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Attached for your review is the "1992-93 Report on the Status of Faculty Women: Measurements and Recognition of Performance." The Report contains the Task Force’s findings on the current promotion, tenure, and salary status of GSU faculty women and includes a series of recommendations for further study by the University in this important area. The members of the Task Force appreciate your attention to this Report and would be happy to discuss the findings and recommendations with you at any time.

Provost Tom LaBelle provided financial support for the preparation of this Report in the form of research stipends for me and for Pat Lynch and Linda Flynn, the two Beebe Institute Ph.D. candidates who provided substantial assistance in the preparation of the Report. We are grateful to him for that support.
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"Progress in the overall employment status [of women in academia] has changed only marginally during the past decade [1980-90] despite the dramatic increase in female doctorates and the increased tendency for women to work outside the home."
(Dwyer at 213.) This bleak description of the status of faculty women on a national scale causes the Georgia State University Task Force on Faculty Women's Concerns to focus once again on the status of female faculty members at GSU. While the Task Force applauds the progress that the University has made in the past decade (for example, the University has hired four female Deans since 1984), we find that faculty women are still suffering from the impact of deeply imbedded stereotypes, not only of women's roles and functions, but also of the roles and functions of academics in general.

The Task Force submits this "1992-93 Report on the Status of GSU Faculty Women: Measurements and Recognition of Performance" as part of a continuing effort to join with other components of the university community in striving to distinguish GSU as "Tomorrow's University Today." The Task Force envisions the ideal university environment as one in which faculty members' performance levels are recognized and rewarded on the basis of merit alone and are unhampered by the debilitating effects of both blatant and subtle forms of discrimination on the basis of such factors as sex, race, national origin, or sexual orientation.
I. BACKGROUND

In Spring, 1988, Dr. Thomas Brewer, the GSU Vice President for Academic Affairs, created the Committee on Faculty Women's Concerns. The Committee was chaired by Professor Paula Dressel and was composed of representatives of the six colleges of the University, the Division of Developmental Studies, the Library, and the Counseling Center. In June, 1989, the Committee presented its first Status Report on Faculty Women at GSU (referred to herein as the "1989 Status Report.") The 1989 Status Report contained twenty-four recommendations for further actions by the University that were designed to address current problems faced by GSU female faculty members. The Committee continued to focus in the ensuing years on measures designed to improve the quality of the worklives of GSU female faculty members. The Committee was chaired by Patricia McDougall in 1990-91 and was restructured in 1991 as the Task Force on Faculty Women's Concerns. The Task Force has been chaired by Professor Mary Radford since July 1991. The current members of the Task Force are Professors Bill Bechtel (Philosophy), Mary Deming (Developmental Studies), Doris Derby (Academic Affairs - Minority Programs), Diane Fowlkes (Political Science, Interim Director - Women's Studies), Janet Franzoni (Counseling and Psychological Services), Patty Gray (Adult Health Nursing), Russell Irvine (Educational Foundations), and Mary Munroe (Pullen Library).

The 1992-93 Status Report was supported by a grant from the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs,
Thomas LaBelle. The grant provided summer research support for Professor Radford and research stipends for Pat Lynch and Linda Flynn, two PhD candidates from the Beebe Institute of the College of Business Administration. Information used in this study was provided by Jim Prather and Carol Hand of the GSU Office of Institutional Research; Ellen Posey, Research Assistant in the Office of the Provost; and Annie Smith, the Director of the GSU Affirmative Action Office. Professor Bikramjit Garcha (Associate Provost) also offered consultative assistance. Members of the Task Force, Professor Radford, Ms. Lynch and Ms. Flynn also engaged in numerous informal conversations with faculty members at GSU and other members of the University community. Findings from these informal conversations are inserted as anecdotal evidence throughout this Report.

The initial purpose of the 1992–93 study was to determine whether women faculty members at Georgia State University suffer from inequities in the related areas of salary, rank, and tenure and otherwise to determine the degree to which performance by these faculty members is recognized by the University. It became clear early on that a truly comprehensive study was beyond the means, capabilities, and limited resources of the Task Force. Members of the Task Force were hampered not only by the limited time they could devote to such an endeavor, but also by the intricate matrix of concerns that confront any researcher of issues as complex as those of performance criteria and gender inequities in academia. This Report contains preliminary
findings by the Task Force and an agenda for more extensive research studies in the area of salary, rank, and tenure. The Report also proposes a general performance review of faculty members at the University that is designed to correct any recognized inequities (not limited to inequities among female faculty members) in an overall effort to raise the quality of faculty performance at GSU.

II. GENERAL THEORIES OF SEX DISCRIMINATION

The Task Force did not focus in its study solely on blatant forms of discriminatory treatment on the basis of sex. Rather, in line with prevailing legal theories of discrimination, the Task Force looked both for obvious forms of sex-biased treatment and for more subtle forms of sex bias that often become evident only when the results of employment practices are examined.

Discrimination on the basis of sex and other factors (race, national origin, etc.) has historically been found to take two forms: disparate treatment and disparate impact. Disparate treatment discrimination occurs when an employer intentionally and sometimes even blatantly makes distinctions among employees on the basis of gender. Examples of disparate treatment sex discrimination fortunately seem to be diminishing on college campuses in general and at GSU.

Disparate impact discrimination, on the other hand, is more difficult to recognize and consequently more difficult to eradicate. Disparate impact discrimination is less obvious than
disparate treatment because the employment practice or criterion that produces the discriminatory effect is usually one that is neutral on its face and thus appears to be "fair". (For example, a requirement that all applicants for a job be at least 5'5" tall and weigh at least 135 pounds appears neutral on its face but would obviously exclude a much greater proportion of women than men.) Recent amendments to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 indicate that facially neutral practices that have a disproportionate impact on groups such as women and minorities will be acceptable only if the factors are job-related and consistent with business necessity. (In the previous example, if the employee is hiring for a job requiring heavy lifting, the employer may be able to show that its height and weight requirements reflect the needs of the job.) Many of the observations in this Report relate to facially neutral criteria that are used by the University in fixing and measuring salaries or rank or in evaluating faculty members for promotion and tenure. One purpose of this Report is to highlight the effect or potential effect of these practices so that University administrators, Deans, and Department Heads will be aware of the risk involved in utilizing these practices and will engage in a realistic analysis of whether these practices are the best means of measuring the merit of faculty members. A common rationalization for employing such factors is their efficiency. For example, it may be more efficient to measure faculty salaries in terms of years in rank or years in service (a concrete measure
that is easily available for all faculty members) than to focus on an in-depth analysis of faculty performance during those years. In this regard, the Task Force realizes that it is asking the University to invest more time and effort than has formerly been devoted to such issues. The Task Force believes that a merit-based approach to faculty promotion and compensation is not only completely consistent with the overall goals of the University but it also is one that is designed to replace efficiency with excellence.

