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Report on the University of California, San Diego  
2004 Gender Equity Summit  

Summary of Proceedings  
The UCSD Gender Equity Summit convened on March 12, 2004, bringing together over 60 senior administrators and faculty from the general campus, School of Health Sciences and Scripps Institute of Oceanography, to discuss issues of faculty leadership, recruitment and retention among ladder-rank faculty, as well as the UCSD academic climate and the shrinking of the academic pipeline in general. This distinguished group included Acting Chancellor Marsha Chandler, Acting Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Dave Miller, the Assistant Vice Chancellor, Divisional Deans, Departmental Chairs and Center Directors.  

The summit program began with opening remarks by Jeanne Ferrante, Associate Dean of the Jacobs School of Engineering, who spoke briefly about the goals of the summit and the charge before the assembled group. Acting Chancellor Chandler followed with an outline of accomplishments made to date in addressing gender equity at UCSD and challenges still before the campus. The morning continued with reports by Acting Senior Vice Chancellor Dave Miller and Deputy Vice Chancellor of Health Sciences, David Bailey, summarized here.  

Dr. Miller presented an Assessment of the 2002 UCSD Gender Equity Report, commenting on the advancements made since the first UCSD-wide Gender Equity Report was issued in March 2002. He began by presenting statistical comparisons between LRF women at UCSD and UC, as well as by division within UCSD, and in relation to the national workforce pool availability. The percentage of women faculty at UCSD continue well below the UC and national percentages, with engineering and physical sciences divisions continuing to show the least change despite substantial growth in faculty hiring. In addition, the rate of separations among women faculty are markedly higher than their representation rate. Next, Dr. Miller summarized the findings and recommendations of the first UCSD Gender Equity Report (2002). Finally, the SVCAA outlined the programs and initiatives that have been implemented since the report. The many new initiatives include annual reviews of faculty salary norms, implementation of two new mentoring programs, initiation of a Career Equity Review process, launching of Partner Opportunities Program, Deans’ evaluation on enhancement of diversity, as well improvements in childbearing benefits, including automated and extended leave, university cost sharing for childcare, and publication of family friendly policies.  

Dr. Bailey continued the morning session with the UCSD Health Sciences Gender Equity Report and Action Plan, which summarized the findings of the 2002 UCSD Health Sciences Gender-Equity Taskforce. This report confirmed the continued under-representation of women faculty in Health Sciences at UCSD with no significant improvement trends noted. In the last six years, no women received full FTEs while 17 men did. Furthermore, the report concluded that women’s salaries lag nearly 25% behind their male counterparts, after accounting for years since receiving their degrees and years at UCSD. Women are under-represented in search-related committees, and are themselves less often proposed for accelerated advancement. While over-represented in other committees, women are less
likely to chair the major committees. The Health Sciences Report made numerous recommendations in their Action Plan, which include the development of a comprehensive program for the recruitment and retention of faculty, expansion of the NCLAM program for mentoring junior faculty, review of academic leaders effectiveness, annual compensation reviews and rectification, encouragement of academic advancement, database enhancements, improvement in search committee preparedness and practices, administration of climate survey and exit interviews, and coordination of childbearing and child rearing policies with general campus.

The remainder of the Summit program was organized around eight small breakout groups of 10-20 individuals in two sets of hour-long sessions to discuss topics of faculty Leadership, Recruitment and Retention, Academic Pipeline, and Climate.
**Summit Recommendations - Overview**

**Leadership:**

1. Develop a Leadership Training program: To develop women leaders, we need to identify potential leaders early in their careers, train them to the next level of leadership, and continue to provide skill building and training throughout their careers as they develop.

2. Charge University administration to cultivate leadership: Deans and other campus leadership should be accountable for and take responsibility in developing leaders. For example, departments should be encouraged to seriously consider women candidates for Chair.

3. Formalize leadership rewards: The University needs to develop clear policies so that leadership is recognized and rewarded by promotion and salary benefits. Release time from departmental duties should be given for leadership development.

**Recruitment and Retention:**

1. Improve policies and procedures. More and better information should be collected and disseminated, including interviews of those who declined recruitment offers.

2. Re-visit effectiveness of recruitment committee practices and procedures. These include recruitment of more junior positions, opening the recruitment process to the whole faculty, ensuring women on search committees, and adding women not on search committees to the candidate’s schedule.

3. Increase faculty, chair and Dean recruiting effectiveness. Change recruitment practices to be more sensitive and knowledgeable about gender differences. Consider giving the Deans responsibility for hiring decisions of junior faculty.

