Report of Findings

on Policies that Affect Female Faculty in the Sciences, Engineering, and Mathematics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

Produced for Rutgers University Office for the Promotion of Women in Science, Engineering and Mathematics

June 2013

Elizabeth Strickland, Ph.D.

Blackburnian Consulting LLC
Morristown, NJ
ehs@blackburnianconsulting.com / 203-747-2812

Report of Findings on Policies that Affect Female Faculty in the Sciences, Engineering, and Mathematics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

Context

In September 2008, the National Science Foundation (NSF) awarded to Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey an ADVANCE Institutional Transformation Award (NSF award #0810978). The NSF ADVANCE program has the goal of "increasing the participation and advancement of women in academic science and engineering careers." The resulting Rutgers University-Faculty Advancement and Institutional Re-imagination (RU-FAIR) initiative is managed by the Rutgers Office for the Promotion of Women in Science, Engineering, and Mathematics (SciWomen Office).

In order to understand better the policy environment at Rutgers in which institutional transformation must be undertaken, the SciWomen Office asked an outside consultant, Dr. Elizabeth Strickland, to undertake an analysis of the policies at Rutgers University that affect female faculty in the sciences, engineering, and mathematics. These could be policies related to employment and academic responsibilities (e.g., leave, tenure, etc.), as well as to academic operations (e.g., school and departmental bylaws, etc.). In order to gather background information for analysis, all web-accessible university policies that may be relevant to faculty in the sciences were gathered into a "Compilation of Rutgers University Policies that Affect Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty in the Sciences, Engineering, and Mathematics" and a series of interviews with Rutgers faculty and administrators was conducted that is summarized in "A Synopsis of Interviews on Policies Related to Tenured and Tenure-Track Female Faculty in the Sciences, Engineering, and Mathematics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey." Together, these two companion documents provide the background material for this Report of Findings and should be reviewed alongside this report.

The report is arranged in two sections. The first is a summary of *Findings*; the second is a set of analyst *Observations* about the policy environment at Rutgers for female faculty in the sciences, engineering, and mathematics.

Findings

Overview of Policy Framework and Organizational Structure at Rutgers

Because Rutgers is an extremely decentralized organization, the policies and procedures that govern faculty life are scattered throughout organizational units across the university. Policies and procedures are set at a variety of levels ranging from departmental procedures to policies that apply to the entire university community. The decentralized way in which Rutgers is organized has implications for the policy environment that will be discussed later in this report.

The highest policy setting body at Rutgers is the 11 member Rutgers University Board of Governors. Policies approved by the Board of Governors, as well as the Board of Trustees, the President, and other Executive Officers, are compiled in a University Policy Library. The University Policy Library also includes certain academic, administrative, financial, operational, and business policies and procedures. It should be the first place of reference when searching for a university policy and may be accessed on the web at: http://policies.rutgers.edu/.

Three main entities at Rutgers impact policies effecting faculty. These are: (1) Academic Affairs and its Office of Academic Labor Relations, (2) University Human Resources, and (3) the Rutgers Council

of chapters of the American Association of University Professors – American Federation of Teachers (AAUP-AFT), that is, the "union." Because faculty-related policies involve all three entities it is easy to be confused about who bears the primary responsibility for each policy area.

In a simplified view, Academic Affairs and its Office of Academic Labor Relations are responsible for nearly all aspects of policies and procedures that affect faculty. These include hiring; academic appointments, reappointments, and promotions; the tenure process; sabbatical leave and competitive fellowship leave; and faculty compensation. Information about each of these is available on the website of the Office of Academic Labor Relations at: http://academiclaborrelations.rutgers.edu/. Because the Rutgers faculty negotiates as a collective bargaining unit, most policies related to faculty are covered under the collective bargaining agreement. The agreement covers many policies, including faculty compensation, health insurance benefits, the tenure process, family leave and disability resulting from pregnancy, the grievance process, and leave without pay. The current collective bargaining agreement may be found at: http://academiclaborrelations.rutgers.edu/AcademicLaborContracts.htm.

