Changing the Continuing Chilly Campus Climate for Faculty Women: Recommendations Based on a Case Study

Mara H. Wasburn
Purdue University

Abstract

A vast body of research conducted in the 1970's and 1980's documented a host of problems confronted by women faculty at colleges and universities nationwide: their small number, a "chilly campus climate," low salaries, slow progress toward promotion and tenure, little power or influence, and a number of worklife issues. Subsequently, many institutions established policies to address these inequities. This qualitative case study compares the concerns expressed in 1988 by women faculty at "Sycamore State University," a Midwestern Research I University, with those women faculty discussed in 1997, when policies apparently intended to correct discriminatory conditions and practices had been in place for almost a decade. The research, foregrounding the voices of women faculty, confronts the question of why, despite the implementation of these policies, many of their concerns remain. It also suggests strategies for meeting some of the challenges women faculty, especially those in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, still confront.

Introduction

Women have made great strides in academe. There are more women assistant professors than ever. Yet, despite these gains, few of them become full professors. At issue is whether or not women faculty, especially those in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) continue to face impediments as they seek to advance within the system that do not appear to face their male counterparts, impediments well-documented by research in the 1970s and 1980s.

In 1988, at "Sycamore State University," (SSU) a Midwestern Research I University, a task force of faculty women under the auspices of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Senate, conducted a Needs Assessment to determine the support for an expanded Women's Resource Office on campus. They invited all women faculty to submit a letter outlining concerns relevant to women at SSU. In their responses, words such as *chilly ... nonsupportive ... unsympathetic ... hostile ... isolating ... deplorable ... disrespectful ... sexually harassing ...* were used to describe the campus climate.

Subsequent to the publication of a Needs Assessment Report, a number of policies were created and implemented by the university's upper administration to address the problems that the assessment had identified. Nine years after the publication of that report, a 1997 University Task Force on Women's Issue's report revealed that women faculty still experienced many of the same problems that initially were identified. However, the 1997 study was not a replication of the 1988 Needs Assessment, nor did it capture any voices of the sort that made the original study so powerful. The research reported below partially replicates the 1988 Needs Assessment,

foregrounding the voices of academic women at SSU. This study also draws on the 1997 University Task Force on Women's Issues study. It explores the extent to which women faculty at SSU perceive any changes for women between 1988 and 1997 that have resulted from policies put in place with the intent of addressing their expressed grievances. The research confronts the question of why, despite the implementation of a number of favorable policies, specified below, many of their concerns remain.

While the type of qualitative research used in this study cannot produce findings that are demonstrably capable of generalization, this analysis of the chronic problems facing women faculty at SSU is intended to provide some insight into challenges facing academic women at many other colleges and universities. It is also intended to suggest specific strategies for meeting these challenges.

Women in Academe

The issues perceived by faculty women at SSU are hardly unique, and have been a topic of study for more than two decades. Hall and Sandler [1] postulated that the source of one major concern of academic women, namely their relative lack of representation in high-level academic and faculty positions on college campuses, has its roots in women's higher education experience. They coined the now-famous term "chilly classroom climate" to refer to the effects that male-dominated university campuses have on undergraduate women. They argue that male professors' use of sexist humor, belittling albeit bantering comments about women's intellectual abilities, and their use of "he" to refer to scholars in their fields can considerably dampen women's career aspirations. Almost twenty years later, Martin [2] asserts that the campus climate remains chilly, resulting in "an under-representation of women in the highest ranks of the profession," and the "backlash against women's studies" (p. 85).

Women faculty in the STEM disciplines describe a "null environment for women" where they receive little support or colleagueship. Often the only women in their departments, women faculty in science, mathematics, engineering frequently are not part of the camaraderie that develops among the younger faculty. This can result in lack of access to information and opportunities. Many find they lack the inner resources to persevere.[3]

When women faculty seek promotion and tenure, some disturbing problems arise. Johnsrud and Des Jarlais [4] point out that faculty women report greater isolation, less time for research, greater teaching loads, more committee assignments, fewer mentors, and more trivializing of their scholarship than their male colleagues do. Rosser [5] observes that the overwhelmingly male nature of STEM disciplines has not only afforded women limited access to participation, but it has shaped the very nature of the discipline itself. She notes that science, for example, is neither unbiased nor value-free. Everything from what is studied to the subjects for the experiments is male-dominated. When women begin to enter a field, different questions are asked and methodological and theoretical assumptions challenged (p. 84), which can lead to the trivializing of their scholarship noted above.

