follow-up questions (from IRB summary):
 1. How do you think the experience of being a faculty member at CWRU is different for women than it is for men?
 2. Does gender make any difference in access to resources for faculty at CWRU – things like salary, travel money, teaching loads, committee assignments, lab space, access to clerical or other support, institutional research funds, sabbatical or other leaves?
 3. Do you think gender makes any difference in everyday interaction among faculty, between faculty and administrators, or between faculty and staff? Do people notice gender when they talk with one another?
 4. Does the impact of family life differ for men and women faculty? Do women and men face different issues in balancing work and family demands?
 5. Do you think the issues facing women faculty change across the academic career – as we/they move from assistant professor to full professor?
6. Closing: two questions, each of which is asked in a round-robin manner. (1) Suppose you had one minute to talk to President Auston about how to improve the situation for

women faculty at CWRU. What would you say? and (2) Have we missed anything? Is there anything we should have asked but didn't?

March 12, 2001

Appendix 9. Sample Introductory Script for Focus Group Moderators

INTRODUCING THE FOCUS GROUP

We'd like to welcome you to the Senior Women Faculty Focus Group and thank you for taking the time to join us in our discussion of the impact of gender on the experiences of CWRU faculty. My name is _____ and this is _____. Both of us are members of the Resource Equity Committee, which was established originally by the Senate Committee on the Status of Women Faculty.

We're interested in learning about what it is like to be a senior woman on the CWRU Faculty. We've invited senior women from different parts of the university to share their thoughts and ideas. We are particularly interested in your views because you have had a number of years of experience at CWRU, and we want to tap into those experiences.

Today we'll be discussing your thoughts and opinions about life as a senior woman on the CWRU faculty. Basically we want to know about the challenges and resources that shape the experiences of senior women and what might be done to facilitate your work situation. We would like you to share your own experiences but also represent the experiences of colleagues who may not participate in one of our focus groups. We want to learn about your perception of the more general environment on campus as well as your particular experiences.

There are no wrong answers to the questions we raise but rather different points of view. Please feel free to share your point of view even if it differs from what others might have said. We are trying to capture the range of experiences – not reach consensus on each point.

Before we begin, let me suggest some things to make our discussion more productive. Please speak up – but only one person should talk at a time. We're tape recording the session, because we don't want to miss any of your comments. We've assigned each of you a letter of the alphabet – your letter is written on the "tent" placed on the table in front of you. We'll be addressing you by letter, and we ask you to do the same. We will carefully edit out any identifying information from the focus group transcripts. And all of us signed a pledge of confidentiality – none of the comments made during these sessions will ever be attributed to individuals or described in such a way that identification of the speaker is possible.

My role here is to ask questions and listen. _____'s is to record the order of speakers (identified only by letter) and to facilitate our discussion. Neither of us will be participating in the conversation, but we want you to feel free to talk with one another.

I'll be asking about five or six questions, and I'll be moving the discussion from one question to the next. There is a tendency in these discussions for some people to talk a lot and some people not to say much. But it is important for us to hear from each of you tonight, because you have different experiences. So if one of you is sharing a lot, I may ask you to let others talk. And if you're not saying much, I may ask your opinion.

Let's begin. Let's find out more about each other by going around the table. We'd like each of you to tell us briefly – in a sentence or two – why you agreed to participate in this session. Let's begin with person "A."

Appendix 10. Focus Group Note Card Data

Note Card Data

Senior women-1:

1. Sad
2. Bad – undercut and time wasted. Good- colleagues of integrity
3. Mixed
4. Frustrating
5. Difficult
6. Degrading

Senior women-2:

1. Less recognized here than outside the university
2. Hard work, but stimulating and satisfying
3. Marginalized
4. Persistence
5. Gratifying
6. Challenging

Junior women:

1. Uninvited
2. Opportunity
3. Challenging!!! And stimulating
4. Such mixed feelings: richness of community, loneliness and isolation
5. Professional black hole
6. Frustrating!
7. Overworked, underpaid, underappreciated
8. Exhausting

Men – mixed rank:

1. Exasperating
2. An organization that does not know its direction
3. Generally positive - sometimes frustrating
4. Overall, they are positive but frustrating due to the lack of change
5. It has eaten me alive

Mixed gender, mixed rank:

1. Generally positive with a bright outlook for the future
2. Stimulating
3. On balance-very satisfying (in ways other than \$)
4. Adequate
5. Challenging and to date, rewarding

6. Difficult to cope with
7. I have benefited from an environment that facilitated my productivity

Administrators:

1. Stimulating and fulfilling
2. An uphill battle in the struggle for equity
3. Discovering with others
4. Rewarding but exhausting
5. Tough

Appendix 11. Descriptive Codes for scoring focus group transcripts

COMBINED CODES – Revision 3

NOTE: Code both positive and negative examples of a particular code.

