

**President's Council
on
Women's Issues**

2004 Annual Report

Approved October 26, 2004



President's Council on Women Issues

32 members
October 2003- June 2004

Externals (5)

Ingrid Saunders Jones, Chair and Senior Vice President Corporate External Affairs	Coca Cola Company
Jane A. Harf, President	Ohio American Electric Power
Philomena (Mimi) Dane, Litigation Partner	Squires, Saunders & Dempsey
Gayle E. Saunders, Special Assistant to the Superintendent	Columbus Public Schools
Diane Cooper, Ed.D. Head of School	Columbus School for Girls

Faculty members (10)

Edward Adelson, Associate Executive Dean	College of Arts and Sciences
Deb Ballam, Professor, Finance, (Vice Chair of Council)	Fisher College of Business
Wayne E. Carlson, Professor and Chair, Industrial, Interior, and Visual Communication Design	Art
Martha Chamallas, Professor, R.J. Lynn Chair	Law
Cynthia Dillard, Associate Professor, Ed. Teaching and Learning	Education
Linda Houston, Associate Professor	ATI
Rebecca D. Jackson, M.D., Associate Professor, Internal Medicine	Medicine
Mo-Yee Lee, Associate Professor	Social Work
Valerie B. Lee, Professor and Chair, English	Humanities
Linda Mizejewski, Professor and Chair, Women's Studies	Humanities

Staff members (10)

Margie Bogenschutz, Ph.D., Director of Undergraduate Internships	Fisher College of Business
Carol Bowman, Director of Labs and Prairie	Marion Campus
Kate Haller, Associate General Counsel, (Chair of Counsel)	Health Sciences
J Stephen Henderson, Director of Compensation	Human Resources
Jeri Kozobarich, Development Director	Education
Rebecca Nelson, Associate Director	Multicultural Center
Mary Rhoads, Office Assistant	Continuing Education
Greta J. Russell, University Controller	Business and Finance
Richelle Simonson, Associate Athletic Director	Athletics
Terri Stankiewicz, Assistant VP for Management	Physical Facilities Engineering

Central administration liaisons (3)

Coordinating Council Member – Dean Joe Alutto	Fisher College of Business
Planning Cabinet Member – Vice Provost Mac Stewart	Office of Minority Affairs
Office of the President – Chief of Staff and Special Assistant to the President Pearl Bigfeather	Office of the President

Students (3)

To be identified later

Ex Officio

Judith B. Fountain, Assistant Vice Provost for Women’s Policy Initiatives; Director, The Women’s Place	Academic Affairs
--	------------------

President's Council on Women's Issues 2004 Annual Report

Table of Contents

President's Council on Women's Issues Roster	i
Table of Contents	iii
Executive Summary	1
Background	2
Progress of Women at OSU	3
Examining Progress: Updates from Council Work Groups	5
<i>Work groups include: Strategic planning, Effective practices, Faculty cohort, Staff cohort, Student cohort, Faculty research, Retention, Data</i>	
Recommendations from 2003-2004	9
Appendices	10
Appendix 1	10
o Status Report: progress of women, 1993-2003	
Appendix 2.....	19
o President's Council mission and The Women's Place strategic plan	
Appendix 3.....	22
o Basic principles for evaluation of work/life policies	
Appendix 4.....	23
o Tips for success in 4 th year review (from Spring 04 workshop)	
o What you can/should expect from your department (from Spring 04 workshop)	
o Interpretations and observations about the faculty cohort project (2003-2004)	
o Faculty cohort analysis (April 2004)	
Appendix 5.....	28
o Article by Joyce Fletcher, <i>Invisible Work: The Disappearing of Relational Practice at Work</i>	
o Summary of discussion from the work group	
o Suggestions for the improvement for the performance review document	
Appendix 6.....	47
o Recommendations from student cohort workgroup to Council	
o Email sent to students and summary responses	
o Focus group on the role of students for the President's Council	
Appendix 7.....	53
o OSU assistant professor retention study	
Appendix 8	54
o NSF indicators	
o Sample population and patterns from an OSU department	

Executive Summary

Women's roles at Ohio State have become more diverse and the numbers of women in all ranks are increasing. However, the full participation of women in all aspects of OSU has yet to be achieved. One measurement for this is our annual 10-year period data snapshot. This year, the data from 1993 to 2003 shows progress in the following areas:

- women deans increased from 5 (20%), to 8 (32%), two of whom are of African American descent
- women of African American descent became heads of two tenure initiating units, up from zero
- a steady increase occurred for women holding Endowed Chairs: 3 or 7.5%, to 11 or 13.4%, two of whom are of Asian American descent
- a steady increase of women occurred for Named Professors: from 2 or 5% to 8 or 14.5%
- women faculty increased by 3.4% overall, as well as by several percentage points at both the full (11.3% to 17.6%) and associate (23.8% to 29.29%) ranks
- among women faculty of color the largest gain came for women of Asian American descent at the associate professor rank, from 5 or .5% to 22 or 2.19%
- the numbers of women students in most graduate and professional programs increased and remained stable in the remaining programs

During this same period, there are other data which raise concerns. Fewer women have moved into leadership roles within tenure initiating units. We also have seen a significant reduction in the number of women assistant professors in general as well as those who are of African American descent:

- women leading tenure initiating units decreased from 16.5% to 14.3%
- at the assistant professor rank, women of African American descent declined sharply over the 10-year period, from 2.8% (26) to 1.84% (14)
- overall, the percentage of women at the assistant rank decreased, from 39.2% (358) to 36.88% (326)
- a large discrepancy exists in most colleges between the number of women graduate/professional students and the number of women faculty in those colleges

With women representing half of the OSU student population, the role models we provide must include more women and racially and ethnically diverse faculty and leaders. The numbers tell us both that we have achieved much and that we need to continue and renew our efforts. This annual report describes some of those efforts and some recent successes. Many of those successes benefit men as well as women, staff as well as faculty. For example, the Parental Leave policy recognizes and affirms each parent's involvement in the family. Parallel programs in leadership development are being developed for staff and for faculty. The President's Council on Women's Issues recognizes its many partners in these efforts to recommend and implement policies and strategies that make a difference for women and for men at OSU.