Data indicate that women faculty tend to be promoted more slowly than their male counterparts, and they are far more likely to leave an institution before gaining tenure, generally a result of

their academic career decisions [4]. Women faculty are often advised to curtail their teaching and service activities in order to publish more [6]. However, women, as well as minority faculty, are more likely to accede to institutional demands to devote time to teaching and service activities. They commonly see themselves as having a special responsibility to women and minority students, often ignoring their own need to publish, creating "a possible mismatch between institutional demands and the perspectives of women and minority faculty members"[7]. Spending a disproportionate time being "good citizens" can result in fewer publications, further damaging women's opportunities for promotion. [8, 9]. By contrast, male academics tend to invest more of their time and energy in research and publication.. As salary and promotion are tied to research and publications, women fall farther and farther behind. The higher the rank, the lower the proportion of women, especially in the STEM disciplines. [10]

Compounding the problems of women faculty is the fact that they often receive little respect in the classroom, especially those in the STEM disciplines where women have been historically underrepresented. [11] Students expect their female professors to be warm and nurturing. But when they are, they are perceived as weak. If they are more assertive, they are viewed as being "bitches" (p. 8).

Competing claims of the personal and professional realms can be staggering for young women academics who are married and/or have children. They are not only expected to be top professionals but good wives and loving mothers as well. Those competing expectations can provide a type of stress that their male counterparts rarely if ever experience. [12] In addition, tenure and promotion decisions are usually made during the childbearing years. Although many universities have policies that can slow the tenure clock for women, very few of them actually take parental leave. [13, 14]

While childbearing has received some attention in the form of policies designed to assist women professors, little if any attention has been paid to the effects of child rearing. [15] Significantly more men than women with children under the age of six achieve tenure. Many women assistant professors are choosing to postpone having children. Almost half of them say the decision was made because of their careers (p. 126).

Not surprisingly, the inequities between male and female faculty are reflected in their salaries. More than three decades after Congress passed the Equal Pay Act, women faculty still earn from 5 to 10 percent less than their male counterparts. [16]

Sycamore State University in 1988

Original interviews conducted for the 1988 Needs Assessment study at SSU provide considerable insight into the situation of women faculty in 1988. However, the brevity of the report precluded the presentation of all but a very few voices. Access to the original data, granted by the 1988 Faculty Affairs Task Force, permits me to present the voices of women as they told their own stories, informing our understanding of their perceptions of the gender-specific career obstacles they confronted at SSU. Some of their voices are reproduced below. In 1988, 69% of the respondents found the climate at SSU unfriendly to women at best and alienating at worst. The concerns ranged from sexism and lack of respect to sexual harassment

The whole atmosphere at SSU is, in fact, anti-woman. This is easy to say and difficult to document, but it is a feeling that impinges on all the work women do at SSU. The feeling ranges from support staff who do not respect women professors to "colleagues" who do not accept women as equals to department heads that treat women differently from men, even to higher officials who deny that sexism (or racism) exist at SSU... Women at SSU are well aware of the anti-woman ambiance here, in which we are devalued workers, though at present we have little power to change it Respondent A-12

From the Sycamore Chicks, whose purpose is to entertain men at athletic events to the Little Sis programs which are designed for the entertainment of male undergraduates to the old-boy faculty and administrative social networks that sustain the power of men by excluding women to the sexual jokes and innuendoes passed off as clever, humorous conversation by male colleagues in various professional and social settings, the very climate at SSU sanctions and encourages sexual harassment and the concomitant disrespect for all women associated with the institution. Respondent A-25

The lack of hope that changes would come anytime soon led some women to contemplate leaving the university.