A. External Environment → CWRU. These codes relate to the impact of academic careers and research universities in general on the experiences of people at CWRU. Material coded here should illustrate the way in which experiences at CWRU are affected by the external environment.

1. Faculty Career Trajectories are Gendered.

Examples:

- Jobs structured to promote certain kinds of bodies.
- Tenure is a gendered institution: tenure track schedule is engineered for men
- Jobs developed with male careers in mind
- Gendered career paths: different for men and women
- Myth of the ideal worker

2. CWRU as a Research University

a. Teaching trivialized

Teaching as devalued labor

b. Only one career path.

- All-or-nothing system.
- Grueling and unfriendly tenure process
- Rising bar for tenure.

c. External networks

- Gold-old-boy networks limits women's recognition.
- Women are less likely to be self-promoting.

3. Societal assumption of a certain family structure

4. Women's contributions devalued in a larger community

B. Internal Environment

1. Token Dynamics

- Lack of a critical mass of women
- Lack of women in engineering
- Seen as representative of a group, a symbol or stand-in for all women

Women aware of being the underclass
 Too few women – stand out but overlooked
 Social exclusion: “Urinal connection” (Exclusion from informal male networks)

2. Everything is Negotiated

a. Secrecy

Cloak of private university.
 Administration controls information

b. Shifting Sands

No clear rules
 Shifting standards re qualifications for admin positions.
 Standards change as women advance.

c. Side deals

Decisions made in secrecy.
 Women excluded from secret “side” deals.
 Some men excluded from secret “side” deals
 Women not taught how to negotiate.

d. Unequal application of rules and procedures

Systems/rules not applied with equity, flexibility

e. Inadequate explanations of options at hire.

f. No accountability

3. Hierarchical, Elitist Structure

a. Rank privilege

Adjuncts as secondary faculty group.
 Full professors have inordinate power/influence.
 Full profs “lord it over others.”
 University run by full professors, others have little impact.

b. “Star system”

Privileges lavished on senior “stars”
 Success generates jealousy

c. Interaction of Rank and Gender

Rank privilege available to men, but not women.
 Gender power differences exaggerated in gender-linked hierarchy.
 Intersection between gender & rank magnifies inequalities.
 Attribution of looking too young. Mistaken for student.
 Infantilizing of women – “not quite ready.”
 Disproportionate segregation of women into instructor positions
 Women use rank to treat others inappropriately

d. Interlocking Inequalities [It’s not just gender]

Not safe for lesbians: heterosexist environment, exclusion from male club.

CWRU: heterosexual, male club: male world.

CWRU stratified along multiple dimensions.

Lack of diversity

Lack of diversity awareness
 Pervasive racism, subtle and unsubtle
 No formal organizational mechanisms for sensitivity training for faculty
 Class differences

e. Too few women, too few at top.

Composition/leadership of board of trustees
 Scarcity of women at upper ranks.
 Struggle to find women to serve on senior committees
 No role models.
 Too few women in university administration.

4. Experience of Faculty Differentiated by Gender

a. Interaction with others (Formal and Informal)

(1) With other faculty

Social exclusion:
 “Urinal connection” (Exclusion from informal male networks)
 Behaviors hidden beneath cloak of academic freedom
 Intentional exclusion.
 Incivility, lack of respect, rudeness by men → women.
 Men and women feel awkward because of threat of sexual harassment.
 Male unreasonableness wins
 Juvenile behaviors “pitch fits, screaming and yelling
 social exclusion (lunch, urinal connection, golf)
 male bonding – social homophily
 Rudeness - “it’s asking too much to expect physicians to be civil”
 Patronizing by older male faculty
 Myth of female advantage – men’s fears and jealousies
 Awkwardness, but unintentional.