University Human Resources primarily is responsible for payroll; benefits such as health, dental, and vision insurance; retirement plans; State of New Jersey insurance programs such as temporary disability insurance and family leave insurance; long-term disability insurance; family and medical leave; and various compliance issues. The University Human Resources website includes a portal for faculty that provides information on these areas and may be accessed at: http://uhr.rutgers.edu/faculty.

In addition to these three entities, faculty members are affected by the policies and procedures of the academic unit in which they reside. Each school and department has its own bylaws that cover many relevant procedures such as the composition of departmental committees. See http://oirap.rutgers.edu/msa/Documents/BylawsMaster.pdf for a compilation of college and school bylaws. A compilation of some departmental bylaws may be found at: http://www.rutgersaaup.org/faculty_governance_bylaws.htm.

Rutgers is a single university with multiple campuses. Although all three campuses (Camden, New Brunswick, and Newark) are subject to the same campus policies as set forth in the University Policy Library, the Camden and Newark campuses are each led by a chancellor who has considerable influence on the campus culture, implementation of policies, and academic decisions at those campuses.

Recent History of Institutional Diversity and Equity Organizational Structures

During the academic year when this report was prepared, significant organizational change was occurring due both to the appointment of Dr. Robert Barchi as the new president of the university and the integration of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey and most components of the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey (UMDNJ). During this period of transition and organizational change, the institutional structures for diversity and equity were also in flux. Under the previous university president, Dr. Richard McCormick, diversity and equity activities and units were organized under an Office of Diversity and Equity within Academic Affairs directed by Dr. Karen Stubaus, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs. Under President McCormick the university also had a large President's Council on Diversity and Equity co-chaired by Dr. Cheryl Wall, Professor of English, and President McCormick. The Council gathered together leaders from many campus entities with a focus on diversity and equity, including the SciWomen Office as represented by Dr. Joan Bennett, Vice President for Women in Science, Engineering, and Mathematics. During the transition period to President Barchi while Dr. Richard Edwards, Vice President for Academic Affairs, was the Interim University President, Dr. Jorge Schement, Dean of the School of Communications and Information, led a working group focused on diversity and equity. Among the recommendations was that deans should be

included in any future council. In spring 2013, Dr. Schement was appointed to a newly created position—the Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion. It is anticipated that all organizational entities related to diversity will report to this new Vice President position and that a newly configured Council for Diversity and Equity will be formed that will include various organizational entities, such as the Office for the Promotion of Women in Science, Engineering and Mathematics, and, also, importantly, academic deans. This Council could develop into a dynamic and useful forum for sharing best practices among various parts of the university.

Policies for Family Leave and Disability Resulting from Pregnancy

Although all faculty members—whether in the humanities or sciences, whether early in their career or well established, and whether men or women—face similar challenges in many areas, female faculty in their child-bearing years face a particular set of challenges. For them, university policies surrounding family leave and "stopping the clock" for the tenure process are particularly important.

At Rutgers tenure-track and tenured faculty, as well as teaching assistants and graduate assistants, are covered by a collective bargaining agreement negotiated between Rutgers University and the Rutgers Council of AAUP Chapters, the American Association of University Professors – American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO (AAUP-AFT).[1] Many provisions related to family leave are covered under this agreement, including policies on family leave and disability resulting from pregnancy (Section XVI); the ability to exclude one year (or, in some cases, two years) from the probationary period prior to tenure due to becoming a parent, caring for a family member or same sex sole domestic partner with a serious health condition, or the faculty member himself/herself having a serious health condition (Section XVI); and grievance procedures (Section IX).

Section XVI of the current AAUP-AFT agreement is devoted to the policies related to family leave. Under the agreement, members of the bargaining unit shall be granted "a leave of absence without pay to provide care made necessary by reason of the birth or adoption of the bargaining unit member's child or the serious health condition of a family member or same sex sole domestic partner" under the provision of the New Jersey Family Leave Act.[2]

Furthermore, "After pregnancy, a member of the bargaining unit is entitled to a recuperative period of paid leave of up to six weeks, or a longer period if the bargaining unit member continues to be disabled… In addition to the above, new parents shall be eligible to receive release time from their specifically assigned classroom teaching and committee service obligations for up to eight weeks. In cases of 'disability resulting from pregnancy,' the additional eight weeks of release from specifically assigned classroom teaching and committee service obligations shall be added to the six weeks of recuperative paid leave, for a total of up to fourteen weeks."[2] In practical terms, in many departments (though not all) this means that a bargaining unit member may be released from teaching and service responsibilities for an entire semester.