I've despaired thinking SSU will ever invite (or allow) women to join the men at the top and plan to leave the university in June. Respondent A-1

Not surprisingly, the women faculty who were employed on campus experienced feelings of isolation and marginalization. Thirty-one percent of the women who responded to that 1988 survey expressed concern about the small number of professional women employed on campus and the resulting impact on women students

I feel isolated as a woman, and sense a lack of female role models. In addition, there is a lack of females within SSU's administration. Without mentors and a support system, it is difficult to thrive in a institution dominated by males. Respondent A-24

Table 1 below shows that the percentage of women among ladder-rank faculty in 1988 were few, both nationally and at SSU.

TABLE 1: Differences in Distribution of Faculty by Rank and Gender Nationwide and at Sycamore State University

	National, 1988-89			Sycamore State University, 1988-89		
	Men	Women	% Diff.	Men	Women	% Diff
Prof.	37.3	3.2	-34.1	32.7	1.6	-31.1
Assoc.	22.5	6.1	-16.4	22.8	4.1	-18.7
Asst.	15.6	8.1	- 7.5	17.1	7.3	- 9.8
Inst.	1.7	2.3	+ 0.6	1.7	2.2	+0.5
Other	1.8	1.5	- 0.3	8.6	1.9	- 6.7
Total:	78.9	21.1	-57.8	82.9	17.1	-65.8

SOURCES: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession (Academe. March-April 1988:9); Sycamore State University Personnel Services 1987-88)

In 1988, 55% of the respondents believed the women's salaries in general and their own salaries in particular were unequal to those of their male counterparts. Many women faculty saw their low pay as indicative of the lack of value the university placed on them.

> *I am concerned that women in the academic arena traditionally make less money for the same positions here at SSU. I do not understand why women should be paid less than a male for doing the same job. It bothers me to hear a department head (male) state that of two people with the same position, background, and responsibilities, the male should receive a higher salary because "after all, he has a family to support." How can women be expected to value their own worth when it is obvious that their employer does not value them as highly as their male counterparts?* Respondent A-3

Table 2 below shows the extent of the discrepancies:

TABLE 2: Salary Differences by Rank and Gender Nationwide and at Sycamore State University

	National, 1988-89			Sycamore State University, 1988-89		
	Men	Women	% Diff.	Men	Women	% Diff
Prof.	54,690	49,250	- 9.9	59.080	48.720	-17.5
Assoc.	40,120	37,550	- 6.4	41,260	36,790	-10.8
Asst.	34,520	31,220	- 9.6	36,910	29,280	-20.7
Inst.	24,710	22,710	- 8.1	30,030	23,010	-23.3

SOURCES: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession (Academe. March-April 1988:10); Sycamore State University Personnel Services 1987-88)

Thirty-two percent of the respondents to the 1988 survey believed that promotion was more difficult for women to achieve at SSU than for men. No one expressed confidence in the equity of that process, citing undue burdens placed on women, as well as limited opportunities for women.

> *In my annual tenure review, a panel of full professors (some not much older than I am) decide whether I can "go up" for tenure. They are all men. They have not been in my situation – they have wives who help them. They have little idea of how truly committed I am to my profession and my field because they rarely talk to me. They have no idea of the sacrifices I make and my family makes because of my devotion to my career. In fact, they probably discount or diminish each of my considerable professional accomplishments because they see me as a woman with family responsibilities. I do not feel I can be fairly judged by these men ...* Respondent A-20

As women faculty viewed the administration of the university, they saw no one like themselves. They found little to encourage their aspirations to those positions, and perceived few avenues for their concerns to be heard.

> *SSU is truly unusual in its complete omission of women from the higher administrative ranks. Although I have not seen statistics on this issue, in my experience other major universities include women at this administrative level. The insensitivity that the administration has shown on issues of special interest to women is consistent with their exclusion of women from their ranks.*

In 1988, 94% of the respondents identified SSUs lack of support for women and women's programs as a critical issue. Most responses centered around support for the Women's Resource Office (WRO) and/or a Women's Center (assessing support for continuation and the expansion of the WRO was the primary reason behind the survey) and the Women's Studies program, which many respondents saw as desperately underfunded and understaffed.