Kate Haller

Chair, The President's Council on Women's Issues

Background

The President's Council on Women's Issues has completed its third year serving as an advisory group to the President and Provost on issues related to the life and work of women faculty, staff and students at The Ohio State University. In 2003-2004 the council consisted of 29 members and meetings were held once per quarter on October 16, 2003, February 17, 2004, May 20, 2004. The following is a brief update on the ongoing initiatives and institutional recommendations reported in the President's Council on Women's Issues 2003 Annual Report:

- Creating a broader base of involvement of non-council members in the work groups as groups work between quarterly meetings was recommended and is currently being implemented on an on-going basis for all functioning work groups
- Re-thinking student involvement with the goal of determining more effective mechanisms for engaging students and sustaining initiatives focused on their needs and concerns was recommended. Results of focus groups conducted in the spring of 2004 will be presented for a fall discussion at the October 2004 meeting of the President's Council
- The Council recommended developing a research plan for the Faculty Cohort Project with the expectation that the plan will be implemented in 2004-2005. This work has been accomplished through the creation of a faculty research work group with Professors Jill Ellingson and Arnon Reichers carrying out the actual research.
- Developing a plan of action for identifying and interrogating the sports-related issues of women. A recommendation to hold focus groups with women in athletics was not acted on during this year however, it is still remains a priority for the Council.
- The institutional recommendation was for the creation of a Commission on Gender and Public Policy. Interim Provost Barbara Snyder convened a meeting to discuss the feasibility of acting on this recommendation. Participants included Jackie Royster, Council Chair, Deb Merritt, John Glenn Institute, Ellyn Perrone, Government Relations, and Carole Anderson, Vice Provost. While the concept was determined to be a valid one, based on conversations with those familiar with the history of the decommissioning of the Ohio Commission on Women, it was determined that this was not an appropriate time to pursue this recommendation. However, as appropriate within academic areas, a commitment was made to continue to discuss of the role such a commission could play. In part as a result of this commitment, Professor Royster included the history of the Commission in her May 2004 Distinguished University Lecture.

Progress of Women at OSU

Each year The President' Council on Women provides a data comparison, based on the benchmark academic year 1993-94, as a guide to progress on the status for women at the University. The data snapshot is based on October 1 of each year. The data comparison for the most recent year, academic year 2003-2004, provides a full decade of developments. The data illustrate many points of progress, but also underscore areas of concern. *See Appendix 1 for the full report.*

Points of Progress

The points of progress are many and significant. The decade witnessed an increase in women in many significant leadership positions, most notably with our first president who is a woman; and, our current provost is a woman. Progress has occurred in other leadership positions as well: on the Board of Trustees (from 1 to 3); among vice provosts (2 to 4); deans (5 to 8); holders of endowed chairs (3 to 11); and, holders of named professorships (2 to 13).

Women of non-European descent made some gains in leadership positions as well: in October 2003, two deans, two associate deans, and two TIU heads were women of African American descent; ten years earlier none of these positions were held by women of African American descent. Two of the endowed chairs in October 2003 were held by women of Asian American descent, up from zero ten years earlier.

Over the past ten years, the number of women faculty holding the ranks of full and associate professor increased (121 or 11.3% to 184 or 17.6%, and 252 or 23.8% to 310 or 29.29%, respectively). The rank of full professor witnessed an increase over the 10-year period among women of African American descent (from 1 to 9), Asian American descent (6 to 10), and Hispanic descent (0 to 3). At the associate rank, women of Asian American descent showed the largest gain (5 to 22).

Over the ten-year period, the number of staff women from the four non-European racial and ethnic groups increased in all three of the staff groups analyzed: Executive/Administrative; Professional; and Paraprofessional/Technical.

The number of women students in most graduate and professional programs increased over the ten-year period, and stayed stable in the remaining programs.

Areas of Concern

The numbers of women heads of tenure-initiating units (e.g., department chairs and school directors) actually declined over the ten-year period, dropping from 16.5% in October 1993 to 14.3% in October of 2003. Fifty percent of the colleges that have TIU units have no women TIU heads, while two others have only one. The percent of women faculty in these eight colleges that have either zero or one woman TIU head ranges from 9.45% to 57.45%. Eight of the fourteen women TIU heads are in two colleges: the Arts and Humanities. This is a matter of great concern since it is the TIU heads, more than any other position at the university, that determine the every day climate for faculty at Ohio State.

For the ten-year period the total number of women faculty increased by 3.43%, from 746 of 3077 to 820 of 2963.

For the ten-year period, the percent of women at the assistant professor rank actually declined, from 39.6% to 36.88%. At the assistant professor rank, women of African American descent declined sharply over the ten-year period, from 26 or 2.8% to 14 or 1.84%.

A large discrepancy still exists in most colleges between the numbers of women graduate/professional students and the numbers of women faculty in those colleges.