Notably, a policy providing release time from classroom and service obligations does not provide any relief from the ongoing responsibilities of running a research program. Typically in experimental sciences, running a research program requires managing a laboratory containing both physical infrastructure and personnel such as postdoctoral fellows, graduate students, undergraduates, and

---

[1] Rutgers University-AAUP-AFT Collective Bargaining Agreement, accessible at:
http://academiclaborrelations.rutgers.edu/AcademicLaborContracts.htm
[2] Section XVI, Rutgers-AAUP-AFT Collective Bargaining Agreement accessible at:
http://academiclaborrelations.rutgers.edu/AcademicLaborContracts.htm

other research assistants. These responsibilities continue regardless of release from teaching and service on committees.

Policies for Extension of Probationary Period Prior to Tenure Review

For faculty members who have not yet achieved tenure, release from teaching and service responsibilities alone may not be adequate accommodation for family responsibilities. Faculty members who are still in a probationary period may be granted an extension on the time of their probationary period before coming up for tenure review for taking leave due to any of the circumstances related to family care-giving responsibilities as described in the section above. Faculty members who receive a full semester of leave may request to have the entire year excluded from the probationary period. "A first year's leave of absence without pay shall automatically extend the term of appointment by a period equal to the time excluded from the probationary period."[2] However, "no extension applicable to the final year of the faculty member's probationary period may be requested or granted."[2] "A second year's leave of absence without pay shall not automatically extend the term of appointment. When the second year's leave of absence is requested, a faculty member may request an extension of his/her appointment for a period of time equal to the amount of the leave."[2] The bargaining unit agreement does not address whether a faculty member may request time be excluded from the probationary period beyond the two years specified.

In addition, faculty members who do not take leave may still request an extension of the probationary period. "A faculty bargaining unit member who continues to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of his/her faculty appointment may request an exclusion of one year from the probationary period when serving as the principal or co-equal care-giver under the following circumstances: when he/she becomes a parent during the first five years of the probationary period, or became a parent within one year prior to appointment at the University, or in order to care for a family member or same sex sole domestic partner with a serious health condition. This provision also applies when the unit member himself/herself has a serious health condition."[2]

It is possible that faculty members who legitimately could request an extension to their probationary period may be hesitant to do so for fear of being judged by a different standard. Some universities have adopted an "opt-out" system rather than an "opt-in" system for taking leave after child birth or adoption so that all faculty (both men and women) are automatically given an extra year prior to tenure review in the case of child birth or adoption to try and address this concern.

Themes Raised in Interviews

During campus interviews and policy research conducted as part of this policy project, two themes emerged repeatedly that warrant some discussion in this report of findings. First are the many ways in which the decentralized organizational structure and departmental variability at Rutgers impact the policy environment. Second is the lack of women in visible leadership positions at the university. Both of these issues will be discussed in more detail below.

Interestingly, during the campus interviews, matters related to work-life balance and childcare were raised infrequently. Although some of those interviewed acknowledged that work-life balance issues are ones that do affect women—and often disproportionately so—they viewed this as a major societal issue largely outside of the university purview and not one that could be addressed with simple tweaks to university policies. This was in stark contrast to the many comments heard regarding the need to value and provide visibility for women within the overall culture of Rutgers. While work-life

balance issues in academia were not, in general, viewed to be matters that could be easily addressed by university policy makers, ensuring that the structure and culture of the university makes it possible for female faculty to thrive at all levels was viewed as an issue that the university could be much more proactive in addressing.