> *Over the years I have become somewhat cynical about the role of women at Sycamore State. I find my department and even my college very supportive of women, but I see the university as indifferent to women's needs. The university has done very little to help women with complex problems of dual careers, salary equity, and sexual harassment*
> Respondent#A-35

Slightly over half of the respondents to the 1988 survey indicated that Institutional Response to Changing Employee Needs, or what is now termed Work and Family Issues, were of great concern to them. Overwhelmingly, the issues they cited were child care and particularly infant care, and the lack of a dual-career policy for the faculty spouses.

There seems to be no commitment on the part of the University to making it possible for parents to teach or attend classes or work here. I feel as if I am still being asked to choose between being a parent and a professor. Respondent B-5

Changes at Sycamore State University

As noted above, subsequent to the publication of the 1988 Needs Assessment Study, SSU enacted a number of policies designed to level the playing field for women faculty. An anti-harassment policy explicitly forbidding gender harassment and/or discrimination was established. Faculty salary equity studies are now conducted annually by the Affirmative Action Office. SSU now has a dual career couples policy, which provides for posting and search waivers for staff and bridge funds to assist departments in hiring the trailing spouse of a prime candidate for a posted faculty position in another department." The Women's Resource Office was funded and a full-time director hired with the express purpose of improving the campus climate for women. A Relocation Assistance Program was initiated and a coordinator hired to identify non-faculty employment possibilities for the spouse of a recruited faculty member. Guidelines for stopping the tenure clock for, among other things, child bearing were approved.

How did academic women at SSU perceive these structural changes institutionalized since 1988? Did the implementation of policies suggested by the Needs Assessment study of that year finally appear to address their longstanding concerns?

Methods

In October, 1997, to answer these questions, questionnaires were sent to all SSU women faculty members holding professorial rank. The response rate was 17.8%. This represents nearly twice the response rate of the 1988 needs assessment, but was somewhat lower than had been anticipated.

Comparing the 1988 and the 1997 responses to the surveys is essential to understanding the changing climate for academic women at SSU. As part of the comparative process, I want to let the respondents tell their stories. At the same time, I recognize my responsibility to contextualize those stories Very few of the respondents to the 1988 survey chose to remain anonymous despite their obvious ability to do so. By contrast, in 1997, very few women signed their names. It is difficult not to conclude that the women who responded to the survey were fearful of being identified.

Since the original study involved questionnaires being sent to all women faculty at this campus, the population was the same as that of the original study. The questionnaire consisted of three open-ended questions, the second of which was identical to the one in the original study. These open-ended questions sought to capture the lived experience of the participants, which is the hallmark of phenomenological inquiry. [17, 18]

1. Please describe your experiences as a woman working at SSU. Feel free to respond with positive as well as negative experiences.
2. Please outline your concerns regarding <u>any</u> issues relevant to women at SSU. You may address issues concerning the status of women at SSU that have touched you directly, that you know to be of concern to other women, or that characterize the general climate here. Feel free to respond regardless of the nature or number of issues you feel are problematic.

3. Please describe the changes for women you have seen at SSU during the years you have worked here. Feel free to describe negative as well as positive changes.

Since this study was modeled on the 1988 Needs Assessment, the categories developed by the task force of women faculty under the auspices of the SSU Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate to organize the data were retained. Those categories were:

1. General Climate
2. Gender-based Inequities
    a. Distribution of Women
    b. Salary
    c. Promotion and Tenure
3. Influence and Power
4. Institutional Support
5. Institutional response to Changing Employee Needs.

Patton [17] recommends utilizing multiple methodologies when studying a phenomenon in order to strengthen the design. That process is termed "triangulation" (p. 187). To triangulate the data, a second coder was employed, who followed the same process as the researcher, reading through the data twice and arriving at the best decision as to where each of the responses belonged. When that was complete the data sheets were compared. Agreement was reached on 89% of the responses to the first survey. The cases where disagreement remained were discussed. Three of those were resolved based upon an error having been committed by one or the other. The remaining four responses were coded by the researcher.