Examining Progress: Updates from The President's Council on Women's Issues Work Groups

The President's Council on Women's Issues is composed of members from the campus, local, state and national communities, appointed by the President following a nomination process. The Council's purpose is to provide a critical gender analysis of policies and practices that impact the progress of women at OSU. The Council carries out its work via workgroups that are comprised of Council members and non-Council members. The work is done in partnership with the administrative unit in which policies are being analyzed. The workgroups focus their efforts to closely examine current policy issues and advise the President, Provost or administrative leader about gender implications. The scope of the work for 2003-2004 included the parental leave policy, University performance review system, faculty retention, and the progress of women in engineering. Summaries of the council work groups follow.

Strategic Planning

The strategic planning work group included: Arnon Reichers (facilitator), Kate Haller, Pearl Bigfeather, Martha Chamallas, Greta Russell, Mo Yee Lee, Margie Bogenschutz, Carol Hallenshead (University of Michigan, ex officio). This work group was initiated at the conclusion of The Women's Place 2003 evaluation and was charged specifically with developing a three-year strategic plan for The Women's Place based on the feedback, findings, and recommendations from the evaluation of TWP. The work group developed an overarching planning statement, guiding principles and strategic goals to align with the mission of the Council. This strategic plan will provide direction for the new director of TWP. The plan was reviewed with the President, Provost and groups on campus, and approved by the President's Council. *See appendix 2: The President's Council on Women's Issues mission and The Women's Place strategic plan*

Effective Practices

The effective practices work group included: Ed Adelson (convener), Mimi Dane, Rebecca Nelson, Carol Bowman, and Linda Houston. This work group developed principles that will be used by the Council when reviewing, evaluating and making recommendations on policies and practices related to work life. The principles were approved by the Council and first used by the work group to review and discuss the proposed parental leave policy. As recommended by the work group the council supported the proposed parental leave policy and recognized limitations of the policy. These were articulated to the Executive Vice President and Provost. The council found the policy should be supportive of all the ways in which families come together and the involvement of either parent during those first weeks and therefore urges consideration of an equal amount of University paid leave for birth fathers/partners and adoptive parents as for birth mothers. As recommended by the work group, the Council also suggested three actions to support the implementation of the policy, which included: 1.) Characterize the leave as 12 weeks, with two separate pools within, rather than six plus six. The latter suggests that the second 6-week period is less necessary or desirable. 2.) Office of Academic Affairs should track the usage of this policy over time to see if women practice bias avoidance behavior in the use of this policy. We suggest that this be undertaken in conjunction with an analysis of the use

of the “stop the tenure clock” policy. 3.) We also suggest that this policy be implemented and monitored so that the hiring of women is not discouraged (in view of the costs being borne by departments). *See appendix 3: Basic principles for evaluation of work/life policies*

Faculty Cohort

The faculty cohort work group included: Cynthia Dillard (convener), Linda Houston, Martha Chamallas, Valerie Lee, Sonia Kovitz (OAA, ex officio). This year the faculty cohort work group continued development of and support for the cohort members with focused attention on preparation for the 4th year review. As women in the faculty cohort project approached their fourth year review, the work group held two workshops during the spring quarter 2004 on the fourth year review and tenure process. Data from these workshops was collected on the level and types of support being provided for the cohort at the TIU/Unit level. The work group found that there is a clear difference between departments who have provided resources for the fourth year review and those who have not, resulting in a wide disparity of new faculty’s knowledge of this process. At the end of April 2004 a total of 123 assistant professors remained in the faculty cohort. Of the total remaining, 45 or 36.6% are women and 78 or 63.4% are men. The original group of 131 hired in the 01/02 academic year included 50 (38.2%) women and 81 (61.8%) men. The Council approved continuing the Cohort Project for two years to follow members through tenure and focus these efforts on feedback individuals receive from tenure review, and continuing exit interviews to learn about reasons cohort members leave OSU. The work group also recommended to the Council that OAA hold a workshop for chairs and deans on the often “invisible” barriers and issues related to women’s promotion and well-being on this campus and other lessons learned from the Faculty Cohort Project. *See appendix 4: Tips for success in 4th year review (from Spring 04 workshop), What you can/should expect from your department (from Spring 04 workshop), Interpretations and observations about the faculty cohort project (2003-2004), and Faculty cohort analysis (April 2004)*

Staff Cohort

The staff cohort work group included: Carol Bowman (convener), Terri Stankiewicz, Margie Bogenschutz, Mary Rhoads, Ann Kelly, Connie Goodman (USAC member, ex officio), Gail Gunderson (Office of Human Resources, ex officio). The work group developed new *relational practice* language for the standard performance review based on research done by Joyce K. Fletcher. Fletcher defines relational practice as a way of achieving goals and getting the job done using skills such as listening, mutuality, reciprocity, and sensitivity to the emotional context. The work group also identified specific training programs at OSU where *relational practice* can be included. Based on this work the group recommended that the council be an active participant when OHR begins to revise the performance management system for OSU particularly in applying the knowledge of relational practice and recognizing the real though often unappreciated contributions of staff. Also recommended are the proposed changes in the performance review document be recommended to OHR as an effective practice for measuring relational practice and that it be offered as an option for use until the entire performance management system be changed. Also recommended is that OHR add training of relational practice to specific workshops. The work group also recommended that professional and leadership development opportunities be systematically created and that the President’s Council play a strategic role in the development of the system. *See appendix 5: Article by Joyce Fletcher, Invisible Work: The Disappearing of Relational Practice at Work, Summary of*

discussion from the work group, and Suggestions for the improvement for the performance review document