<u>Decentralization / Diversity among departments</u>

Rutgers is an extremely decentralized institution, based on history, geography, organizational structure, and budgeting. This has many implications for the policy environment and affects faculty, departments, and the central university administration in different ways. In a decentralized environment the formation, communication, and implementation of policies can be complex. For faculty members, the most significant organizational unit at the university is the academic department in which they are members and, secondarily, the school in which that department resides. At Rutgers, the diversity among departments is further complicated by the three campus nature of the university. Rutgers-Camden and Rutgers-Newark each operate under the leadership of a Chancellor, while at the Rutgers-New Brunswick campus, the main academic leader is the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A new structure is anticipated once the integration of Rutgers and UMDJ occurs on July 1, 2013, one that will accommodate the large health sciences enterprise as part of the newly integrated university.

From the perspective of an individual faculty member, whose routine interaction is at department level, it may be easy to be confused about where to access policy information or where to turn when an issue arises that requires a problem to be addressed. If an orientation to and overview of university and departmental policies and resources are not provided regularly, faculty may not fully understand policies that could affect them. In a decentralized environment, faculty members may feel isolated within their department where the tone may be set either by a chairperson or the faculty as a whole. They may note appreciate what the broader university expectations and standards are. In cases where the departmental culture is not perceived to be inclusive, a faculty member may feel this isolation even more acutely if she does not possess a knowledge base of university policies and resources available to her.

From the perspective of a department that is interested in promoting gender diversity and equity, a decentralized environment may make it more challenging to know how best to do so. For example, it may not be apparent what best practices have been developed elsewhere and what, if any, university resources are available to assist the department in developing and maintaining an inclusive culture. This could encompass everything from the recruitment and hiring process to recognizing senior female faculty. Furthermore, department chairs who are interested in undertaking conscious steps to provide women with opportunities to thrive in their department may be hesitant to do so, unless they are convinced that the dean to whom they report and other senior leaders will be supportive of their actions. They want to know that their leadership will back them up, and it may be less obvious if this is the case in a decentralized environment. Finally, for departments that are not interested in addressing gender equity issues, no pressure to change the status quo may be felt in an organizational environment in which departments have significant autonomy.

From a university-wide perspective, when many academic and personnel decisions are made at the department or school level, any broad policy changes contemplated at a university-wide level must take into account the effect that they would have in each part of the university, be communicated clearly, and have local champions for their implementation. It takes skilled leadership to achieve a balance between respecting academic freedom within a department while at the same time holding departments accountable to university-wide expectations. Departments and schools may be motived and encouraged to pursue directions take through the use of incentives, but this requires creativity by

university leaders to do so in a way that will be effective and achieve genuine buy-in by departments. Finally, when so much of the activity related to faculty policies occurs at the department level, the central administration has a challenge in disseminating information. At Rutgers, there seem to be limited orientation and training opportunities provided for new faculty, department chairs, search committee chairs, etc. This hinders the ability of university leadership to provide consistent information and resources to all parts of the university.

The implications of a decentralized university structure extend beyond the impact on individual faculty members, departments, or the central administration. For example, with so many entities involved in faculty policy issues, the temptation is to allow difficult and thorny issues to fall between the organizational cracks, with no single entity either able or willing to take complete responsibility for resolving complex issues.

A decentralized environment has implications for how an entity such as the SciWomen Office with a university-wide scope of activities must function: that is, in part, by pursuing relationships with many individual departments and schools. Although it is undoubtedly time consuming, building relationships with each relevant department and school may be one of the most effective ways to pursue institutional transformation. In addition, communication mechanisms must be in place to disseminate information broadly.

Although a decentralized environment may pose some challenges in implementing policies across a diverse campus, it also has distinct advantages. Among these is that departments and schools with capable and visionary leaders can be nimble and quickly take advantage of opportunities. The success stories of departments may serve as exemplars to inspire other departments and schools. The ability for some units to serve as test beds for small-scale programs and innovations that may later be adopted across the campus is a powerful tool for the university. However this approach is most effective when mechanisms exist for sharing and scaling up success, as well as incentivizing departments to adopt best practices.

Ultimately, at some level, however, pursuing transformation across an entire institution requires a concerted effort from leaders at the top of the organization, as well as from individuals and small groups around the campus. Although a decentralized environment may make it possible for departments to chart forward-thinking courses that are tailored to their own situation, this alone is insufficient to change the culture of a large, complex institution. When university leaders at the highest levels do not voice support for institutional change on a topic, it is difficult to translate isolated department and school actions into wide-scale institutional transformation.