4. Be more proactive in recruiting practices. Decrease the lag time of formal offers to allow more effective recruiting. Offer better startup packages to be competitive; scout talent and bring back names from scholarly meetings; advertise by distributing brochures, and invite a wide range of speakers to campus.

5. Implement better programs to promote retention. These include more effective faculty mentoring, offering expanded Partner Opportunities services on campus, providing better child-care resources, offering full-year teaching relief for new parents.

6. Advertise and post information on website on UCSD’s family friendliness.

7. Consider part time positions to mitigate career gaps, and supporting a slow clock for child-bearing and rearing years.

8. Remove off-scale salary from CAP’s authority.
Pipeline:

1. Modify duties during childbearing years – reduce or eliminate teaching load, to provide additional time for the research on which future promotions depend.

2. Extend teaching and service relief for childbearing to one year. This could be funded by SVCAA.

3. Explore part-time and re-entry options for parenting, to provide additional flexibility in the academic career path. Part time positions must include a proportional extension of the tenure clock in order to be a valid option.

4. Consider increasing rate of sabbatical leave credit accrual during childbearing years for part-time positions.

5. Allow service credit for - both external (K-12) and internal (WISE) outreach activities, to expose more young women and girls to female role models in the sciences.

6. Advertise family friendly practices among faculty, post-docs, graduate students and undergraduates, to raise the awareness.

7. Research best practices in other institutions and in industry, and implement applicable policies.

8. Develop a tradition of mentoring, an explicit and implicit expectation – make mentoring a formally rewarded activity.

Climate:

1. Charge university administration to change cultural attitudes among faculty towards collaboration and away from competitiveness.

2. Conduct a university-wide survey of climate issues, with commitment for real action.

3. Reconstitute gender equity task force to focus on climate.


5. Climate could be improved by more opportunities for networking and support, with incentives for participating (for example, junior faculty development based on the NCLAM model).

6. Consider giving priority to faculty to get campus assistance with childcare (extended hours, etc.); reserved slots for faculty in university child care.

7. Examine childcare at UCSD carefully with emphasis on affordability, time-slots, after school, backup childcare, multiple-children discounts, etc.
Summary Recommendations: by Breakout Group Topics

The breakout groups were each provided with a preamble as the premise for consideration of their topic, as well as a short set of questions to address. The groups were charged with discussing these questions, identifying the problems associated with this topic and providing a set of recommendations. The moderators and scribes for each group were asked to condense their groups’ recommendations and provide one set of summary recommendations for each topic at the end of breakout sessions.

LEADERSHIP:

Breakout Questions

1. What are the obstacles to women in leadership roles?
2. What needs to be put in place to enable/encourage more women to enter leadership positions and more become more recognized internally & externally?
3. How can we get both men and women faculty to support the needed changes?

Findings & Recommendations

The breakout group members all agreed that Leadership is a long-term investment. Faculty need experience, opportunities, skill, and the desire to lead. The institution needs a means to support evolution from level to level. Leadership carries with it power, visibility, and responsibility.

The groups felt that obstacles to women in leadership roles are climate driven. UCSD doesn’t hold women back but it doesn’t particularly propel women forward either. The tradition of “grooming for leadership”, leadership training, and indeed opportunities for leadership, seem mostly directed at men. This may have a big impact for women. Men get more accelerations than women and they are more aggressive at self promotion; women are less aggressive at getting outside offers. The current climate is more difficult for women.

The group determined that there are several general themes that run through the problem of diversity in leadership. Lack of mentoring is the biggest. Mentoring will help in developing leadership – we can use the service requirement to develop leadership skills in men and women. There should be strategic mentoring of women – not just a lot of committee work, but a balance of activities. Women need to be mentored early in their career to speak up and be heard; women must be counseled and coached to speak up and participate.

Finally, mentorship is not only important within the department, but outside as well. Outside there are many opportunities, for example, the Whittaker Foundation junior faculty leadership training was discussed as a very commendable example.
Breakout session members felt strongly that leadership should be rewarded. For example, the position of department Chair on campus is often not a coveted position. It is considered a duty and the reward is service. Leadership is not valued and there should be more rewards for being Chair. The Chair needs to have professional networks and status. CAP should understand the work load of Chairs and recognize it formally.

Leadership should be defined more broadly. Leadership is not only at the level of the department Chair or vice-Chair. Leadership implies that one does something extraordinary. Attention should be given to the fact that different personalities have different skills and different strengths. Demonstrating leadership in various committees is also important. Faculty can be rotated on committees so they get experience of different parts of the university, and use committees as opportunities for gaining leadership experience.