Student Cohort

The student cohort work group included: Rebecca Nelson (Convener), Jeri Kozobarich, Joni Bentz Seal, Anindita Sunder (WSS rep), Sarah Brackmann (student and WSS rep), Jeannie Tao (student and CGS rep). Students have been members of the council since its inception however, the council had not found an effective and inclusive way to include student members or found a method to surface critical issues facing students. For the 2003/4 Council, unfilled student positions remained and the Council formed a work group to determine the most effective model to involve students on the Council. During May and June 2004, the workgroup collected data in several ways including a survey of student leaders and a focus group made up of student affairs administrators. The outcome of these processes was to determine the purpose and role of students as it related to the President's Council on Women's Issues. Based on the initial data collected the work group gave recommendations at the May council meeting and Council tabled any decision until the fall meeting when a full discussion regarding students could occur and would include all data collected. *See appendix 6: Recommendations from workgroup to the Council, Email sent to student leaders and summary responses, Focus group feedback from Student Affairs administrators on the role of students for the Council*

Faculty Research

The faculty research work group included: Arnon Reichers (facilitator), Jill Ellingson (facilitator), Mo Yee Lee, and Rebecca Jackson. The work group focused on developing a method to put the faculty cohort project in a broader institutional perspective. Based on the initial work of the faculty cohort project, Arnon Reichers and Jill Ellingson have developed the OSU Assistant Professor Retention Study which will focus on those factors that relate to retention and turnover within the assistant professor population here at OSU with the variables that contribute to these individuals' choices to stay or leave OSU being of key interest. The council in conjunction with OAA approved this study and the first two stages of this work have begun. The work group recommendations included participation of council in the development of a long-term project and monitoring of the research study results by the Council. *See appendix 7: OSU assistant professor retention study*

Retention

The retention study work group included: J Henderson (convener), Kate Haller, Wayne Carlson, Linda Mizejewski, Ruth Dyer (ex officio), and Mary Juhas (ex officio for Engineering). The work group developed a model for salary and time in rank analysis and tested it in one unit in engineering. This standard model reflects the National Science Foundation ADVANCE grant institutional transformation indicators and can be replicated in other units. Data from the unit in engineering was provided to the dean and informed tenure decisions. With the council's support the work group will replicate the model in other departments in Engineering, and with the support of the deans, replicate the model in MAPS and Biological Science. *See appendix 8: NSF indicators, Sample population and patterns from an OSU department*

Data Identification and Analysis

The data identification and analysis work group included: Deb Ballam (convener), Greta Russell, J Henderson, Sonia Kovitz (ex officio), Laura Gast (ex officio), Julie Carpenter-Hubin (ex officio), Suzanne Nagy (ex officio). The work group produced the “Status Report: progress for women” based on data comparisons within the University which illustrates points of progress and areas of concern. The workgroup also developed a standardized method of collecting data for the annual report by adopting as the data collection model the data used in last year’s annual report. The work group will collect data no later than June 1 annually with the snapshot for data as October 31 of the previous year. The council will continue to collect and analyze institutional data and produce the “Status Report: progress of women”. *See appendix 1: Status Report: progress of women 1993-2003*

Recommendations from 2003-2004

The Council recommends implementation of the following intervention strategies identified to make a significant difference in the quality of life and work for women and all staff, faculty and students at The Ohio State University. Implementation of these strategies will be coordinated by The Women's Place.

- recommend OAA track and analyze the use of OSU's new parental leave policy over time to determine if women practice bias avoidance behavior in the use of this policy
- recommend OAA continue the faculty cohort project for two additional years to follow the cohort member through tenure decision
- recommend OAA develop and implement workshops for chairs and deans on often "invisible" barriers and issues related to women's promotion and well-being on campus and other lessons learned from the Faculty Cohort Project
- recommend OHR implement proposed changes in performance review document as an effective practice for measuring relational practice should be implemented until entire performance management system is changed
- recommend OHR incorporate training of *relational practice* to existing workshops
- recommend OAA create professional and leadership development opportunities
- recommend OAA and OHR support the replication of the retention analysis model based on shared interest in other departments in Engineering, as well as in the Colleges of MAPS and Biological Sciences
- recommend that OAA & OHR support the ADVANCE Grant workshop in its effort to secure an NSF ADVANCE grant

**Status Report: Progress of Women
The Ohio State University
1993-2003
October 2004**

Several points in this data illustrate progress and some show areas for concern.

Points of Progress

For the 10 year period 1993 to 2003

- Women deans increased from 5 (20%), all of European American descent, to 8 (32%), two of whom are of African American descent
- A steady increase occurred for Endowed Chairs: 3 or 7.5%, all of European American descent, to 11 or 13.4%, two of whom are of Asian American descent
- A steady increase occurred for Named Professors
- the percentage of women increased by several percentage points at both the full (11.3% to 17.6%) and associate (23.8% to 29.29%) ranks
- Among women faculty of non-European descent, the largest gain came for women of Asian American descent at the associate professor rank, from 5 or .5% to 22 or 2.19%
- the number of staff women from the four non-European racial and ethnic groups increased in all three staff categories analyzed
- the numbers of women students in most graduate and professional programs increased and remained stable in the remaining programs
- Women of African American descent became heads of two TIUs, up from zero