The same process was followed on the new surveys. Agreement was reached on 89% of the responses. As before, the remaining cases were discussed. Nine of them were resolved, leaving nine to be decided by the researcher.

The literature cited above served as a second point of triangulation. The research tended to support many of the concerns voiced by the respondents, as well as their perceptions of the gains they believe women have made. As a third point of triangulation, all available quantitative data were gathered, both nationally and at SSU. Those data (see Tables 1 through 5) also support the claims of the respondents.

It is important to note that the schools and departments of which any university is comprised are highly diverse. They have very different and often competing goals. For example, primary committees, which determine promotions, use different standards to rate their candidates. While one department may only consider published articles, another can decide to privilege teaching and/or service.

In order to preserve their anonymity, the participants were not encouraged to mention their schools and/or departments. Therefore, the differences inherent between and among those schools and departments must be borne in mind when reading and attempting to make sense of the participants' experiences.

Additionally, the first questionnaire was sent to women with the express purpose of determining the need for an expanded Women's Resource Office. Therefore, the women who chose to respond, as well as types of responses, may have differed sharply from those in the second survey, which had no such agenda.

Before viewing each response category separately, it may be helpful to look at the percentage responses to each category in 1988 and in 1997. Table 3 below shows those percentage responses.

TABLE 3: Percentage of Women's Concerns at Sycamore State by Category, 1988 and 1997

	1988 (n=65)	1997 (n=166)
Distribution of Women	31	05
Salary	55	23
Promotion & Tenure	32	22
Influence & Power	45	29
Worklife Issues	51	34
Institutional Support	94	08
Climate	69	46

Sycamore State University in 1997

All organizations operate within a culture (a configuration of values, beliefs, and attitudes either widely shared by the organization's members or shared by those in positions of power and authority within the organization) that influences the manner in which the organizations distribute their scarce and valued resources. Respondents' perceptions of the organizational culture of SSU referred to here as "general climate," is the point of departure of this analysis.

The literature cited above points to the climate on college campuses as negatively impacting women's career paths in both academic and administrative positions. In 1997, 46% of the women surveyed found the campus climate for women oppressive. Many of the issues raised in 1997 were strikingly similar to those expressed in 1988, such as the presence of gender bias by the "good old boys' network" and difficulties finding mentors.

> *Although lip service to women's issues is given, the subtle "old boys" network is still in place ... the Alumni Fish Fry is reminiscent of a salesman's convention. Despite complaints from women faculty , this continues. Women who complain about it are seen as over sensitive.* Respondent F-17

Many faculty women felt isolated in their departments. The support systems they needed to be successful were often not in place. Opportunities for advancement open to men did not appear to be available to them as women.

> *I am the only woman in my department, and as such, I am reluctant to reach out to my male colleagues. Our department has a "closed door" culture, and although my*

colleagues seem to have no problem knocking on each other's doors, I don't feel comfortable doing that. Respondent F-38

The men in my department have lunch and work on grants together. No one thinks to include me. Respondent F-63

Many of my students have never had a female professor and speak to me rudely. I'm afraid to say anything to my department head or to ask my male colleagues for advice. What will they think if I say I can't control my class? Respondent F-8

Only 5% of the women respondents expressed concern about the number of women faculty and staff on campus. However, it is important to bear in mind that many of the respondents voiced their concerns that so many of those women are still in the lower echelons of the faculty and administrative/ professional staff. The 1999 Sycamore State University Task Force on Women's Issues [17] reported that women faculty hires at SSU in 1995 were nearly equal to that of men at the assistant professor level. However, of 8 hires at the associate level, only one was a women, and of the 4 hires at the full professor level, there were no women. Although there were, indeed, more women faculty at SSU, there were few full professors.