Academic Pathway and Lack of Women in Leadership Positions

The traditional academic career trajectory proceeds from appointment as an assistant professor to achieving tenure and on to promotion to associate and then full professor. At Rutgers there is also a possible promotion from Professor I to Professor II. During the interviews conducted as part of this policy project, relatively few complaints were heard about women facing disproportionate difficulty during the tenure process and early phases of their career progression at Rutgers.[3] However, concerns were raised related to the experiences of senior faculty. The impression given was that the further along the academic pathway female faculty progressed, the less they felt fully included in university life, appreciated, and rewarded.

---

[3] For fuller description see Strickland, E., "Synopsis of Interviews on Policies Related to Tenured and Tenure-Track Female Faculty in the Sciences, Engineering, and Mathematics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey," March 2012

Although the deleterious effect over time of the accumulation of many only incrementally more difficult hurdles for professional women compared to professional men is well documented, the comments related to the experiences of senior women at Rutgers seemed to extend beyond this phenomenon and suggest a structural issue may be a factor.

In addition, as described in the Synopsis of Interviews companion to this report, many expressed concern during the interview portion of this project about the lack of visibility for women at the university.

> Many of those interviewed expressed dismay at the dearth of women in leadership positions at the university. This observation, more than any other, was one that many interviewees chose as their first comment. Nearly every person interviewed commented on the disproportionate number of academic deans who are men (both currently and historically), even in disciplines such as nursing that traditionally have included a large proportion of women enrolled as students and appointed to the faculty. The lack of women in visible senior leadership positions was viewed by many as indicative of the overall status of women at the university.[3]

NSF Indicator Data compiled by the SciWomen Office and included in the May 2012 RU-FAIR ADVANCE Annual Report shows that for academic year 2011-2012, women comprised only 16% of academic deans and executive administrators.[4] To emphasize this point further, only one of the eleven members of the Rutgers Board of Governors in 2012-2013 is a woman.

Interestingly, many of those interviewed noted that more women hold visible leadership positions at UMDNJ than at Rutgers and wondered what impact the integration will have on the overall number of women in leadership positions after the July 1, 2013 integration is completed. Notably, among the senior positions held by women at UMDNJ is the President, Dr. Denise Rodgers.

As in the discussion of the challenges to institutional transformation in a decentralized environment, the lack of women in senior leadership positions is an issue that cannot be easily addressed by small, local groups of individuals, but rather must be an issue where leadership occurs at the highest possible levels of the university.

Previous Related Reports and Contemporaneous Publications of Interest

During the course of preparing this Report of Findings, several reports were located that could be instructive background material or useful starting points for future policy efforts. These are listed in Appendix B and explored either the experiences of female faculty at Rutgers or work-life balance concerns that potentially disproportionately affect female faculty.

In addition, it should be noted that although policy issues surrounding women in academia at one particular American university are the focus of this policy project, the university does not exist in isolation. While this report does not attempt to review the voluminous literature related to women in academia, women in leadership positions in society, or gender bias, several widely-read publications appeared during the time that this report was being conducted that merit mention. The first was a paper published in PNAS by Jo Handelsman and colleagues that found subtle gender bias in both male and female science faculty.[5] Second were two publications that led to significant cultural debate and media attention beyond the scientific community and stimulated broad societal discussions regarding

---

[4] May 2012 RU-FAIR ADVANCE Annual Report, Summary Table 8. Annual report accessible at: http://sciencewomen.rutgers.edu/quarterly_annual_reports

[5] Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. Moss-Racusin CA, Dovidio JF, Brescoll VL, Graham MJ, Handelsman J., Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2012 Oct 9;109(41):16474-9

the disproportionately low number of women holding high level positions in all types of organizations: "Why Women Still Can't Have It All" by Anne-Marie Slaughter (*The Atlantic*, July/August 2012) and "Lean In: Women, Work and the Will to Lead" by Sheryl Sandberg with Nell Scovell (Alfred A. Knopf, 2013). Together, these publications hint at the complexities involved in addressing policy issues related to female faculty in the sciences, engineering, and mathematics, when many of the relevant issues overlap with broad societal issues that extend beyond the university.