Areas for Concern

- For the 10 year period women TIU heads decreased from 16.5% to 14.3%
- At the assistant professor rank, women of African American descent declined sharply over the 10-year period, from 2.8% (26) to 1.84% (14).
- For the 10 year period, the percentage of women at the assistant rank decreased, from 39.2% (358) to 36.88% (326)
- A large discrepancy exists in most colleges between the numbers of women graduate/professional students in those colleges and the numbers of women faculty in those colleges

Profile of women in leadership positions

Academic Year	1993/4	2003/04
FY	1994	2004
Board of Trustees	1 (9%)	3 (27%)
President	0	1
Vice Presidents	2 (20%) (1 AsAm)	2 (29%)
Vice Provosts	2 (33%)	4 (66.7%)
Deans	5 (20%)	8 (32%) (2 AfAm)
Associate Deans	13 (28%)	16 (30.8%) (2 AfAm)
TIU Heads	19 (16.5%)	14 (14.3%) (2 AfAm)
Eminent Scholars	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
Endowed Chairs	3 (7.5%)	11 (13.4%) (2 AsAm)
Named Professors	2 (5%)	13 (20%)

For the 10 year period, 1993-2003

- **Women deans increased** from 5 (20%), all of European American descent, to 8 (32%), two of whom are of African American descent
- A **steady increase occurred for Endowed Chairs** (3 or 7.5%, all of European American descent to 11 or 13.4%, two of whom are of Asian American descent)
- A **steady increase occurred for Named Professors** (2 or 5%, both of European American descent, to 13 or 20%, all of European American descent)
- **Women TIU heads decreased** from 16.5%, all of European American descent, to 14.3%, two are of African American descent

Profile of Women Faculty: Full, Associate, & Assistant Professors

Academic Year FY	1993/4 1994	2003/04 2004
% of all tenure track women	24.24%	27.67%
Raw Number of all tenure track women	(746 of 3077)	(820 of 2963)

- The actual number of women faculty increased over the ten year period by 74; the faculty as a whole decreased in number by 114 over this same time
- The percentage of all tenure track women increased 3.43% over the 10 year period, from 24.24% to 27.67%

Academic Year FY	1993/4 1994	2003/04 2004
Full	11.3% (121)	17.6% (184)
Associate	23.8% (252)	29.29% (310)
Assistant	39.6% (373)	36.88% (326)

- For the period since 1993/94, **the percentage of women increased by several percentage points at both the full (11.3% to 17.6%) and associate (23.8% to 29.29%) ranks**
- For the period since 1993/94, **the percentage of women at the assistant rank decreased in both raw numbers and percents, from 39.6% to 36.88%**

Profile of women faculty/racial & ethnic diversity

Note: Ethnicity is self-reported and the number of persons who choose not to disclose their ethnicity continues to grow each year.

Women Faculty: Racial & Ethnic Diversity

	Academic Year	1993/4	2003/04
	FY	1994	2004
African American	Full	1 (.1%)	9 (0.81%)
	Assoc	14 (1.4%)	17 (1.69%)
	Assist	26 (2.8%)	14 (1.84%)
	Total	41	40 (1.39%)
Asian American	Full	6 (.7%)	10 (0.90%)
	Assoc	5 (.5%)	22 (2.19%)
	Assist	22 (2.4%)	25 (3.29%)
	Total	33	57 (1.98%)
Hispanic American	Full	0 (0%)	3 (0.29%)
	Assoc	3 (.3%)	3 (0.29%)
	Assist	6 (.7%)	13 (1.71%)
	Total	9	19 (0.66%)

- At the rank of full professor, there is an increase over the 10-year period among women of African American descent from 1 (.1%) to 9 (.81%), Asian American descent from 6 (.7%) to 10 (.9%), and Hispanic descent from 0 to 3 (.27%)
- At the associate rank, women of Asian American descent showed the largest gain, from 5 (.5%) to 22 (2.19%). Women of African American descent increased from 14 (1.4%) to 17 (1.69%), while women of Hispanic descent remained steady at 3 and .3%.
- **At the assistant rank, women of African American descent declined from 26 (2.8%) to 14 (1.84%).** Slight increases occurred for women of Asian American descent (22 or 2.4% to 25 or 3.29%) and Hispanic descent (6 or .7% to 13 or 1.71%).

TIU Heads: Gender Comparison*(Academic Year 2003/04)*

	% of Women Graduate or Professional Students	% of Women Faculty	% of TIU Heads
Art	65.4	40.74	71% (5 of 7)
Biological Science	49.2	17.36	0 (0 of 6)
Business	36.4	19.32	0 (0 of 5)
Education	74	52.6	0 (0 of 3)
Engineering	22	11	0 (0 of 9)
Food, Ag & Enviro Science (Includes extensions)	53	25.6	11% (1 of 9)
Human Ecology	83.6	57.45	33% (1 of 3)
Humanities	56.3	40	21.4% (3 of 14)
Math & Physics Science	29.9	9.45	0 (0 of 6)
Medicine	43	20	8.3% (2 of 24)
Social Behavioral Science	56.7	26.34	22% (2 of 9)
Vet Med	76	23.7	0 (0 of 3)

- **6 colleges that have TIUs have no women as heads of TIUs**
 - the % of women faculty in the 6 colleges with no women TIU heads ranges from 9.45% to 52.6%
- **8 of the 14 women who are TIUs are located in two colleges:** Arts and Humanities
- 6 colleges do not have departments or schools and have no TIUs (Dentistry, Law, Nursing, Optometry, Pharmacy, and Social Work); the deans of two of these colleges are women