The small number of women in senior faculty ranks can have the following results: a lack of female peers for those women who do achieve senior faculty rank: few women role models and mentors for junior faculty and students (both men and women); an increased likelihood that departmental policies or other issues of interest to women including retention and promotion decisions, will be discussed with little or no input from women (p. 55). As shown in Table 4 below, in 1997, women remained underrepresented among faculty both nationally and at SSU. Data also indicate that the disparities at SSU were still greater at all ranks, with the exception of the rank of instructor, than they were nationally.

TABLE 4: Differences in Distribution of Faculty by Rank and Gender Nationwide and at Sycamore State University

	National, 1996-97			Sycamore State University, 1996-97		
	Men	Women	% Diff.	Men	Women	% Diff
Prof.	34.8	5.5	-29.3	34.2	2.9	-31.3
Assoc.	20.8	8.8	-12.0	21.3	7.4	-13.9
Asst.	12.2	9.6	- 2.6	12.4	7.6	- 4.8
Inst.	1.5	2.4	+ 0.9	1.4	2.3	+0.9
Other	1.9	2.4	+ 0.5	7.8	2.7	- 5.1
Total:	71.3	28.7	-42.6	77.1	22.9	-54.2

SOURCES: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession (Academe. March-April 1997:32); Sycamore State University Personnel Services 1996-97)

Twenty-three percent of the 1997 survey respondents identified salary as an area of concern.

When I finally looked in the salary book, I was earning $6,500 less than my male cohort. I had to threaten to file a grievance before it changed. Respondent F-28

I feel that a lack of a University-wide pay plan penalizes women more often than men. I think the faculty and other executives are afraid a salary review would limit their freedom too much. Perhaps someday they will understand that justice is also important. Hopefully it won't have to come as the result of a lawsuit. Respondent F-43

Data in Table 5 below reveal that salary inequities at SSU were considerably greater than those found nationally.

TABLE 5: Salary Differences by Rank and Gender Nationwide and at Sycamore State University

	National, 1996-97			Sycamore State University, 1996-97		
	Men	Women	% Diff.	Men	Women	% Diff
Prof.	73.140	66,117	- 9.6	79,650	65,070	- 18.3
Assoc.	53,100	49,661	- 6.5	54,320	48,890	-10.0
Asst.	44,961	47,921	+10.9	47,888	43,720	- 8.7
Inst.	31,612	30,482	- 9.6	NA	NA	NA

SOURCES: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession (Academe. March-April 1997:33); Sycamore State University Personnel Services 1996-97)

Promotion and tenure issues remained in 1997. Twenty-two percent of the women faculty respondents had serious concerns about how equitable the promotion process was for women. Lack of respect for women's scholarship and the absence of promotion also concerned many respondents.

Publish or perish certainly applies to our department, but although I have published, my publications are dual-authored … something that is not valued in our department. By the standards of our department, I have more than enough publications to be promoted. The head of our department asks me, "how do we know which part you did?" I have gotten tired of explaining collaborative research to men who can never understand it.
Respondent F-29

Because the men in my department don't know much about my research area, they don't seem to regard it highly. I worry about what will happen when I come up for tenure.
Respondent F-47

I don't know that I have seen many changes for women faculty up close. I know there are more of us than there were when I came here. Many departments had none. But if you look at Primary Committees, there aren't many women there. There's certainly nothing resembling parity. I would say there are more women but very little power. What good

is that? If women's careers are blocked before they reach full professor, then their presence on SSU's campus is window dressing. Respondent F-46

Slightly more than one-third of the respondents to the 1997 survey saw work and family issues as serious problems at SSU ... many fewer than those who responded to the 1988 survey. However, for the 34% of the respondents who voiced such in 1997, the greatest difficulties they identified centered around child care and dual career issues.