Another persistent source of sex discrimination in our society, and, consequently, in academia, is discrimination that results from stereotyping. Numerous studies have shown that women are particularly vulnerable to such discrimination in the working world. This results from the fact that the average individual's stereotyped notions about those qualities that are necessary for "success" in the working world are almost identical to the average individual's stereotyped notions of qualities that are "male". (Schein at p.99). For example, it is commonly assumed that males are "assertive" (an admirable trait in the working world) while it is also commonly perceived that women are "timid". To make matters even worse, if a woman is perceived to be manifesting "male" traits (e.g., an "assertive woman"), she may be perceived to be abnormal or even perverted. This classic "double bind" has been blamed by many researchers for the "glass ceiling" effect that occurs when women strive to achieve high-level management positions.
Sex stereotyping in a university environment may take many forms. Female faculty members' teaching evaluations by male and female students and other faculty members may be affected by "male" norms for effective teaching. (For example, one female faculty member reports that she received a negative evaluation from a male counterpart who stated that she used "charm" in the classroom rather than strength and assertiveness.) Female faculty members' research areas may be deemed "soft" by the norms of fields that have been dominated by analytical or statistical approaches. (Female faculty members who research and write in the area of Feminism and Women's Studies seem particularly vulnerable to this judgment.) Female faculty members may also be viewed by their students as more "open" and more "nurturing". Many women faculty members at GSU relate how they are constantly called upon by students for advice or just to serve as a shoulder to cry on. While the Task Force does not conclude that availability to students is a negative trait, it cannot be denied that there are few rewards in the current University system for one's success in this area. In addition, time devoted to student involvement often results in distraction from the types of activities that are rewarded, particularly research and publication.

One final form of discrimination that is relevant to the findings in the Report is commonly referred to as "tokenism". In the GSU environment, women faculty members perceive that their committee and other extra-curricular assignments are far more
burdensome than those of their male counterparts. This seems to result from two phenomena. First, an (admirable) effort is made by the University to include women on most of its major committees. However, because there are relatively fewer women than men on the university faculty, this cannot help but have disproportionate effects. Several GSU women faculty members report serving on and even chairing University-wide committees as early as their second or third year at the University. The second phenomenon is that (again admirable) efforts are made by the University to ameliorate the environment of women at GSU by establishing committees which have a focus that is unique to or of primary importance to women (e.g., Task Force on Child Care, Task Force on Faculty Women's Concerns, etc.) The work of these committees, while vital to the progress of the University, is also extremely demanding of those who take on the responsibilities.

Recent years have seen an upsurge in the establishment of consulting firms whose expertise is managing diverse work populations. Also, academics at GSU and at universities throughout the United States have or are developing expertise in the areas of sex discrimination. This Report contains many suggestions for research projects that could be performed by such consultants or, alternatively, that could be incorporated into the research agendas of faculty members rather than delegated to faculty committees. (For example, at least two College of Business faculty members who are aware of the Task Force study
have expressed an interest in pursuing in depth studies that are suggested by the Task Force's findings.) The Task Force applauds the University's willingness to provide research support for this Report. The Task Force urges the University to take on further financial responsibility in the form of consulting fees or research stipends for the research agenda laid out in this Report. For example, the University could offer research grants similar to the Research Enhancement Grants to faculty members who choose to study issues such as compensation or promotion at this University. Any resources devoted to this effort are an investment by the University that should show high returns not only in terms of garnering national attention but also in terms of increasing the quality of job performance and the degree of job satisfaction of the University faculty.

III. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Force begins its discussion and series of recommendations with an endorsement of the ostensibly simple concept that the primary basis for reward and recognition in the University should be merit. The Task Force approaches the interests of GSU faculty women with the confidence that an informed and unbiased approach to compensating, promoting, and tenuring faculty will remove the artificial barriers that have impeded faculty women (and other talented members of the GSU community, both male and female) from achieving their full individual potentials and, consequently, from elevating the
quality and prestige of the University as a whole. With this endorsement, the Task Force makes clear that is it not seeking "special treatment" for women but rather a recognition that certain obstacles, both blatant and subtle, hinder the professional growth of faculty women and, consequently, the growth of the university.

Recommendation #1: The University should perform an in-depth study to discover what factors control rank at GSU and to determine whether such factors are masking subtle biases based on gender or other classifications.

In terms of rank, GSU female faculty members fare no better than - and, in some cases, not as well as - their female counterparts nationwide. Furthermore, the statistics at GSU vary little from nationwide statistics of a decade ago. "[Nationwide] data on full-time faculty by academic rank in 1982-83 reveal that, relative to their male counterparts, faculty women were less likely to be full professors (36 versus 12.1 percent), while the opposite is true for assistant professors, lecturers, instructors, and in non-ranked classifications at two-year institutions (1 of 3 males versus 2 of three females)."

(Bognanno at pp. 246-47.) "Women faculty are still promoted at a slower rate than male faculty. Despite an increased proportion of females receiving doctoral degrees and pursuing postdoctoral training, they represent a disproportionate share of the
unemployed, part-time status, special program, or adjunct employees." (Dwyer at p. 214)

Studies by the American Association of University Professors show that, in 1992-93, women comprised 29.4% of all college faculty nationally. Only 14.4% of full professors were women while 42.3% of assistant professors and 58.1% of instructors were women. AAUP studies for 1991-92 showed that, in doctoral granting institutions, 48% of the male faculty members but only 17% of the female faculty members were full professors, roughly the same percentage of men and women were associate professors, 20.3% of men and 38.7% of women were assistant professors, and 4.5% of men and 16% of women were in the non-tenure-track ranks of Instructor and Lecturer.

Statistics from the 1991-92 GSU Fact Book show that women faculty at GSU remain clustered in the lower ranks. In 1991-92, 68% of the full-time instructional faculty were males, 32% were females. The percentage of females employed at GSU is higher than the nationwide percentage; however, women faculty members at GSU are more likely than their nationwide counterparts to be serving in a lower level rank. Table I shows the array of males and females in each of the ranks at GSU in Academic Year 1991-92.
TABLE I


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Males</th>
<th>% Females</th>
<th>% of All Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics from the GSU Fact Book also indicate that, in 1991-92, of a total of 759 full-time instructional faculty members in the rank of Instructor through Full Professor:

43% of male faculty and 13% of female faculty were full professors;

34% of males and 35% of females were associate professors;

21% of males and 42% of females were assistant professors;

2% of males and 10% of females were instructors.

Another phenomenon evident from the 1991-92 GSU statistics is that faculty in those divisions of the University that are predominantly female were disproportionately clustered in ranks lower than the rank of full professor while faculty in male-dominated divisions did not exhibit this same effect. In 1991-92, the full-time instructional faculties of the College of Health Sciences and the Division of Developmental Studies were
predominantly female: Health Sciences - 75% female; Developmental Studies - 83% female. The predominance of males on the faculties of the College of Arts and Sciences and Business Administration was quite high, with the Arts and Sciences faculty composed of 75% males and the Business faculty composed of 85% males. In divisions where there was no major discrepancy between the percentage of males and the percentage of females on the full-time instructional faculty, the rank statistics show no definite pattern. These include the faculties of the Colleges of Education, Law, and Public and Urban Affairs: Education - 41% females; Law - 40% females; and Public and Urban Affairs - 42% females. Table II shows the rank and tenure status of full-time instructional faculty by college.

**TABLE II**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>% Prof.</th>
<th>% Assoc.</th>
<th>% Asst.</th>
<th>% Instr.</th>
<th>Ten.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sci</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub. &amp; Urb.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. Studies</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNIV.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These statistics indicate that in the College of Health Sciences
and the Division of Developmental Studies, the faculty were concentrated in ranks lower than that of Full Professor. This phenomenon also occurred in the College of Public and Urban Affairs, whose faculty is 42% female. This phenomenon cannot be explained entirely by the educational credentials of the faculty members because, in both the College of Public and Urban Affairs and the Division of Developmental Studies, the percentage of faculty members who hold the doctoral degree (84% and 83% respectively) was close to the percentage for the total University full-time instructional faculty who hold the doctoral degree (88%).