Observations

Overview of Rutgers University Policy Environment

Rutgers University operates within a very complex policy framework that is a consequence of several factors including: (1) the university's history as an amalgamation of several predecessor institutions over the course of several centuries[6]; (2) the unionization of Rutgers faculty and staff; and (3) the multi-campus nature of the university with campuses at Camden, Newark, and New Brunswick. Together these factors contribute to a highly decentralized policy environment, yet one with some significant policy constraints. A decentralized institution such as Rutgers may be described both as advantageous for those with an entrepreneurial spirit and, simultaneously, as challenging for any centralized effort toward institutional transformation.

Rutgers University is at an exceptionally dynamic time in its history. This has the potential for major upheavals in the university policy environment. Currently, several destabilizing events are converging: (1) a leadership transition from University President Richard McCormick (2002-2012) to University President Robert Barchi who took office in September 2012; (2) the integration of Rutgers University with most components of the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey (UMDNJ) to be effective July 1, 2013 as mandated by the NJ legislature in the New Jersey Medical and Health Sciences Education Restructuring Act of June 2012; and (3) the development of a university strategic plan slated to be presented to the Rutgers Board of Governors in Fall 2013. The merger of Rutgers and UMDNJ is one of, if not the largest integration of its kind in American higher education history and will have a significant impact on the future of Rutgers, including its faculty, students, and research enterprise.

The second important dynamic is the pervasive sense that the university is significantly under-resourced to carry out its mission. In nearly every conversation about any policy issue, the matter of funding arises. Departments and schools are constrained by a lack of financial resources, and funding support by the central administration is limited. In some instances the lack of resources may mean that limited or no funding is available to provide seed money to a new program. In other cases, lack of funding may mean that human resources are not available to provide adequate staff support for the management of important initiatives. Although it is true that in some cases, relatively small amounts of money can be leveraged to address gender diversity and equity issues, this takes creative leadership and purposeful intent on the part of administrators to accomplish. The availability of even a small pool of resources (either financial or staff time) within a centrally administered university office set aside for use to incentivize and/or supplement the activities of academic units working to promote female faculty in the sciences, engineering, and mathematics could be extremely valuable and should be considered when developing university budgets.

---

[6] See http://www.rutgers.edu/about-rutgers/history-overview for a useful overview of Rutgers history.

Paradoxes

The policy environment for female faculty at Rutgers presents several paradoxes. On the one hand, formal policies that relate to individual faculty members have many provisions in them that can be viewed as good for female faculty. Perhaps because of the collective bargaining agreement that covers Rutgers faculty, faculty compensation, benefits, and family leave policies are reasonably accommodating to the lives of women (for example, see discussion of specific policies related to family leave and stopping the tenure clock above). On the other hand, during interviews conducted across campus, the view expressed by many was that the institution as a whole is not a welcoming and inclusive place where women are visible and thriving. This paradox suggests that tweaks to formal university policies may not be the most effective way to address concerns relevant to female faculty, but that more creative and innovative solutions will be required.

A second paradox is that although Rutgers has a decades-long history of activism on gender equity issues in academia, it is not perceived to address these issues effectively and proactively. For example, a sex discrimination complaint against the university made by tenured female science faculty at the College of Arts and Sciences at Rutgers-Newark in the early 1970s went to the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Guidelines and resulted in a salary equalization plan.[7] More recent history of gender activism among female faculty at Rutgers includes complaints made in 2007 and 2008 to the university and the New Jersey State Attorney General's Office about salary inequality in the political science department that were resolved internally.[8]

Despite this history of activism on gender equity issues, a widespread perception exists that there is not a sincere institutional commitment to gender diversity and equity at the highest levels of the university. Even if this perception is not accurate, the existence of the perception itself is problematic. Repeatedly, the analyst heard statements in interviews such as "Rutgers is a very male-dominated institution." As discussed above, the lack of senior administrators on campus who are women is interpreted as a broad lack of concern for gender diversity and equity at the university.