Profile of Women in Three Major Categories of Staff Positions

Appendix 1

Academic Year FY	1993/4		2003/04	
	1994		2004	
	Raw Number	Percentage	Raw Number	Percentage
Total of women staff in all 3 major categories	4952 (of 7863)	62.98%	7938 (of 12364)	64.2%

- The percent of women staff in all 3 major categories increased slightly over the 10-year period (62.9% to 64.2%)

Profile of staff women in three major categories

Academic Year	1993/4	2003/04
FY	1994	2004
Executive/Administrative	42.1% (252)	50.8% (566)
Professional Non-Faculty	68.1% (3,389)	65.2% (5449)
Paraprofessional/Technical	57.4% (1311)	66.4% (1923)
Total Number	4952	7938

Note: This report focuses an analysis of three of the six EEO categories of employment for staff.

- The percentage of women in Executive/Administrative positions increased over the 10-year period (42.1% to 50.8%), although the number declined by 2.9% over the last year (from 53.7% to 50.8%)
- The percentage of women in the Paraprofessional/Technical category has increased steadily over the 10-year period (from 57.4% to 66.4%).
- The percentage of women in the Professional Non-Faculty category has declined over the ten-year period (68.1% to 65.2%), although it increased slightly from last year (64.8% to 65.2%).

Profile of women staff/racial & ethnic diversity

** Note: Ethnicity is self-reported and the number of persons who choose not to disclose their ethnicity continues to grow each year.*

	Academic Year	1993/94	2003/4
	FY	1994	2004
Female	Executive, Administrative	252 (42.1%)	566 (50.8%)
	Professional	3389 (68.1%)	5449 (65.2%)
	Paraprofessional, Technical	1311 (57.4%)	1923 (66.4%)
African Americans	Executive, Administrative	21 (3.5%)	45 (4%)
	Professional	207 (4.2%)	420 (5%)
	Paraprofessional, Technical	209 (9.2%)	344 (11.9%)
Asian Americans	Executive, Administrative	3 (.5%)	12 (1.1%)
	Professional	149 (3%)	330 (4%)
	Paraprofessional, Technical	27 (1.2%)	62 (2.1%)
Native Americans	Executive, Administrative	0	2 (0.2%)
	Professional	5 (.1%)	17 (0.2%)
	Paraprofessional, Technical	4 (.2%)	6 (0.2%)
Hispanic Americans	Executive, Administrative	NA	5 (0.4%)
	Professional	27 (.5%)	57 (0.7%)
	Paraprofessional, Technical	11 (.5%)	17 (0.6%)

- Over the 10 year period, the numbers of women of for all four racial/ethnic groups increased in all three categories
- Over the last year, the percent of women of African American descent declined by .51% in the Executive, Administrative Category

Profiles of women students

In 1873, OSU's first year, there were 50 students and 10% were women.

In 1950, there were 25, 948 students and 6,568 (25%) were women.

	Academic Year 1993/94		Academic Year 2003/04	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Women Undergraduate Students	18152	47%	17922	48%
Women Graduate Students	5365	51%	5346	54%
Women Professional Students	1189	45%	1699	53%

Gender Distribution of Students & Faculty as Role Models by Gender

(Academic Year 2003/04)

		% Female		% Male	
		Students	Faculty	Students	Faculty
Graduate	Total	54%	27.48%	46%	72.52%
	Art	65%	40.74%	35%	59.26%
	Biological Science	49%	17.36%	51%	82.64%
	Business	36%	19.32%	64%	80.68%
	Education	74%	52.60%	26%	47.40%
	Engineering	22%	11%	78%	89.00%
	Food, Ag & Enviro Science	53%	25.60%	47%	74.40%
	Human Ecology	84%	57.45%	16%	42.55%
	Humanities	56%	40.00%	44%	60.00%
	Math & Physics Science	30%	9.45%	70%	90.55%
	Nursing	92%	100.00%	8%	0.00%
	Social Behavioral Science	57%	26.34%	43%	73.66%
Social Work	85%	64.29%	15%	35.71%	
Professional	Total	53%	27.48%	47%	72.52%
	Dentistry	37%	22.60%	63%	77.40%
	Law	48%	30.60%	52%	69.40%
	Medicine	43%	20%	57%	80.00%
	Optometry	58%	33%	42%	67.00%
	Pharmacy	65%	12.80%	35%	87.20%
	Veterinary Medicine	76%	23.70%	24%	76.30%
Undergrad	Total	48%	27.48%	52%	72.52%

Last edited: August 10, 2004

President's Council on Women's Issues

Mission Statement

Approved May 2003

The President's Council on Women's Issues serves as an advisory group to the President and Provost on issues related to the life and work of women faculty, staff, and students at The Ohio State University. (The Council also serves in an advisory role to the work of The Women's Place, approving the goals for TWP and evaluating the outcomes. Through its work groups the Council provides expertise to carry out the mission of the Council and the goals of The Women's Place.)

The Council functions based on four mandates, to:

Identify and clarify women's issues and concerns across the variable constituencies of women faculty, staff, and students.

use the resources of the University to gather the information necessary to carry out mandate #1, i.e., in articulating women's issues and concerns clearly and insightfully.

recommend policies that positively affect the environment for all women at Ohio State.

identify intervention strategies designed to make a significant difference in the quality of life and work for women.