Librarians and Counselors are two additional groups of individuals who hold faculty rank at the University. According to the 1991-92 Fact Book, of the eight Counselors, two (25%) were men and six (75%) were women. The only Full Professor was a male. One male and three females were Associate Professors. Three females were Assistant Professors. All of the Counselors hold the doctoral degree.

---

1There is a variety of possible explanations for the occurrence of this phenomenon, including the relative newness of the Division of Developmental Studies and the focus in some of these departments on teaching and professional service over research activities. As with all other aspects of this Report, the Task Force highlights this phenomenon as a topic of exploration for future study and does not intend to imply that intentional sex discrimination exists in this departments.
Table III shows the rank of Librarians in 1991-92.

**TABLE III**

**LIBRARIANS BY RANK (1991-92 Fact Book):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Males</th>
<th>% Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Library faculty group is composed of 10 men (29%) and 25 women (71%). The only Full Professor is male. Most of the Librarians (70% of the men and 84% of the women) are concentrated in the ranks of Assistant Professor and Instructor. Nine percent of the Librarians hold the doctoral degree.

Women are sorely underrepresented among those faculty members at GSU who receive additional honors (and sometimes benefits) in the form of endowed chairs, endowed professorships, and the status of Regents' Professor. The 1991-92 GSU Fact Book listed 11 endowed chairs at the University; only one of these was held by a female faculty member. Two endowed professorships were listed; neither of these was held by a female faculty members. GSU had nine faculty members in 1991-92 who held the status of Regents' Professor. Only one of the Regents' Professors was a woman - and she was the same woman who held the endowed chair. (There were two men who held both an endowed chair or professorship and also the status of Regents' Professor.) The 1989 Status Report pointed out this under-representation of
females and minorities and recommended that "Individuals and/or committees who make the determination of these awards need to be aware of this shortcoming and be committed to affirmative steps to address any inequities in the selection process."

Women faculty at GSU are also less likely than males to hold the position of Department Head or to serve as a General Administrator. The 1991-92 GSU Fact Book indicated that 80% of department heads were men and 74% of General Administrators who hold faculty rank were men. (Of the total GSU personnel who held faculty rank, 66% were male.) Among the Academic Administrators, 61% were males and 39% were females. These percentages more closely reflected the overall percentages among personnel who hold faculty rank.

A focus on faculty rank is vital because this factor has been found to correlate with other issues of importance to male and female faculty members. For example, as will be noted in the following discussion on Salaries, faculty rank is one of the most accurate determinant of salaries. One researcher, citing the national statistic that 70% of all male faculty members are tenured while 63.5% of women are tenured, states that the "difference is partly explained by the intersex variations in academic rank . . . ." (Bognanno, p. 247). When statistical or qualitative studies are performed to determine whether there is inequitable treatment of faculty, rank is often overlooked or is itself not considered to be the result of potential gender bias. In other words, if a female Assistant Professor receives a salary
similar to that of a male Assistant Professor, questions are rarely raised as to whether the female should in fact be in a higher rank and thus be eligible for a higher salary.

In 1992, the Task Force submitted as part of University's "Action Plan" a recommendation for the recruitment of high-ranked, high status female and minority professors and the identification of individual female and minority faculty members within the University whose status at the University may not reflect their level of achievement. The Task Force now suggests an in-depth study to discover what factors control rank at GSU and to determine whether such factors are masking subtle biases against female and minority faculty members. Questions which also should be explored include: whether there is a correlation between rank and age or rank and years since terminal degree; whether faculty members at lower ranks tend to carry heavier teaching loads (and thus may be unable to engage in the type of research necessary for promotions); and whether qualified female faculty members are not applying for promotions and, is, so, why they are not submitting their applications.

Recommendation #2: The University should perform a study of the tenure system at GSU and the recent attrition of GSU faculty members to determine how to encourage the retention of talented faculty at the University and to ferret out any gender-oriented issues that are having a disproportionate effect on the tenure and retention of female faculty members.
As noted above, national statistics show that 70% of all male faculty members are tenured while 63.5% of women are tenured. (Bognanno at p. 247). The GSU 1991-92 Fact Book does not report the gender of those faculty members who are tenured, showing only that 64% of full-time instructional faculty are tenured and 60% of all personnel holding faculty rank are tenured. Table II (above) includes a breakdown of tenure status among the divisions of the University and contains statistics that are worth noting. First, in the two units of the University that have predominately female faculties (Health Sciences and Developmental Studies), the percentage of faculty who are tenured (Health Sciences - 56%, Developmental Studies - 11%) falls below the overall percentage of the University. This gap also is evident in the College of Public and Urban Affairs (42% female) where only 45% of the faculty are tenured. Sixty-three percent of the Counselors are tenured but only 34% of the Librarians are tenured.

Tenure patterns at GSU should be studied in conjunction with an analysis of why faculty members leave GSU. Some leave because they are denied tenure or reappointment. Others leave for better job opportunities. Still others leave because of family

---

2It should be noted that in the Division of Developmental Studies, the low tenure percentage is due primarily to the fact that the faculty in this Division are relatively young and new to the University. Faculty members in this Division who have applied for tenure have not been turned down. As noted above, these statistics are cited for the purpose of opening avenues of inquiry, not for the purpose of pointing "accusatory" fingers at particular divisions of the University.
responsibilities. Many of these faculty members are valuable assets whose absence will be felt by the University not only in terms of the loss of their talents and contributions but also in terms of the cost of recruiting replacements for them.

The study of tenure and termination should focus on whether gender-related issues dictate the career patterns of female faculty. The multi-faceted issue of family responsibilities is one that cannot be explored in depth in this Report. However, the following observations may serve to guide those who engage in more extensive study of tenure and termination at GSU.

First, it cannot be denied that family responsibilities continue to fall disproportionately on female workers in our society. Consequently, the matter of child care is one that takes on magnified importance for female faculty members. The University has established a Task Force on Child Care which is engaging in a continuous study of options to fulfill the child care needs at the University. The Task Force on Faculty Women's Concerns supports the work of this Task Force, realizing that any advances the University makes in this area will benefit faculty women and all faculty and staff members who have made the commitment to bear and raise the next generation.

Related to the matter of child care is the issue of leave time or reduced loads for faculty members who are raising children. Effective January 1, 1993, the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia approved a Family Leave Policy allowing employees to take up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave to care
for a child or ailing dependent or parent. (One of the first laws signed by President Bill Clinton, the Family and Medical Leave Act, requires private employers with 50 or more employees to offer this same policy.) However, a 12-week leave policy alone may not resolve the difficulties raised by a junior faculty member who is trying to raise a child at the same time he or she is trying to become tenured. The tenure system of the University System allows faculty members only a limited period of time in which to achieve tenured status. A faculty member will not be reappointed to the University if tenure is not achieved after a seven-year "probationary period". The 1989 Status Report pointed out that "there is no apparent provision for an extension of this period for women who take time to bear and rear children. A woman who is pregnant and has given birth (or, for that matter, any parent who has adopted a child and begun raising an infant) is held to the same schedule for publication and service as any other faculty member, unless that person opts for a formal leave of absence." (1989 Status Report at p. 23) While a faculty member who is raising a child may not desire a formal leave of absence, consideration should be given to allow a faculty member to "stop-the-clock" toward tenure from running in a year in which he or she has compelling family responsibilities.

