

January 16, 1998 Faculty Council Meeting
Committee on the Status of Women
Committee Appointed by the Chair of the Faculty
1996-1997 Annual Report

Members: Abigail T. Panter (1997-00), Chair; Susan Bickford (1997-00), Nancy Chesheir (1997-00), Allen F. Glazner (1995-98), Karla A. Henderson (1995-98), Laurie E. McNeil (1997-00), Susan J. Navarette (1996-99), Debra L. Shapiro (1996-99), Michael J. Symons (1996-99), Rebecca S. Wilder (1995-98).

Members leaving committee during past year: Catherine Marshall, Brent S. Wissick

Meetings during past year: December 4, 1997, September 29, 1997

Report prepared by: Abigail T. Panter (Chair), with review by Laurie McNeil and Rebecca Wilder

Committee Charge: "The Committee addresses ongoing concerns of women faculty members, identifies obstacles to achievement and maintenance of equality in the representation and status of women on the faculty, and proposes steps for overcoming those obstacles." (*The Faculty Code of University Government* IV.B.2.a.iii).

Previous Faculty Council questions or charges: None.

Report of activities:

In this past year the Committee:

- Continued its work examining glass ceiling effects on campus. In collaboration with the Provost's Office (especially, Kathleen McGaughey and Laurie Mesibov), the focus turned from Academic Affairs to the Division of Health Affairs. The resulting study ("Career and promotion of faculty appointed in the Division of Health Affairs 1980-1986") had two components; the Committee contributed to the study and instrument design for both components. The first component was a quantitative investigation of promotion rates, and the second consisted of in-depth interviews with Health Affairs faculty (conducted by Mesibov) about the role of gender in promotion and work patterns. This latter aspect also incorporated a short exit questionnaire sent to former faculty to address possible gender effects in decisions to leave the University. In the promotion data, the comments made by those who agreed to be interviewed, and the exit data, clear ceiling effects were not obtained. Mesibov identified important attitudinal differences about women's work patterns and professional roles, and the Committee also is considering a number of Mesibov's recommendations, regarding mentoring, standards and procedures for promotion, and understanding why respondents viewed their workplace environment as neutral -- not negative, but not positive.
- Collaborated with the Advocacy Division of the Carolina Women's Center to determine the extent to which women are represented in decision-making bodies of the institution,

beyond the recent prominent appointments of several senior women administrators. The Committee has been compiling a list of major existing committees, boards, and administrative positions on campus, determining procedures for updating the list each year, and defining concepts such as adequate representation.

- Continued to consider systematic ways to obtain data about why individuals choose to exit this institution and specifically, whether these issues are in any way related to poor climate, real or perceived gender bias, and/or lack of advancement opportunities. The Committee has begun to develop a set of procedures for tracking departures from the university to improve the current, poor response rates for the exit interview.
- Began designing and planning for a small-scale evaluation of the Bridges program and its impact on women's academic leadership and career opportunities on the UNC-Chapel Hill campus.
- Started re-analyzing the salary equity data set from Academic Affairs prepared by Lynn Williford for her April 1997 report ("Gender differences in faculty salaries in the College of Arts and Sciences, 1995-1996: An exploratory analysis"). New analyses focus on within-Division comparisons, with particular emphasis on the sciences. The committee is also contacting departments/academic units with few or no women faculty to underscore the importance of recruiting and hiring talented women faculty despite small applicant pools.
- Continued to assemble and categorize procedures used in promotion decisions from Associate to Full Professor. Although procedures/policies were submitted by a subset of units responding to the Provost's charge (and the Committee's request), the data now are incomplete. The Committee is assessing what is needed at this point to gain a fuller understanding of how these promotion decisions are made across campus.
- Discussed and reviewed various proposals (e.g., the spousal/partner hiring proposal) and responded to requests for information as needed.

Recommendations for Action by Faculty Council: None.