(2) With students

Awkward interactions between men and women due to sexual harassment
 Male faculty get instant respect from students, women don’t.
 Students expect nurturance from women faculty.
 Students resent high standards from women faculty
 Students treat women faculty differently:
 Male students aggressively confrontational toward women faculty
 Women are subjected to more criticism (from grades to clothes)
 Height-ism

Women students expect women faculty to be confidants
 Women seen as champions of women students.

(3) With staff

Preferential treatment of men by staff
 Inappropriate treatment of staff by male faculty
 Abusive
 Trivializing
 Demeaning
 Sense of entitlement
 No sanctions; lack of rules and guidelines

b. Everyday, routine procedures.

Gender-unfriendly scheduling silences voices.
 Women assigned to committees not helpful for T/P.
 P/T rules poorly laid out.
 Unclear norms; vague about what's needed for promotion.
 Ghettoization (Steering) of women (e.g., committee assignment)

c. Professional Development (can be used alone as a general code)

(1) Lack of Mentoring

No one tells you the ground rules.
 No one teaches you how to negotiate.
 No one tells you about side deals.
 No info about others – negotiating out of the loop.
 Lack of self-promotion by women.

(2) No socialization re negotiation

(3) Experience of senior women.

Senior women are overloaded.
 Carry scars from a brutalizing system.
 Suffer token dynamics
 Queen bee syndrome shown by some senior women.
 “Clarence Thomas Chair:” not all women see women's
 issues.

Token women as apologists for the system.

(4) Senior women as role models?

Lack of support from senior to junior women.
 Senior women as negative role models – overworked,
 overwhelmed.

d. Academic Careers at CWRU are gendered (specific references to CWRU, not academe in general).

5. Culture Experienced as Exclusionary → Women

a. Marginalizing of Women.

Insidious, psychologically debilitating climate → women.
 Women's issues are invisible.
 Women's work is invisible.

Championing of women's concerns viewed unfavorably by some,
encouraged by others

Passive discrimination, benign neglect.

Women slapped down for standing up for themselves.

Unintentional discrimination.

Lack of proper appreciation of accomplishments.

Women as backstage players.

Viewed as petty if complain (E: micro-inequalities)

b. Double standards

Caricaturization of women who don't fit female stereotype.

Women judged more rigorously.

Asked me to bake cookies last week. For a conference.

Negative attitudes toward working women.

Expectations of nurturance from women.

Pressure to conform to stereotypes.

Woman as "marked" status.

Women expected to smile.

"Forthright, outspoken" positive for men, negative for women.

Labeling. Playing into gender stereotypes, i.e., good girl.

If you're nice you're invisible. If you're visible, you're
caricatured.

Different standards for male/female behavior.

Leadership seems male.

"Still expected to make the guy think it's his idea."

Masculinity → power (manifested in conscious & unconscious
ways)

c. Women constantly seen as falling short

Lack of affirmation, acknowledgement that they are progressing,
that they have unique intellectual and other contributions to
make

"Anything we do somehow doesn't weigh as much as what men
do."

Lack of recognition of expertise – Not seen as authorities in their
fields

Women have to constantly prove themselves: at time of hire as
well as in career track.

Women not seen as authorities in their fields.

Women's work "is no as important in itself."

Not given appropriate rank at recruitment

Scapegoating of women

Women seen as their own worst enemies

Women judged much more rigorously than men

d. CWRU = Unwelcoming Community for Many

Tough, isolating environment.

Not a place people want to stay.

Pervasive fear.

6. Structural/Organizational Issues

- a. Huge Inertia in system – system not open to change.
- b. Unsupportive Administrators
 - Collusion among administrators
 - Lack of leadership
 - Lack of accountability
 - Lack of opportunity for redress
 - Information control by administration
 - Silencing of dissenting voices
 - Silencing of unfavorable news
 - Lack of true commitment on part of administration to change women's positions.
 - How little can we give, not what do they need
 - Ignorance of issues
- c. Resource Structure
 - Salary/benefit structure at CWRU below national average.
- d. Private institutions tolerate more discriminatory behavior under the guise of academic freedom