A study of tenure and termination may also benefit the University by manifesting to what extent faculty member's careers at GSU are dictated by the careers of their spouses. As part of the University's "Action Plan," the Task Force submitted a
proposal that the University focus more attention on the role played by faculty candidate's spouses in determining whether the candidate will accept a position at GSU. In conjunction with this effort, if the tenure and termination study shows that faculty members are leaving GSU to follow their spouses to other career opportunities (a phenomenon which once again seems to fall disproportionately on women), GSU should investigate ways in which it can retain talented faculty members by aiding their spouses in locating career opportunities in Atlanta. As this issue is of particular concern to couples who are both academics, GSU could join with other colleges and universities in Atlanta in establishing a network for exploring career opportunities for faculty spouses.

Recommendation #3: The University should engage in more extensive analysis of the salary structure at GSU. This analysis should include a focus on the extent to which factors that help determine salaries but are unrelated to academic performance (such as negotiation skills, mobility or perceived mobility of a faculty member, and the use of years of service) have disproportionate effects on female faculty members.

Nationwide statistics show that "there is still significant disparity between males and females in financial rewards even when controlling for career age, academic rank, prestige of institution, and discipline." (Dwyer at p. 214.) One study from 1985 showed that women earned 88.1% of male earnings (full
professors), 92.9% (associate professors), 91.9% (assistant professors), 93.1% (lecturers), 87.3% (instructors). These percentage figures were actually lower than comparable figures from 1975-76. (Bogmann at pp. 250-51). An AAUP Study shows that by 1992-93, the 1985 statistics had seen little change: in 1992-93, women earned 88.2% of male earnings (full professor), 93.0% (associate professors), 92.3% (assistant professors), 94.4% (instructors) The AAUP annual salary surveys over the past nine years show that there has been little progression in the gender gap in academia and in some areas, the ratio of female to male salaries has gotten worse. Studies have also shown that the gap between men's and women's academic salaries widens with experience and that after 25 years of work experience, a man's salary continues to climb but a woman's salary typically no longer increases. (Billard, citing Vetter at pp. 8-9)

In its 1992-93 study, the AAUP expressed its concern that, while the number of women in academia had increased substantially over the previous 10 years, there has been essentially no change in the ratio of male and female faculty salaries. The study stated as follows:

What are the possible causes of these two strikingly different patterns? At the level of associate and full professors the unchanging relative salaries could be explained by the growth in women's share of tenured positions, since that growth lowers the average age of women compared to men within these ranks. But at the assistant
professor level, where few people stay beyond six or seven years, this explanation, though possible, is harder to credit.

One possibility is that women's representation in lower-paid fields, where they had already constituted a disproportionately large fraction of the faculty, increased as rapidly as in the higher-paid fields where they remain unrepresented. Another is that discrimination against women in higher education remains unchanged, but is now manifested mainly in salary discrimination rather than in the creation of general barriers to entry. (AAUP Study at p. 12)

The University's Office of Institutional Research performs an annual analysis of faculty salaries. This analysis uses a multiple regression model that has been developed and used over an 18-year period. The model incorporates rank, highest degree, administrative status, discipline, years-in-rank, endowed chairs, and contract status. The model does not incorporate any measures of merit. Separate models are built for each college and department of the University to assist in identifying individual faculty salaries that are too high or too low when compared with the predicted range for each college and department. Table IV shows the results of the 1991-92 analysis. The second column shows the percentage of females (and, in parentheses, the percentage of males) whose salaries were above the predicted range. The third column shows the percentages of males and
females in each college and department whose salaries were below the predicted range.

**TABLE IV**

"An Analysis of 1991-92 Instructional Faculty Salaries,"

(Research Report No. 92-11 by Carol A. Hand and James E. Prether)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of females (males)</th>
<th>% of females (males) w/higher salaries</th>
<th>% of females (males) w/ lower salaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>33% (67%)</td>
<td>26% (74%)</td>
<td>33% (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; S</td>
<td>25% (75%)</td>
<td>17% (83%)</td>
<td>19% (81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>16% (84%)</td>
<td>18% (82%)</td>
<td>15% (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>41% (59%)</td>
<td>38% (63%)</td>
<td>52% (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci.</td>
<td>74% (26%)</td>
<td>79% (21%)</td>
<td>79% (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>40% (60%)</td>
<td>9% (91%)</td>
<td>56% (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;U Affairs</td>
<td>42% (58%)</td>
<td>33% (67%)</td>
<td>46% (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. Studies</td>
<td>83% (17%)</td>
<td>60% (40%)</td>
<td>80% (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis from 1991-92 indicated some form of gender differential in the colleges of Arts and Sciences, Education, Law, and Public & Urban Affairs. The gender disproportions in the College of Law were the highest. The College of Business, although it did not show salary disproportions, showed an over-representation of males on its faculty. No salary figures were reported for the Librarians and Counselors with faculty rank, who are primarily females.

Studies of 1991-92 GSU salaries also showed that the overall salaries in the College of Health Sciences (a faculty that is
predominantly female) did not compare favorably with other universities in the South. The other College in which salaries did not compare favorably with those at other universities was the College of Law, whose faculty is 40% female. Two Colleges with female faculty proportions of 40% or higher (Education, Public & Urban Affairs) compared favorably with other universities. No comparison was reported for the Division of Developmental Studies, whose faculty is predominantly female. The 1989 Status Report cautioned against an over-reliance on salary comparisons with other universities, saying "in effect, the phrase 'market factors' is a euphemistic substitute for the gender-intensity of a field. Male-intensive fields are rewarded more highly than female-intensive fields. Insofar as GSU reproduces these market conditions in its remuneration policies, it is also likely to be reproducing gender discrimination."

(1989 Status Report at p. 3)

One significant factor that may not have been fully accounted for in the recent salary analyses is the fact that some faculty members in some divisions of the University have received additional compensation in the form of "industry supplements". The Chair of the Task Force was informed by financial affairs officers that no such supplements are currently being paid at GSU. Female faculty members report, however, that they have not only received such supplements in the past but that such supplements are still being paid. The Task Force does not oppose the use of such supplements but rather suggests that they be
examined for any possible disproportionate gender-based effects.

The Task Force commissioned Pat Lynch and Linda Flynn, two Ph.D. candidates of the Beebe Institute, to perform its own study of GSU faculty salaries. Ms. Lynch and Ms. Flynn based their salary study on a statistical model the purpose of which was to account for every possible variable in salary structure (except performance variables) over a span of several years. Ms. Lynch and Ms. Flynn used data supplied to them by Ellen Posey, Research Assistant to the Provost. Ms. Posey's salary data covered an 11-year period with separate regressions for each year. (The Task Force understands that a longitudinal study is planned for the future.) The variables used in the Task Force study included rank (Regents' Professor, Full Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor); whether the faculty member held a tenure-track position; race; years from terminal degree (as a proxy for experience); whether the faculty member held a doctoral degree, a professional degree or a masters degree; and college. The study did not include any variables related to performance, as such information is not available in any uniform format.

The following findings emerged when the statistical model was applied to the relevant data:

1. Although salary differences based on sex appeared in every year of the study, the sex of faculty members was not a statistically significant variable in salaries in the years 1982-84 and 1988-92. Sex was a statistically significant variable in years 1985-87. The 1989 Status Report noted that in 1988, then-
Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Thomas Brewer, began a three-year Salary Improvement Initiative, the result of which was that 70% of the females who had been identified as potential participants in the Initiative received salary improvements, while only 56% of the identified male faculty members received salary improvements. The Task Force suggests further research to determine why these variables change so much from year to year.