Non-tenured women in male-dominated departments and/or schools are still fearful of taking maternity leaves, stopping the tenure clock, etc. Respondent F-19

My department meetings are in the late afternoon when I have to pick up my children after school. Often there is no one else to get them, so I miss the meetings. Respondent F-2

I also believe that my male colleagues do not feel as constrained in making decisions to have children as I do. They all have (or are in the process of having) children. I, on the other hand, keep putting off the decision to have children. Although I know I can take maternity leave, I am worried about the effect having a child would have on my productivity level Respondent F-58

I have been challenged as a woman to find adequate day care for my children. At times I thought I needed a wife like my colleagues! My department head was understanding and helpful, but it was difficult. I think I missed a great deal of my children's growing up years. I hope it was worth it. Respondent F-26

While many respondents to the 1997 survey acknowledge the gains women have made, they continue to be concerned that there are so few women at the top. Even women who "make it" have lesser positions. There is also a concern that women's voices don't count, and that their presence may be "window dressing," rather than a recognition by the university of the need for gender equity.

By 1997, an Office of Human Relations had been in existence for five years. The vice president of that office had, among other responsibilities, the supervision of the Women's Resource Office, which had been continued and upgraded to a separate office with a full-time director. The Women's Center, about which so many women spoke, had not been achieved, but the Women's Studies Program had received enough funding to permit the hiring of a half-time director who also had half-time responsibilities in her home department.

It is, perhaps, those positive changes for women on SSU's campus, coupled with the fact that the 1997 survey was not sent to assess the level of support for a Women's Resource Office as the 1988 survey had been, that accounts for the fact that in 1997, only 8% of the respondents identified Institutional Support as an area of concern, while 11% expressed positive attitudes about the support SSU provides women.

The addition of the WRO and director have been positive. So has the creation of the work-life coordinator position. They are both still so new that the results of their efforts are still out with the jury. Respondent S-70

Not all of the respondents were pleased. Some were concerned about the follow-through on the programs for women that had been initiated. Others were cynical about the efficacy of women administrators in general and the Human Relations area in particular on the SSU campus.

I see a few female administrators, but some of them seem to have been hired because of what they WON'T do rather than because of what they WILL do. Specifically, I have seen the creation of a Human Relations area and a Women's Resource Office, but what have they done for the campus? Respondent F-23

The administration has not been incredibly supportive, but I cannot help but think that administrators are never the ones who initiate change or a dynamic of social justice. Respondent F-7

Recommendations

Envisioning SSU as a campus where women faculty, particularly those in STEM disciplines, feel valued enough not only to come but also to remain requires a change in its culture. Clearly SSU has begun that process by appointing more women to upper administrative positions, as noted by some of the participants, addressing the salaries of women faculty; providing the option to stop the tenure clock for women faculty, and beginning to address the situation of dual-career couples. However, in order for women to thrive on this campus, the University must establish guidelines for assessing the effectiveness of those policies already in place, and then addressing the problems of safe, affordable childcare, and the recruitment, retention, and promotion of faculty women.

The ten recommendations below respond to the continuing concerns of women faculty at SSU, particularly those in STEM disciplines who often lack female colleagues. They are also borne out by the literature cited above, and hence may be applicable to other university campuses that have not yet addressed these problems. With the exception of childcare, most can be implemented without cost to the University:

1. Although the burden of childcare falls disproportionately on women, it is an issue of concern to men as well. Work to develop adequate childcare on campus to support both men and women faculty.
2. Conduct exit interviews with every woman faculty member who leaves the University. If patterns emerge, they can be addressed.
3. Encourage male faculty to include their women colleagues in impromptu lunches, proposal writing groups, and any outside consulting groups that are formed.
4. Women faculty are often assigned to a disproportionate number of committees in order to have female representation. Limit the number of committees to which all junior faculty are

assigned, as well as the number of advisees assigned to them. This avoids calling attention to the women faculty.
5. New faculty members, both male and female, can be reluctant to admit they cannot control their classrooms. Develop a departmental policy on handling disruptive students and support all faculty in implementing those policies.
6. Support an open-door culture to encourage more faculty interaction. This will be particularly beneficial to women in male-dominated departments.
7 Foster respect for collaborative scholarship, gender-focused research, and new research questions.
8. Encourage the mentoring of all junior faculty, particularly women, ensuring that they all have equal opportunities to succeed.
9. Many women faculty have childcare responsibilities in the late afternoon. Set departmental meetings in the mornings and early afternoons when women are not as likely to have schedule conflicts.
10. Women faculty can be reluctant to avail themselves of existing policies related to childbearing for fear of the negative effect on their tenure cases. Encourage all faculty to support their women colleagues in utilizing those policies.