7. Dimensions of Inequality: Unfair/Unequal Access to/Allocation of Resources

- a. Allocation of Work Load
 - Unfair allocating of teaching load
 - Women given skunk work to do.
 - Gendered nature of committee assignments (men get power ones)
 - Informal advising responsibilities – advising overload for women.
- b. Unequal access to resources.
 - Library Resources
 - Access to TAs
 - “Protected” time
 - Access to Support staff.
 - Travel money
 - They really cut up who's going to teach what. I found out that two of my colleagues were teaching summer school, instead of teaching in the fall. No one even offered me the chance.
- c. Unequal Salaries and compensation

8. Work Family Issues.

- a. Framing Work/Family Conflict as Individual Choice.
 - Expectations that women will have a conventional family.
 - False choice between work and family
 - What are the constraints within which we make choices? Are they true choices? No true choices. Choosing to act in favor of

your family costs money.

Women have to make choices; men do not.

No family policy – individual solutions

b. Women with families selected out, don't fit.

Visibility of family - Lack of Commitment.

Motherhood is “not being dedicated”

Women with families are selected out

Work/family conflict = gender discrimination.

Childbearing inevitably leads to decreased productivity -reflected
in salary inequities and in lower promotion and tenure rates
for women

Women have larger home responsibilities than men

Women are disproportionately single and/or childless

Family time = missed research time

Pre-tenure women with kids seen as “risk takers”

“Family men” also selected out.

c. Double standard: family positive for men, negative for women.

Parenthood positive for male faculty, negative for women faculty.

Family policies seen as “for women only”

Men given credit for “putting children to bed”

d. No recognition (invisibility) of constraints of personal/family life

Lack of response for women's personal life: Problems of trailing
spouses

Family issues are not limited to childbearing and child-rearing
years; it is a multigenerational issue

Lack of geographic mobility as an explanation

Re family life: Men help; women have responsibilities.

Men have wives, women don't

Faculty members' personal relationships may suffer due to
stressful tenure process

e. Need for resources, administrative support for managing work/family
conflict.

Women have less access to family-related resources (e.g., money,
help with childrearing), which impedes their career
advancement

Positive admin change in recent past that helps families: improved
health care benefits for families

Response to family exigencies positive when the chair is sensitive

Coordinating dual career marriages

Informal culture re family issues often differs from formal policies

9. Outcomes

a. Women's feelings/experiences

Double bind: entitled to certain things, but lose if you ask.

Feelings of fence sitting.

Overworked, underpaid, unwelcome.

Outsider feelings.

Women feel disconnected

Women lack sense of entitlement → they don't complain.

Demoralizing

Marginalized

Belittled

Being silenced

Isolated

Feelings of responsibility

b. Leaky Pipeline

Slow promotion, women get stuck at associate rank.

Retention of junior women is a problem.

Need for exist interviews.

Women leave CWRU – both junior & senior women.

Retention is poor, especially in engineering.

Fear! Women leave rather than confront.

Leaving preferred option rather than dealing with issues.

Difficulties of recruiting qualified women candidates into this system/climate.

Men have wives, women don't (see Work-Family)

c. Dimensions of Gender Inequity at CWRU

Women get heavier teaching load

Women get more, less powerful committee assignments

Women have heavier advising responsibilities

Women earn lower salaries

Women get fewer benefits

Women get less space

Women get fewer services from support staff

Women have less access to TAs

Women brought in at lower rank than their accomplishments indicate.

d. We're not good role models for our students

10. Solutions

a. System levels solutions [Include both proposed solutions and positive changes that have already been made (e.g., salary adjustments have been made, some administrators are supportive)].

Need for ombudsperson, ethics officer with teeth.

See faculty as an investment.

Embrace pluralistic approaches.

- Tenure system needs to incorporate family trajectory.
- Side deals replaced by open policies.
- Need more senior women as mentors.
- Need more senior women in administrative roles.
- Need to make active (r/t passive) effort to get passed the stereotype that maturity and authority are male characteristics
- Improved health care benefits for faculty with families

b. Individual Level Solutions [Solutions that suggest that women need to change]

- Women should become better at networking.
- Women should become better at self-promotion.
- Women should not internalize criticism.
- Women should become better at negotiating/bargaining.
- Women should forge ties with other women.