2. Beginning in year 1989, an interesting picture emerges when one "outlier" is excluded from the data. This individual is a female professor in the College of Arts & Sciences, with many years of service at the University, who is both a chaired professor and a Regents' professor. In each of the recent years' statistics, when her salary was excluded, the significance level of "sex" as a variable increased substantially.

3. Salary ranges for males and females indicated in recent years substantial differences between the highest salary paid to male faculty members and the highest salary paid to female faculty members. For example, monthly salaries of male faculty members ranged from $860.75 to $13,184 while salaries of female faculty ranged from $1008 - $9589). Table V contains a listing of salary ranges for 1981-1992.
TABLE V
Salary Range by Gender, 1981-92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male High</th>
<th>Male Low</th>
<th>Female High</th>
<th>Female Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$13,184.89</td>
<td>$ 860.75</td>
<td>$9,589.67</td>
<td>$1,077.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$13,068.11</td>
<td>$ 860.75</td>
<td>$9,166.67</td>
<td>$1,166.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$12,763.56</td>
<td>$ 871.25</td>
<td>$8,708.33</td>
<td>$1,466.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>$12,488.89</td>
<td>$ 858.33</td>
<td>$8,375.00</td>
<td>$1,388.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>$12,222.22</td>
<td>$ 833.33</td>
<td>$10,273.33</td>
<td>$1,044.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>$10,296.44</td>
<td>$1,426.00</td>
<td>$ 9,850.00</td>
<td>$1,004.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>$ 9,731.67</td>
<td>$1,298.00</td>
<td>$ 9,166.67</td>
<td>$1,277.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>$ 8,969.22</td>
<td>$1,318.67</td>
<td>$ 5,416.67</td>
<td>$1,623.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>$ 8,582.89</td>
<td>$1,282.00</td>
<td>$ 5,150.00</td>
<td>$1,888.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>$ 8,059.00</td>
<td>$1,361.11</td>
<td>$ 4,833.33</td>
<td>$1,363.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>$10,113.33</td>
<td>$1,220.33</td>
<td>$ 4,562.50</td>
<td>$ 944.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>$ 5,344.44</td>
<td>$1,099.89</td>
<td>$ 4,649.44</td>
<td>$1,477.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note: Lower male minimum salaries for years 1988-92 reflect the inclusion of male instructors in the database.]

4. The study also showed a substantial increase in recent years in the proportions in which women, as opposed to men, are serving in non-tenure-track positions. For example, in 1992-93, there are 492 male tenure-track and 49 male non-tenure track faculty members while there are 210 female tenure track and 51 non-tenure-track female faculty members. In other words, while only 9% of male faculty are non-tenure track, almost 20% of female faculty are non-tenure-track.
5. Rank is the strongest predictor of faculty salaries. As noted above, hidden factors that may influence faculty rank may also play a role in determining faculty salaries.

The Task Force study also highlights a factor that is not always evident from salary studies: to the degree women faculty are highly paid at GSU, these tend to be women faculty who are nearing retirement age. (This tendency does not appear to be as prevalent among highly-paid male faculty members.) From this it is reasonable to predict that, unless changes are made in the near future, the overall picture for women faculty members' salaries not only will not improve over the next few years, but in fact may look worse when these "outliers" choose to leave the University.

While realizing that further analysis is necessary to determine if and where inequities in faculty salaries exist, the Task Force offers the following discussion as "food for thought" for those persons in the University who are responsible for fixing salaries in the near future. Basically, the discussion covers three factors which play a role in the fixing of faculty salaries but which have little or no relation to any given faculty member's performance level. These factors are: a) negotiation techniques and effectiveness; b) mobility or perceived mobility of the faculty candidate; and c) the use of years in service or years since receipt of doctoral degree.

a) Negotiation Techniques and Effectiveness: Studies show that women generally are "significantly more satisfied with their
pay than males." (Schwab at p. 85) While this may on its face seem a positive factor, it may also indicate that women tend to be less demanding about salary than men are. (The variety of social and psychological reasons behind this phenomenon are beyond the scope of this Report.) Salaries, particularly initial salaries, are often fixed after extended negotiations between the University and the faculty candidate. To date, very few studies have been performed that examine the relationship between negotiation technique and effectiveness and the gender of the negotiating party. The studies that have been performed, however, yield relatively consistent results. "The most consistent finding in the negotiation literature is the fact that men are more comfortable with, and interested in, tasks labeled 'negotiation'." (Lynch at p. 2) "Women are generally believed to be less effective negotiators than men because their socialization makes them too cooperatively-oriented, fairminded, and generous." (Watson & Hoffman at p. 1) One study of managerial men and women indicated that, even though the women managers were no less effective than the male managers in negotiations, they felt less comfortable about negotiating and were more critical of their own performance. (Watson & Hoffman at p. 12)

As the studies indicate that women tend to be less comfortable with negotiation than men, it is not unreasonable to assume that there will be fewer negotiations surrounding the fixing of female faculty member's salaries than of men's
salaries. The Task Force suggests that the long-term ill effects of rewarding higher salaries to better negotiators will strongly outweigh any initial financial benefits garnered by the University. As University salaries tend to stay closely tied to a faculty member's starting salary, a less effective negotiator will suffer for years to come as the gap continues to widen between her own salary and that of her more effective counterpart.

Negotiation is not a technique that has been shown to have any high correlation with effectiveness as a faculty member. Consequently, a system that rewards negotiation effectiveness is one that offers no incentive for high performance levels. Furthermore, if future studies bear out a gender gap in negotiating skills and effectiveness, the so-called "neutral" practice of rewarding better negotiators will have a long-term disproportionate impact on women. A focus on this issue now may well prevent or decrease equity problems in the future.

b) Mobility or Perceived Mobility: A factor that is inextricably intertwined with the negotiation issue is the geographic mobility or perceived geographic mobility of a faculty candidate. "Mobility within academia has been related to career advancement and prestige of employing institution. . . . Advancement may also be related to being perceived as mobile when negotiating with present and future institutions." (Dwyer at p. 187) The Task Force suggests that basing a faculty member's salary on his or her mobility or perceived mobility has the same
inherent dangers as rewarding a faculty member for good negotiation skills.

Universities that use mobility as a factor in determining faculty raises or initial faculty salaries in a sense have delegated the task of assessing worth to institutions outside of themselves. The mere fact that an individual is sought after by another university may be a strong indication of that faculty member's perceived expertise in a field. On the other hand, most faculty members are not "sought after" unless they initiate or at least acquiesce in the initial overtures of the competing university. A university such as GSU should not put itself in the position of encouraging its finest faculty members to look for other jobs in order to have their worth recognized at GSU. There is one very simple reason for this: if the faculty member is truly of a calibre that will interest other universities, there is a good possibility that a competing university will be successful in luring the faculty member away. Over time, GSU will be left with a disproportionate number of faculty members who are staying at the University because they could not find jobs elsewhere. Furthermore, the costs of recruiting a new faculty member to replace the one who is lured away may well outweigh any potential financial savings the University garners by not raising the faculty member's salary to an amount that would encourage him or her to stay.