In his 1990 book *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*, [20] Ernest Boyer calls for "a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar" (p. 24). He goes on to say "... (P)rofessors cannot work continuously in isolation. It is toward a shared vision of intellectual and social possibilities - a community of scholars - that the four dimensions of academic endeavor should lead. In the end, scholarship at its best should bring faculty together "(p. 72, 80).

Conclusion

This study has examined the work lives of women faculty on SSU's campus. It has reviewed the literature on women in academe, surveyed women faculty on campus, and made recommendations. There is no doubt that SSU has made great strides in effecting positive changes for women, but there are many changes still to be made before women at SSU can achieve equity. Future comparative research is needed to investigate the extent to which the concerns of women faculty at SSU mirror those of women faculty at other campuses. Only if researchers continue to listen to women's voices and make changes accordingly will truly equitable campus communities be achieved.

Bibliography

1. Hall, R.M., & Sandler, B.R. (1982). *The classroom climate: A chilly one for women*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

2. Martin, J.R. (2000). *Coming of age in academe*. New York: Routledge.

3. Betz, Nancy E. 1992. The invisible woman: Effects of the educational environment on women's Vocational identity. In *Women's work*, edited by Smith, Nancy J., and Sylvia Leduc. Calgary, AB: Detselig Enterprises, Ltd.

4. Johnsrud, L.K. & Des Jarlais, C.D. (1994). Barriers to tenure for women and minorities. *The Review of*

Higher Education, 17, 335-353.

5. Rosser, S. V. (1997). *Re-engineering female friendly science.* New York: Teachers College Press

6. Park, S.M. (1996). Research, teaching and service: Why shouldn't women's work count? *Journal of Higher Education, 64*, 46-84.

7. Allen, Helen. 1994. Workload and productivity in an accountability era. *1994 Almanac of Higher Education:* 25-38

8. Creamer, E.G. (1995). The scholarly productivity of women academics. *Initiatives, 57 (1),* 1-9.

9. Astin, H.W., & Bayer, A.E. (1973). Sex discrimination in academe. In Rossi, A.S., & Calderwood, A. (Eds.) *Academic women on the move.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

10, Fox, M. F. (1996). Women, academia, and careers in science and engineering. In Davis, C. et al. (Eds.), *The equity equation: Fostering the advancement of women in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering.* (pp. 96-121). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

11. Sandler, B.R. (1991). Women faculty at work in the classroom, or why it still hurts to be a woman in labor. *Communication Education, 40*, 6-15.

12. Williams, J. (1999). Unbending gender*: Why family and work conflict and what to do about it.* New York: Oxford University Press.

13. Finkel, S.K., Olswang, S., & She, N. (1994). Childbirth, tenure, and promotion for women faculty. *The Review of Higher Education, 17*, 259-270.

14. Wilson, R. (1995, March 10). Scheduling motherhood. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. A14-A15.

15. Finkel, S.K., & Olswang, S. G. (1996). Child rearing as a career impediment to women assistant professors. *The Review of Higher Education, 19*, 123-129.

16. Almanac. (2001, September 1). *Chronicle of Higher Education, 47*.

17. Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods.* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications

18. Van Manen, John. 1990. *Researching lived experience*. London, Ontario, Canada: University of WesternOntario.

19, Sycamore State University Task Force on Women's Issues. (1999). *The status of women at Sycamore State University*. West Lafayette, IN: Sycamore State University.

20. Boyer, E.L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.Hensel, N. (1991). *Realizing gender equality in higher education: The need to integrate work/family*

Biographical Information

MARA H. WASBURN is an Assistant Professor of Organizational Leadership and Supervision (OLS) at Purdue University. She holds a Ph.D. from Purdue University. She teaches courses in training methods and service learning, is coordinator of the coop and internship programs in OLS, and serves as faculty advisor to Women in Technology. Her research interests focus on mentoring with an emphasis on women in technology-related disciplines.