These roles support both the Academic Plan and the Diversity Plan by:

facilitating the ability of campus leaders to develop a more inclusive vision of women's participation in a variable workplace environment;

developing a language of leadership that encourages high achievement, professional growth, and personal and interpersonal development;

making visible women's work, contributions, and achievements in ways that extend dynamically the boundaries of what constitutes valuable performance, service, and leadership.

helping the University to create an environment in which all constituencies, including women, can survive and thrive.

The Women's Place

Approved May 2004

Overarching Planning Statement

The Women's Place is a catalyst to create processes, services and resources to enhance the capacity of the University and its members to more effectively address conditions and barriers that affect recruitment, retention and advancement of women at The Ohio State University. TWP connects across the University and partners with existing and emerging efforts to assist the University in carrying out the Academic and Diversity Plans. TWP is sponsored by the Provost's office and works directly with that office as well as the President's Council on Women's Issues. An important function of TWP is to serve the Council in carrying out its mission and goals.

Guiding Principles

The following guiding principles are based on the historical data and the experience of University women working together that led to the creation of TWP. These guiding principles encapsulate what had worked well in the four years since the inception of TWP and reflect values of shared decision-making and collaborative work.

- TWP is committed to an equitable environment for all people
- TWP recognizes that gender powerfully affects experience and opportunity
- TWP recognizes that men as well as women need to be freed from the constraints of their stereotypes
- TWP emphasizes the necessity to create constructive, system-wide change, not just to enable individual women to cope with issues that they currently face
- TWP works in partnership with units across the campus. It does not work on units, but rather with them to identify and remove barriers to the recruitment, retention and advancement of women
- TWP uses current research and data to identify issues and units for intervention when needed
- TWP uses collaborative approaches to decision making that serve as a model to other units on campus; these approaches emphasize open, democratic and respectful ways of working together that foster true dialogue and mutual understanding
- TWP is a safe haven for individuals and units to seek resources for identifying problems and finding constructive solutions
- TWP is focused on the future, as informed by the past
- Critical Difference for Women is an integral part of TWP and the working relationship between these two enhances their ability to carry out their separate missions regarding the progress of women at the university

Strategic Goals

Goals for the next three years:

- Continue to act as a voice and a champion for the advancement of women at OSU
- Enhance understanding of the way in which male and female stereotypes diminish the ability of the University to provide an equitable environment for all people.
- Continue a systematic and ongoing data collection to inform efforts related to the progress of women
- Become more proactive in identifying barriers to the recruitment, retention and advancement of women, and instigate and lead efforts to make change
- Enhance TWP's capacity to provide high-quality consultation and innovative strategies for individuals and units on campus that are seeking to create constructive change
- Identify and invite experts on gender issues to campus and facilitate application of their expertise to issues women face at OSU
- Secure permanent facilities for TWP that are reflective of its mission and goals
- Develop and implement approaches to expand women's leadership development
- Enhance TWP's visibility and purpose to the OSU community

BASIC PRINCIPLES FOR
EVALUATION OF WORK/LIFE POLICIES

Note: Proposals/policies will be reviewed in the first instance to ascertain whether their subject matter falls within the scope of the mission of the President's Council. The following six basic principles will then be used as a template for evaluation:

1. Is the proposal actionable and practical? Can these proposed policies be implemented in an effective manner? Are there available resources and infrastructure to support these procedures?
2. Does the proposal adequately and equitably speak to the needs of all of the relevant constituent groups of staff and faculty?
3. Does the proposal speak to the issues and goals addressed in the Staff and the Faculty Worklife Surveys?
4. Are there ways in which the proposal falls short of its stated goals?
5. Is the proposal sufficiently current in addressing issues in the context of emerging societal issues?
6. Is there an appropriate and sufficient use of a language of leadership and professional growth, as articulated in the Council's mission statement?

TIPS FOR SUCCESS IN FOURTH YEAR REVIEW

- Be knowledgeable about the criteria for promotion and tenure
- Be brutally frank regarding your own progress—your success is in your hands
- Take annual reviews seriously---don't make excuses
- Take advantage of university policies e.g. exclusion of time from the probationary period
- Don't overextend yourself with service obligations
- Off quarter is not "vacation"---use for scholarly work
- Take advantage of SRA's
- Determine if department flexes schedules. If so, make sure you are given opportunity
- Ensure that you know senior faculty and they know you and your work
- Seek advice from well-regarded senior faculty
- Follow advice

**WHAT YOU CAN/SHOULD EXPECT FROM YOUR DEPARTMENT AS YOU
PREPARE FOR REVIEW FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

- A copy of the departmental and college promotion and tenure criteria
- A candid explanation of ways in which criteria are operationalized---e.g. what are “high quality” journals, are there preferred sources for extramural support, what are expectations for service in the department/college
- An annual performance review that:
 - Assesses your performance against the criteria
 - Future plans and means to achieve them
- A face to face meeting with the department chair with input from senior faculty
- Assessments that reflect the department, college and university criteria
- Candor and data to support assessment
 - Teaching evaluations
 - Any problematic areas
- Clear, unequivocal suggestions for going forward
- Opportunity for faculty development to improve performance
- Availability of your personnel folder to review
- Opportunity to provide written comment re: the annual review

Interpretation and Observations About the Faculty Cohort Project 2003-2004

Background

The Faculty Cohort Project has completed its third year. Council members who have been supporting the cohort met in May, 2004 to share their interpretations and observations about the cohort and our activities in working with the cohort. These observations are designed to inform the institution about the experiences of this cohort. It is important to note that sixteen of the nineteen colleges, including the library, have a new faculty member who is a participant in the cohort.