One might argue that, since women have historically been less mobile (or have been perceived to be less mobile) than men,
a university could "get away with" paying women less and still expect them to stay. There are a number of holes in this argument. First, at least one study shows that women faculty members are in fact more mobile than men, but have benefitted less from their mobility. (Dwyer at p. 187). If this is the case, then men are being rewarded not because they are mobile but simply because they are perceived to be mobile. Besides the obvious observation that the perception of mobility has little or no correlation with one's performance as a faculty member, the Task Force hopes that the university takes very seriously the matter of the inherent inequity in paying one gender more than another simply because of a perception. This subject is clearly one that calls for further research.

Even if the perception is a perception of truth (that is, that women are in fact less mobile than men), the Task Force suggests that the long-term effects of basing salary on mobility will be negative and will outweigh any short-term financial gain. There are several reasons for this. First, as noted above, the university that does not pay a higher starting salary or improve a deserving female faculty member's salary on the theory that "she is not going anywhere" runs a great risk that the particular woman will find better employment elsewhere. In a city like Atlanta, it cannot be ignored that any faculty member may be able to change to another college environment without even having to make a geographic move. Not only are there other opportunities within the Atlanta community, there are opportunities within a
70-mile radius that would not be so inconvenient as to discourage a faculty member who feels she has been inequitably treated at her own university. Second, while not raising salaries or offering high starting salaries under the "she is not going anywhere" theory may not drive talented female faculty away from the University, such an approach could serve to discourage future applicants from other universities who perceive the dangers of such an approach. Once again, a university like GSU cannot afford to discourage talented faculty members from accepting offers. Any university that wants to compete for the best faculty talent on a nationwide basis should be accustomed to that fact that - just as in private industry - it will become public knowledge in a relatively short period of time which universities are the "best places" for female and minority faculty members. Third, as transportation and computer technology continue to advance, it will become more and more easy for universities to hire "commuter teachers" - faculty members who teach at their schools for two or three days a week but live in a different city. Universities such as Yale and Harvard already frequently take advantage of the talents of faculty members at neighboring schools in the northeast corridor of the United States. A GSU faculty member may find that she is able to teach at a distant university without moving from Atlanta, thus removing "mobility" as a factor in her decision. Once again, the faculty who are lured to these positions will typically be the ones GSU most wants to retain as its own.
c) Years in Service and Years from Terminal Degree:

National studies show that the most accurate predictor of the salaries of faculty members is the number of years since the faculty member received his or her terminal degree and the number of years of full-time experience. (Billard, citing Ahern & Scott). Years in rank has been used as a variable in GSU studies of faculty salaries. ("An Analysis of Faculty Salaries by Minority Status, Gender, and Age - Institutional Research Report No. 92-12). Also, anecdotal evidence indicates that years since terminal degree and years of experience are considered as factors in fixing initial salaries of incoming GSU faculty members and in comparing salaries of GSU faculty members.

The use of time in service and time from terminal degree as measures for salary calculation and comparison not only may serve as a disincentive for performance but also may affect subtly the overall salaries of female faculty members. "Seniority" is a time-honored tradition in the employment arena. Seniority systems encourage stability and reward those who have exhibited loyalty to the employer. Seniority benefits in the non-university environment take the forms not only of increased salary but of preference for higher positions, preference for vacation leave, preference for leaves of absence, and preference in times of downsizing. In a university environment, faculty members with seniority may be given preference in their choice of classes or class times, research funding, committee assignments, and summer employment. In the GSU setting, the use of time in
service or time from terminal degree is sometimes used as a measure for calculating initial salary. Additionally, when equity studies are engaged in at the department, college, or university level, these time factors may used as a basis for comparison.

In calculating initial salaries, the time factors are used as a proxy for competence, under the theory that the amount of experience an individual has in his or her field is directly related to that individual's competency. Time factors are also an efficient means of comparing salaries of individuals who are already at the university to isolate superficial indications of race or gender inequities because they are "normally regarded as unbiased predictors of salary." ("An Analysis of Faculty Salaries by Minority Status, Gender, and Age - Institutional Research Report No. 92-12, at p. 3). However, the use of time factors as a method of fixing and adjusting salaries may be more harmful than helpful both to women and minorities and to high-performance-oriented faculty members of any race or gender.

The fixing of initial salaries on the basis of time will logically have a disproportionately negative impact on women and minorities as a whole because these groups have historically not pursued graduate education and not pursued careers in academia in the same numbers as their male counterparts. Particularly in the fields which have been traditionally male-dominated (Science and Engineering, Business, Law, etc.), an emphasis on the use of time factors to fix or measure faculty salaries may be inappropriate.
Other ways of measuring competency (qualitative reviews of relevant experience as opposed to quantitative reviews, greater reliance on professional references, peer reviews of work product) may require more effort on the part of Faculty Recruitment Committees, Department Heads, Deans, and Academic Administrators, but such measures are more likely to produce more equitable results and to be more accurate predictors of success at GSU.

One interesting phenomenon related to the use of time factors as a salary comparison measurement for faculty who have already spent time at the University is that the time factor is only used as a positive factor. In a University that aspires to greater focus on faculty performance (in terms of research, teaching, and service), it seems ironic to reward a person merely for his or her presence on the University faculty. On the other hand, typically, no upward adjustment is made for a young faculty member who has achieved relatively high levels of performance in a shorter period of time. For example, if Professor A received his doctoral degree in 1965 and has been at the university since 1972, the university has had over 20 years in which to observe Professor A's performance. If Professor B received her doctoral degree in 1975 and has been at the University since 1982, the University also has had an adequate amount of time to observe her performance. If Professor A and Professor B have each published 15 articles and are deemed through peer and student evaluations to be equally competent teachers, and if, due to salary
compression, Professor A's salary is approximately equal to the salary of Professor B, it is possible that Professor A's salary would be found to be inequitable because he has been teaching for twice as long. On the other hand, little recognition would be given to the fact that Professor B has produced twice as quickly as Professor A and should (in a pure merit system) actually be earning more than Professor A. In a system that measures worth in terms of time, no incentive is given to those professors whose performance levels will far surpass the norm in shorter periods of time. As women and minority faculty members are often disproportionately clustered among the less senior members of the department, the effect of this phenomenon is disproportionately borne by them. An over-emphasis on time factors for salary purposes thus not only perpetuates the past discrimination that has resulted in women and minorities being "latecomers" to academia but may also alienate the most productive members of the junior faculty.

Recommendation #4: Within each division of the University, each faculty member should receive a performance review in a form that will allow his or her past and present performance to be compared with that of other faculty members in his or her division. Following the performance reviews, three-year strategies should be developed for raising the salary, rank and tenured status of faculty members whose reviews reveal that they are not being
recognized for their achievements in the same manner as their peers.

The Task Force has found that performance reviews across the University vary from rigid formality to casual informality. Unequal treatment in areas such as rank and salary may be ignored or even purposefully hidden if there are not specified criteria by which faculty are judged and compared with other faculty members. For example, if the head of a division (Dean, Department Head, etc.) adjusts salary on the basis of such vague criterion as a faculty member's "overall contribution" in any given year, it is difficult for a faculty member to argue that his or her "overall contribution" is equal to or better than that of his or her counterparts. Performance reviews, on the other hand, could "grade" a faculty member in specific areas such as research, teaching, and service and then compare that faculty member's "grade" with those of others in the division.