It will take consistent communication and action at every level of the university to alter the negative perceptions of faculty, which have been developed over long years at the university. High level leadership is needed in holding forth a vision for a university culture where female faculty members are thriving in all departments—but especially those in the sciences, engineering, and mathematics.

Data

It has been said that "we measure what matters to us." If that is true, then having a solid collection of data that is readily accessible on the status of female faculty at Rutgers is an essential part of providing a valuable knowledge base and tool for the use of university leaders in analysis, planning, prioritization, evaluation, and benchmarking. In areas where no systematic data set exists, administrators and policymakers often are left to make decisions based on either their own preconceptions or on anecdotal evidence that may not reflect accurately the broader context. The availability of data on the status of female faculty can help inform university policy-makers in evaluating

---

[7] Documented in "A Pervasive Pattern of Delinquency:" Rutgers University and the Struggle for Equal Pay, 1970-1976 by Kathryn Mahaney, September 2010, available at:
http://sciencewomen.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/RUFAIR/pdfs/Dinnerstein%20Strauss_Mahaney%20paper.pdf
[8] See contemporaneous new reports at: http://chronicle.com/article/Women-Accuse-Rutgers/13963/ and
http://www.nj.com/news/index.ssf/2008/10/rutgers_probing_allegations_of.html

the need for and effectiveness of university policies and programs that promote the full inclusion of female faculty in all aspects of academic life. Deans and department chairs, in particular, may find such data useful as they consider the climate in their individual departments.

The SciWomen Office has compiled important indicator data on the status of female faculty in some areas as part of the RU-FAIR initiative.[9] This data, if made widely available and easily accessible to the broader university community, could help guide discussions on the status of female faculty at Rutgers. In addition, it would be particularly useful to compile comparison data that would allow comparison of Rutgers to national trends, against peer institutions, and over time. For example, how does the percentage of female faculty at Rutgers in a given department compare with the nationwide representation of women with terminal degrees in that field and with the percentage of women in faculty positions at peer institutions? How has the percentage of female faculty in that department changed over time? Data that compares Rutgers departments and schools to each other may also be helpful.   It will be important for the institutional data resources and infrastructure that the SciWomen Office has developed in collaboration with other entities at Rutgers as part of the RU-FAIR initiative to be sustained.

When data is either unavailable or not made public, many possible interpretations arise beyond the simple possibility that no one has compiled the data. These may include that the lack of transparency on the part of an organization may reflect its hesitancy to grapple with unflattering data or its disinterest in the outcomes that would be measured. Although it is unfortunate that some desirable data related to female faculty have not been collected and/or compiled systematically in the past, gaps in what administrators and policy makers might wish they know now can serve to highlight areas where future data collection would be beneficial. Examples could be conducting exit interviews with all faculty members leaving the university, both male and female, that could probe issues surrounding retention and a well-designed and regularly administered university-wide "climate survey" for faculty. As UMDNJ mergers with Rutgers, this could be a productive time for institution-wide new thinking on how to collect, compile, analyze, and use this sort of data. Baseline data from the first years of the integrated university could be particularly valuable as part of forward planning for the institution. Furthermore, data such as this would likely be of interest to broad diversity, inclusion, and equity efforts across the institution.

Recruitment of a Diverse Faculty and Numbers Need to Alter Faculty Composition

The Rutgers student body is incredibly diverse in many ways, and this is widely recognized as a strength of the university. In contrast, the Rutgers faculty is less diverse than might be possible, including the representation of women on the faculty in the sciences and engineering. As reported in the June 2012 RU-FAIR ADVANCE Annual Report, the percentage of full-time faculty in the sciences and engineering who are women varies among departments and schools. Overall, in academic year 2011-2012 38% of full-time Assistant Professors in the sciences/engineering were women, and 14.6% of full-time faculty members at the rank of Professor II in the sciences/engineering were women.[10]

If the goal is to have the number of women on the Rutgers faculty at each rank reach parity with some benchmark such as, perhaps, the percentage of women graduating with PhDs in a given field, significant progress will need to occur to achieve this goal. This will require a sustained effort over a