Another problem is the lack of grooming mechanisms for leadership. Several group members felt that there need to be opportunities for leadership for women that involve power, visibility, etc. There are not enough opportunities for development of women and many need help with leadership skills. The university should provide support for women to address burnout, isolation, and juggling family issues. There should be a University-wide organization focused on women interested in leadership, possibly in conjunction with UCSD ATHENA. Receiving “assistance” should not provide additional burden to women, nor should it be stigmatized. Men would like and should be offered training and mentorship as well.

Leadership training should be institutionalized. This training should include resource development, cross university relationships, political or social influence, informal and formal engagement in community. Department Chairs, for example, are often not trained while it is evident that they have to be good with people, responsible, experienced, and reliable. Most faculty have too many other commitments at home, and aren’t seen around the campus. This is a perceived impediment to leadership. Mentoring to help them develop those skills in earlier training is critical. Yet currently, there are no incentives to take the time and resources for leadership development.

Breakout participants agreed that the support required to bring about these changes comes from increased awareness and education. Divisions and other groups should share education, experience, programs and in general, their best practices. The leadership, from the top, needs to make this a priority and to supply effective carrots and sticks. We must keep in mind that most of these problems are not just women’s problems, they are everyone’s problems.
RECRUITMENT & RETENTION:

Breakout Questions

1. Why aren’t there more women faculty being successfully recruited and retained?
2. What needs to be put in place to enable/encourage more women to be successfully recruited and retained?
3. How can we get a critical mass of both men and women faculty to support the needed changes in recruitment and retention practices?

Findings & Recommendations

The groups that met to discuss recruitment and retention agreed that the four categories affecting success in these areas are Culture, Policy & Procedures, Program and Proactivity.

The pervasive culture of competitiveness rather than collaboration should be seriously looked at on this campus. The University should re-examine priorities to assess whether our hurdles and rewards are consonant with our goals.

The group members agreed that better programs should be implemented to promote retention. An effective faculty mentoring system should be set up whereby senior faculty can mentor faculty on questions of, for example, how to successfully get tenure and have a family. Another is the need for expanded Partner Opportunities service on campus. The dual body issues needs to be better handled, with formalized programs promoting partner opportunities.

Faculty felt that the University should make providing better child-care resources a priority. This can improve both recruitment and retention odds by creating a far more family-friendly environment. Related to these child care issues are the needs for full-year teaching relief for new parents, as well as part time positions. Part time positions should be carefully considered to accommodate career gaps; and to allow for the option to slow the clock for child-bearing. Finally, there should be adequate advertising of UCSD’s family-friendly climate in order to attract more candidates with family concerns. Faculty members felt that stellar family/work policy would be huge recruitment tool. The flip side is that system is geared to outside offers, but women for family reasons are less likely to court them. Men also are more aggressive on pushing for accelerated promotions.

San Diego on the whole remains an attractive living environment for women and does not adversely affect recruitment other than the issue of housing.

Many group members agreed that recruitment needs to be more proactive. The salary and timing of recruitments ought to be re-examined. Organizing search committees in the spring or summer would be desirable. Currently there is a lag in timing between informal and formal offers. Critical negotiating power is lost in this lag time. The question was raised whether the lag be managed more positively—strongly worded/clear (but conditional on CAP) offers. We should look into whether it is possible to delegate the hiring process at assistant level. The make-up of the search committees also needs to be better planned.
Women should be encouraged, even at junior level, to be on search committees. This teaches the junior faculty what is valued and helps the search.

Some group members questioned whether there is adequate outreach to get out the word about searches. In natural sciences it is not a problem, as highly centralized sources of information exist. However this is not the case with most other divisions. Finally the group discussed whether CAP should be involved in salaries, or should focus just on step.
PIPELINE:

**Breakout Questions**

1. Why does the proportion of women shrink through the academic pipeline?
2. What needs to be put in place to insure a successful flow of women through the academic pipeline?
3. How can we get greater support and commitment to increasing the flow of women through the pipeline?

**Findings & Recommendations**

The primary question addressed by the breakout groups was why women leave the academic pipeline, and to identify steps that can be taken to abate this trend.

Most of the group members agreed that the shrinking pipeline at UCSD can clearly be divided into two areas: The early pipeline which includes K-12, and the later pipeline which includes college through women with graduate degrees who have entered or are entering the academic tenure track.

The group felt that this phenomenon of the shrinking pipeline which originates with a perception held even in elementary school by many young girls that certain fields are not appropriate for women, (such as physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering), and that this perception is exacerbated in college.