The initial performance reviews should cover not only one year but rather the entire teaching career of the faculty member. Some faculty members relate to the Task Force that although their overall performance equals or matches that of their male counterparts, a problem early on in their careers (e.g., a low starting salary, a less productive year due to the birth of a

---

1 The term "division" is used to refer to the appropriate evaluation unit within the faculty member's college. For some faculty members (e.g., in the College of Business), the department may be the appropriate unit. For others (e.g., the College of Law), the entire College may be the appropriate unit. The Task Force understands that performance reviews of the type suggested here are already taking place in some divisions.
child) may still "haunt" them in the form of a lower salary and cause them never to be able to "catch up" with their peers.

The performance reviews should be conducted by a committee of the faculty, not just by the Dean or Department Heads. The committee members should be representative of the faculty in the division (including junior faculty) and should include members who have demonstrated sensitivity to the role that subconscious racial or sexual stereotypes may play in performance evaluations. If possible, the review committee should engage in at least one consultation with an outside individual who has had experience in helping others to recognize how subconscious stereotyping may affect one's judgment.

The performance review should then serve as a basis for evaluating whether the individual's salary, rank, and tenured status reflect that individual's standing in relation to his or her peers. As will be discussed herein, such reviews may themselves indicate a variety of strategies for correcting what may have been inequitable treatment of individual faculty members. For example, the performance review of a faculty member whose research and publication level is below par may reveal that the faculty member has not received opportunities to engage in concentrated research (such as reduced course loads, relief from committee assignments, etc.) that may have been available to other faculty members.

The criteria that are used in performance reviews should reflect the performance criteria of the particular division of
the University. These criteria should also reflect commonly accepted measures of performance in the discipline on a nation-wide basis. Any attempt to set up specific University-wide performance criteria is not only unrealistic (in that different disciplines approach teaching, research, and service in entirely different ways) but may also have an adverse impact on disciplines that are dominated by women. For example, if a University-wide criterion of a specified number of scholarly publications is given the highest priority, faculty members in fields that are service-oriented (such as Health Sciences) would not compare favorably with their peers in fields where scholarly research is the norm. On the other hand, the University may indicate general certain areas that cannot be ignored by the performance review committees. For example, the University's reputation for excellence in teaching would seem to mandate that adequate weight be given to a faculty member's success in that area. Additionally, the University's commitment to diversity among its student body would indicate that a faculty member be recognized for time spent working with students, particularly on projects that further the diversity pledges of GSU. (Studies have shown that such counseling responsibilities fall disproportionately on female and minority faculty.) Finally, the University's focus on quality education would seem to mandate that faculty members who are often called upon to serve the University community (either informally as student advisors or formally as committee members) should not be rewarded less
generously than those who choose to spend all of their working hours in a research laboratory or library.

Performance review committees should be particularly sensitive to ways in which facially neutral performance criteria may work to a female faculty member's disadvantage without actually indicating that the female is less accomplished or less capable than her male peers. Such problems may occur in any of the three areas traditionally highlighted by the university: scholarly research, teaching, and service.

a) Scholarly Research: Nationwide studies show that women faculty members tend to publish or at least are perceived to publish less than their male counterparts (Billard at p. 14). Some researchers, however, attribute this discrepancy to differing opportunities, pointing out that similarly situated men and women (that is, men and women who are given the same research opportunities and rewards) tend to publish at the same rate (Billard at p. 15). One challenge to review committee members is to determine which faculty members are "similarly situated". Some studies indicate, on a nationwide basis, that women tend to receive lower rewards (in the form of increased salary, summer support, travel money, desirable teaching assignments, etc.) for comparable work (Billard at p. 15). A faculty member who has received fewer summer stipends, research leaves, or reduced teaching loads will often have a lesser research and publication record than her or his colleagues. On the other hand, a faculty member who has accomplished more in the research arena should see
those accomplishments reflected in terms of rank and tenure status as well as salary (assuming that the discipline is one in which research and publication is given a high priority).
Committee members will need a complete history of the faculty member's career at the University as well as an overall history of the division's research support structure to determine whether the faculty member was: a) treated equitably in terms of research support; and b) rewarded equitably for research production. In other words, if a faculty member has not had the advantage of research grants or reduced course loads, she should not be judged in comparison with those who received such support. Alternatively, if a faculty member produced appropriate evidence of scholarly research, her history should indicate a recognition of such accomplishment in the form of increased salary, rapid promotion, increased research support, etc.

In examining both individual career histories and the histories of each of the University divisions, performance review committees should be alert to whether research opportunities are disproportionately granted to male rather than female faculty members. For example, research leaves may be offered as a function of seniority rather than need or productivity. The 1991-92 GSU Fact Book indicates that 10 of the 12 faculty members who were on leave in Fall Quarter, 1991 were men. Statistics such as these within a division should be examined more closely to discern whether an over-emphasis on seniority for such privileges has the effect of perpetuating past inequities in the
treatment of men and women. The 1989 Status Report recommended that departments should develop "systematic criteria for released time so that it is awarded in a clearly defined manner."

In the course of performance reviews, review committees should also remain aware of the subtle ways in which gender may play a role in the evaluation of research and publications. First, the committee members should be aware that many nationwide studies indicate that women's research work is sometimes perceived to be of lower quality than men's work simply because it is the product of a female rather than a male (Billard at pp. 16-17). If necessary, blind reviews of research products may be employed to compare faculty members' proficiencies.

Secondly, research in areas related to matters that are of particular interest to women may be interpreted by some evaluators to be of less value than research in areas that are of "general interest" (otherwise stated, of interest to men or to both genders). This subconscious devaluation within the University can result in poorer performance reviews for faculty members whose research is not only on the cutting edge of scholarly research but is also widely recognized outside the University as meeting the highest standards of academic rigor. For this reason, appropriate weight should be given to both internal and external analyses of a faculty member's work that are undertaken by other researchers in the same or similar
area. Faculty members within the University but from other disciplines might also be employed for these reviews. For example, a Sociology or Philosophy professor specializing in Women's Studies may be invited to review the work of a Law professor or a Political Science Professor who has written articles on Feminist Political Theory. The 1989 Status Report recommended that scholarship by and about women should have a greater role in the GSU curriculum (1989 Status Report at 13). The GSU Women's Studies Program has submitted proposals to expand into an Institute offering both undergraduate and graduate courses of study. Such a step would not only be highly beneficial to the University as a whole but also would provide an opportunity to assemble faculty members from across the University into a body of scholars who could critique and enrich each other's work. The Task Force strongly supports the expansion of the Women's Studies Program at GSU.