---

[9] Much indicator data is available on the SciWomen website as part of RU-FAIR ADVANCE Annual Reports to NSF at http://sciencewomen.rutgers.edu/quarterly_annual_reports.
[10] RU-FAIR ADVANCE Year Four Annual Report to NSF, June 2012, Table 1, accessible at: http://sciencewomen.rutgers.edu/quarterly_annual_reports

long period of time and likely will require the recruitment of female faculty at all levels, not just at the assistant professor level. It may also require conscious efforts to retain female faculty already at Rutgers. Given that most faculty members remain in their positions for decades, the overall composition of the faculty at any university typically changes very slowly over time. An informative analysis would be to project the percentage of women in various academic departments over time if hiring trends from the past continue into the future. It is conceivable that even with a record number of women hired by a department in any single year, the overall percentage of female faculty would not change dramatically in the short term.

During the interviews that were conducted as part of this policy project, extensive comments were made regarding current policies and practices related to faculty recruitment and hiring. See Synopsis of Interviews for more detail.[3] As in other areas, many commented on the need for senior university leaders to be proactive in setting forth a vision for faculty recruitment that is intentional about increasing the number of women on the faculty in the sciences, math, and engineering. Certainly some departments and schools have made significant progress in this regard during the years of the RU-FAIR initiative, but the progress has not been uniform across all departments and schools. Although the SciWomen Office and other similar entities can facilitate sharing best practices among academic units, leadership and communication of a vision from senior university leaders on the value of working toward a more diverse faculty is critically important. Furthermore, support from a centralized office—whether through financial incentives, staff efforts, or coordination of hiring opportunities among schools—would also be beneficial.

Conclusion

Rutgers is approaching a major milestone in the summer of 2013 as the integration with UMDNJ draws near. Almost simultaneously, the RU-FAIR initiative is reaching the end of its five year funding from NSF with many successes and best practices learned. As university leaders consider how best to develop policies and strategic plans going forward, they would be wise to view investments made in promoting female faculty in the sciences, engineering, and mathematics not as a distraction from the main objective of moving Rutgers forward as an institution, but as advantageous to the entire university. In nearly all cases, what is good for female faculty members is good for the entire faculty. Furthermore, many of the lessons learned as the SciWomen Office has achieved success in working across the multiple campuses and units that compose Rutgers, may be useful guides as the newly integrated university develops organizational structures.

Appendix A

Reports Related to this Document

Strickland, Elizabeth, "Compilation of Rutgers University Policies that Affect Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty in the Sciences, Engineering, and Mathematics," February 2013 (unpublished, but available from SciWomen Office)

Strickland, Elizabeth, "A Synopsis of Interviews on Policies Related to Tenured and Tenure-Track Female Faculty in the Sciences, Engineering, and Mathematics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey," March 2013 (unpublished)

Appendix B

Previous Related Reports

Balliet, Barbara, Mary Hawkesworth, Barbara Balliet, Lisa Hetfield, Jennifer Morgan, Lillian Robbins, "Feminist Interventions: Creating New Institutional Spaces for Women at Rutgers" (the Ford Foundation report), May 11, 2005; later published in *Doing Diversity in Higher Education: Faculty Leaders Share Challenges and Strategies*, Winnifred Brown-Glaude, Editor, Rutgers University Press, 2009

Committee on Work and Family Issues, "Report of the Committee on Work and Family Issues," co-chaired by Marianne Gaunt and Barbara Lee, June 2009, available at: http://www.rutgersaaup.org/work-family/work+family+committee+report_062209.pdf

FAS Gender Equity Committee, "A Study of Gender Equity in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Rutgers University-New Brunswick," October 2001, available at: http://sas.rutgers.edu/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=152&Itemid=159

Mahaney, Kathryn, "'A Pervasive Pattern of Delinquency:' Rutgers University and the Struggle for Equal Pay, 1970-1976," September 2010, available at: http://sciencewomen.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/RUFAIR/pdfs/Dinnerstein%20Strauss_Mahaney%20paper.pdf