Group members agreed that at UCSD, there is a clear lack of appropriate role models and mentors for young women. There was a sense among female faculty members that even those that consider themselves successful role models for their students are often viewed by their students (and occasionally by their colleagues!) as exceptions to the rule, rather than as examples of success.

Related to the issue above is the oft-sited perception by female undergraduate and graduate students of their own low probability of success academically and professionally, which likely leads to further drops in the percentage of women applying for academic positions. Faculty members pointed to anecdotal evidence derived from conversations with their women students that at all stages of the academic pipeline these young women experience lower self-confidence than their male students.

However, the group felt that the primary cause of the shrinking pipeline through the primary and secondary school years is caused by concerns about how to balance two “full-time” activities of family and career. There is a perception held among the students that academic careers, especially in sciences and engineering, lack flexibility and that it is impossible succeed in academic research as a woman with a family. This is a real deterrent to young female students who are unwilling to commit to a lifetime in the “narrow path” of academia.

Similarly, women faculty members are lost to the academic pipeline by the same balance issues. Female faculty are often hesitant or unable to ask for the time needed to bear and raise
children, and if forced to choose between the two, will often leave academia. There are not enough clear policies and adequate options for families, and in particular, for women who wish to start a family. Breakout members pointed out that often unless the department chair makes some special arrangements with them; there is no overt mechanism for release time. There is also stigma attached to wanting to slow the tenure clock to raise a family, and women are concerned that they will be considered less rigorous scholars if they place equal value on raising a family and research.

The group recommended that the shrinking academic pipeline can only be successfully combated if we are able to provide more visible female role models and facilitate balancing family with research and scholarship. The group recommended modifying duties during childbearing years to extend teaching and service relief to one year, and exploring part-time and re-entry options for parenting. Also the divisions might consider increasing the rate of sabbatical leave credit accrual during childbearing years. Another thought was to formalize service credit for outreach activities, to provide more role models to bolster flow through the early pipeline. Other thoughts were to more broadly advertise existing family friendly practices and to look into best practices by other institutions that have more successfully recruited and retained women faculty in the sciences. Finally, the group overwhelmingly acknowledged the need to develop a tradition of mentoring, and favored making mentoring a formally rewarded.
CLIMATE:

Breakout Questions

1. Do men and women faculty view the campus climate differently?
2. What needs to be put in place to give this campus a more supportive climate for both genders?
3. How can we get both men and women to support the changes needed to improve the climate?

Findings & Recommendations

The discussion of climate among UCSD faculty focused around several questions. The first one was: How can we judge whether there is a climate problem? There was a concern that there may not be any formal mechanism by which we could assess attitudes towards climate. If we did, most men would probably say that there is no climate problem and most women might say that there is. Of course the climate is influenced by the largely male majority. The climate can change with the hiring of enough women to create a “critical mass”.

Another issue discussed was the difference in climate for issues of balancing family and work. The group agreed that the level of expectation about work performance without recognition of the larger landscape was difficult. Additionally, some group members felt that it was hard for faculty struggling with family and other issues to be open about their problems. Many women felt that this perception lead them to experience difficulty in making the decision to go part time.

Some felt that there needs to be a differentiation between problems we inherit from professional academic life and problems at UCSD we can do something about. There should be recognition that academics are “free agents”, and that a positive climate makes you want to be on the team and stay on the team; chilly climate on the other hand does not promote loyalty.

The group felt that the climate could be improved by more opportunities for networking and support among campus groups (ORU directors, department chairs, senior faculty, etc.). There needs to be a better understanding of what the issues are. Leadership can make an incredible difference in setting the tone, and addressing climate and cultural issues. The group discussed other campuses where they have professional level leadership programs for faculty and administration (not gender specific), and the climate appears to be linked to the structure of the university and make-up of personnel.

In conclusion a number of suggestions were discussed on how to create a warmer climate. These ideas include a faculty survey on climate issues. The survey can only be effective with commitment for real action. Another idea was for the Gender Equity Task Force to be reconstituted to conduct a study on climate on the campus. The group felt strongly that family-friendly recommendations of UC Work and Family Survey should be adopted and that there should be more venues for faculty to meet and make recommendations to administration. There should be real benefits and incentives for participating (make recommendations and then administration acts on reasonable ones). The group agreed that more priority should be
given to faculty couples to get campus assistance with childcare (extended hours, etc.); and slots for faculty in university child care. All in all, childcare should be examined carefully: affordability, time-slots, after school, backup childcare, multiple-children discounts, etc.