The third subtle way in which gender could play a role in research reviews would be through an over-emphasis on the traditional indices of success in a field of study. In speaking of the undervaluation of the work of female and African American scholars, the 1898 Status Report noted as follows:

The devaluation may not be overt; rather, it is more likely

---

4 As some of these research areas have only been developed as such over recent years, the "experts" in the areas may themselves still be Associate or Assistant Professors or be employed at "less prestigious" institutions. The value given to reviews by these experts should not be undermined simply because they do not exhibit the traditional manifestations of "success" in academia.
to take forms that appear to reflect neutral criteria: one must publish in the "top" journals, one should be active in the discipline's "major" organization, etc. Yet, because Blacks and women (and the study of their worlds via women's studies and African American studies) have systematically been excluded or marginalized in disciplines for decades, these groups have often formed their own professional organizations and specialty journals and focused on these arenas for professional development. The latter, by virtue of not being as longstanding and of emphasizing so-called "special interests", are generally not seen by dominant group members as equal in importance or scholarly quality to the "mainstream" outlets. Insofar as the foregoing considerations operate in hiring, promotion and tenure decisions, those decisions may be reproducing the sexism and racism that have plagued women and Black professionals historically. In other words, the supposedly neutral criteria generate indirect institutional discrimination, which reduces the presence of Black and women faculty on campuses where such discrimination operates.

b) Teaching: In recent years, GSU has been struggling to determine its overall mission. The tradition of the University as a "teaching university" has been replaced with the vision of a University where both research and teaching are emphasized. In such a transition, the University must not lose sight of the fact
that the change in emphasis may have an unintended effect on the status of faculty women. Nationwide studies show that women continue to express greater interest in teaching than in research (Dwyer at p. 215). Yet most Universities (including GSU) seem not to reward excellence in teaching in the same way they reward excellence in research:

Most teaching awards carry a prize of no more than $1000. Let us suppose a winning assistant professor put [such an award] in the bank at 5% interest. In 20 years it will be worth a bit more than $2500. Meanwhile, let us say an equally talented junior colleague does a decent job on her courses, but rather than investing extra time and energy on [teaching] the colleague pours that into a few extra articles, maybe even a book, which also culminates in $1000, that is, an extra 4% salary increment on a $25,000 salary. Such an increment is paid every year, of course, while it is augmented by the retirement benefits of some 10% and by future raises, say 5% per year. If all this is annually put in the bank at 5% interest rate, the result in 20 years will be close to $60,000. (Kimball at p. 14.)

When examining a faculty member's teaching history, review committees should look for indications not only of the number of courses taught but also of the relative degree of difficulty of the courses (lower level, upper level, graduate level) and of the number of students in each course. Review committees should weigh whether a faculty member was required to teach a variety of
different courses or was in fact able to utilize the same basic preparation several times a year.\(^3\)

Teaching evaluations - both peer evaluations and student evaluations - should be examined with care. Committee members should watch for gender-influenced assessments. For example, a comment such as "Professor X does not retain control of the class discussion" could mean simply that or could disguise the fact that the students are not comfortable with a female professor who encourages student discussion rather than standing in front of the room and lecturing for an hour. Attention should also be paid to the fact that the traditional mode of peer evaluation involves observation of younger faculty members by more senior faculty members (who, statistically speaking, will be predominantly men). These evaluators have not had their own teaching evaluated for several years and may thus have lost perspective on their own abilities and may also operate under the presumption that their own methods of teaching are the "only" or the "best" way to teach. (Divisions of the University may want to consider adopting continued peer evaluations even of tenured full professors in an attempt both to encourage an exchange of

\(^3\) In 1989, the GSU Office of Institutional Research produced Research Report \#89-9, an examination of faculty workloads in terms of faculty hours taught, student credit hours taught, and student enrollments. The writers of the Report found no apparent difference on the basis of race and gender but did find a definite correlation with rank - that is, faculty members with lower ranks seemed to carry a heavier teaching workload. However, as was discussed above, the Research Report also recognized that female faculty are clustered disproportionately in the lower ranks of instructional faculty at GSU.
ideas about teaching and to dispel the over-confidence that may come when one's teaching is never observed or criticized.)

c) Service: In informal conversations with female faculty members, a frequent topic was the degree to which faculty women seem to be bearing a disproportionate share of the "service" activities at the University. Although this phenomenon has obviously not been statistically documented, performance review committees should be alert to its existence and its ramifications.

Female faculty members recount two basic reasons why their service load is so heavy. The first reason, as discussed above, is the facially benign and even admirable desire on the part of the University to have female representation on all of its major committees. In a University in which only 30% of the instructional faculty members are women, the goal of including women on all committees will of course have profound effects. The burden is particularly heavy on minority women. Female faculty members report being elected to the faculty Senate in their first year of eligibility. Female faculty members from the smaller colleges who are elected to the faculty Senate bear heavy responsibilities due to Senate rules that require representation on major committees from faculty at each college. One female faculty member reported that she was a member of five Faculty Senate committees while still an untenured Associate Professor.

Most female faculty who spoke of the committee problem did not express a desire to be relieved from the committee work. In
fact, many of them relished the opportunity to be involved in the inner workings of a department or the University as a whole. The complaint of these faculty members is that their committee work is not recognized in terms of promotion or salary or released time. They still are expected to carry the same teaching loads and produce the same amount of research as their counterparts whose service contributions are minimal. Performance review committees should examine closely the degree to which faculty members have been called upon to serve the University and their colleges or departments and should weigh that contribution when comparing a faculty member's history to that of other (predominantly white male) faculty members whose service burdens may be much lighter.

The second reason female faculty workloads are perceived to be heavier relates to the interaction between female faculty and their students. For whatever reason, female faculty report that their students generally perceive them to be more accessible than their male counterparts. Female faculty members also report that they are not inclined to turn away students who come to them for assistance. In fact, they feel that availability to students is an important responsibility of their positions. Once again, their complaint is not that their time is devoted to students but that there is little recognition for such commitment. They see faculty members who close their doors to write articles receive greater salaries increases and quicker promotions than those who take time to counsel and advise students. This responsibility is
particularly great for female minority professors who are often the only person to whom their minority students feel they can turn.

Difficult as this may be to put into practice, some female faculty members have expressed the desire to hold faculty members accountable for their availability (or lack thereof) to students. They feel that if performance reviews included this responsibility as an essential job function, many more faculty members would become involved in the process, thus reducing the burden on the few female faculty members to respond to so many students' needs.

When the performance reviews are completed, the committees should submit detailed recommendations to the head of their division. These recommendations should rank faculty in terms of their cumulative contributions and make any appropriate observations as to particular methods by which faculty members' careers could be ameliorated (e.g., reduced course load, increased research stipend). The head of each division, after discussion with the faculty member and the Dean and Provost, should offer three-year plans for correcting situation in which the committee has found that a faculty member's performance and merit has been hampered by some artificial barrier or has not been appropriately recognized. While these plans obviously must remain flexible, the heads of divisions should realize that their own performance will be evaluated on the basis of the overall
"picture" of their faculty at the end of the three years.

The Task Force's aspiration is that, within the next three to five years, statistics will indicate that GSU faculty members are given equal opportunities for success and that factors such as gender and race bias (in blatant or subtle forms) play no part in rewarding performance.

CONCLUSION

A study conducted in 1985 of three "highly reputed institutions which achieved positive changes in the status of female faculty employment" listed four similarities among those institutions:

1) high level of commitment on the part of top institutional leaders;

2) affirmative action personnel had high visibility and were integral in setting goals and reporting progress;

3) decisions [relating to hiring, salary, etc.] were closely monitored and decision-makers were held accountable for good faith efforts;

4) two or three senior female faculty at each institution were "critical change agents" through articulating women's issues and providing leadership by deliberately implementing objectives. (Hyer at pp. 292-99).

The Task Force endorses these concepts as integral to the improvement of the status of faculty women at GSU. Studies at corporations throughout the United States indicate repeatedly
that no institution makes strides in attracting and managing a diverse work force without a commitment from the top and a system for holding accountable the major decision-makers of the institution.

The Task Force reiterates its commitment to working in partnership with the University to bring about improvement in status of faculty women at GSU. The recommendations in this Report are offered in the belief that the overall quality of the University will show substantial progression when artificial barriers are removed and faculty of all races and gender are encouraged to operate at their highest potential.
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