Shared Interpretations and Observations

1. Colleges have a specific culture about tenure that strongly determines the environment for success (or lack thereof). Stances towards the tenure process range from developmental to punitive.
2. The kinds of support faculty receive and the resources made available are a reflection of the culture and emanates from the culture.
3. There is a clear disparity between new women faculty who have been provided resources in their colleges and those who have not, in terms of their feelings of preparation for the fourth year review and their knowledge of its processes.
4. In those colleges where there is strong support and resources for new faculty, the cohort members are able to point to that support and rely on it as the formal first level information.
5. There are some units that clearly have not changed in terms of the “chilly climate” for women. Thus, at the fourth year review, there are some women in the cohort who are at risk of not having the resources needed to be successful. Some of the issues surrounding this problem include:
 - Faculty who are the solos or singles, that is those who are the first woman and/or the first person to go up for tenure in twenty years!
 - Units that lack knowledge about the P& T process because the faculty have been very “stable” and little attention has been paid to assuring that the P & T documents or process is made clear.
 - Units where women are under represented continue to lack specific support for the newly hired women faculty

- Increased standards that are being developed and changed in P& T documents that are not understood by either the senior faculty or the cohort members.

Learnings from these Interpretations and Observations

Based on these interpretations, grounded in the experiences of the cohort members and other available information, a number of strategies will enhance the success of newly hired women faculty members.

1. Units can investigate their stance towards tenure and determine if it is a stance that enhances the unit's ability to retain women faculty.
2. Dossier preparation can be seen as a *shared responsibility*, with the unit making sure it is clear about what is expected. Several departments including English, provide models of interventions such as the core dossier training.
3. Units can experiment with ways that new faculty members can be assured of connections. These can include a traditional mentor or, in line with Virginia Valian's work, new faculty can be helped to develop their own group of advisors that could change over time. Creating connections is critical for tenured as well as untenured faculty; the College of Law provides a model of connections between junior/new and senior faculty that can be easily replicated.
4. The formation of a group of advisors should assure the faculty member has access to the informal clues in the unit to assure that the faculty member can determine what is of value in the unit as they proceed through promotion and tenure.
5. Letters of reference can be a place where women and men are referenced in differential ways. Units can encourage all faculty to examine letters of reference to see what patterns of language may advantage men over women.
6. Units need to be encouraged to provide opportunities for candidates for the fourth year review to "practice" using the T & P guidelines throughout their probationary period, either in workshops or in annual reviews, as done in the College of Education and other colleges.

Faculty Cohort Analysis

April 2004

Separation data

A total of **131 tenure-track assistant professors** were hired in **the 01/02 academic year**. Of that total, **50 or 38.2%** were women and **81 or 61.8%** were men.

At the end of **April 2003** a total of **126 assistant professors** remained in the cohort. Of the total remaining, **48 or 38.1%** are women and **78 or 61.9%** are men.

In **April 2003**, the reported reason for departure was **RESIGNATION** for both the women (2) and men (3) who resigned.

At the end of **April 2004** a total of **123 assistant professors** remained in the cohort. Of the total remaining, **45 or 36.6%** are women and **78 or 63.4%** are men.

In **April 2004**, the reported reason for departure was **RESIGNATION** for the women (3) who resigned. To date, two of the women resigned from Medicine, one from Nursing, and one each from Humanities and Food and Agriculture.

Prepared from data provided by Sonia Kovitz – May 18, 2004

**INVISIBLE WORK:
THE DISAPPEARING OF RELATIONAL PRACTICE AT WORK**

*Prepared by Joyce K. Fletcher, Professor of Management,
Center for Gender in Organizations, SIMMONS Graduate School of Management*

Relational Dilemmas

An engineer working in a major high-tech firm spends hours briefing someone from another company division, sharing her team's preliminary solutions to a design problem, the product of six months' of work. She feels good knowing that the other division won't have to spend time simply reinventing the wheel.

A technical analyst at a scientific research center assists a team of scientists by suggesting, and then helping to implement, an obscure statistical analysis. It pleases him to go beyond his formal job description and official role--which is simply to carry out the scientists' decisions--by making intellectual contributions to the project's success.

At a mid-sized manufacturing firm, a new, self-managed team is developing a list of performance criteria. One member suggests that the ability to bring people together, resolve differences, and make team members feel at ease with each other is essential to getting the job done and should be included on the list.

Each of these examples focuses on the kinds of behavior that have become increasingly important in organizations: sharing information across organizational boundaries; doing whatever it takes to get the job done; fostering teamwork and collaboration; thinking systemically rather than individuals focusing on just their own little piece of the picture. These are exactly the kinds of actions that management writers are saying employers must encourage in order to compete in the global, knowledge-intensive economy. Indeed, new models of leadership tout these practices as the essence of good leadership. Here is the problem: In each of these examples, the employee later had second thoughts about what she or he had done. The engineer began to worry that the other division's team would be credited for an innovative new approach, which her own team had actually developed. She realized that giving away her team's learning might not be a very sound career strategy and said she regretted having been "led down the garden path." The technical analyst realized that, although the scientists had thanked him profusely in private, they, alone, got the public recognition for their research design. And the person who suggested that team competencies should be included with other performance criteria saw her suggestion shot down when others complained that such skills were too difficult to measure. What bothered her most was that she felt these competencies were her most important contribution to the project's success--more valuable, even, than her technical capabilities. Yet the team's decision to leave them off the performance criteria was as good as saying they did not count.

Why are contributions such as these--which I call relational practice--devalued or dismissed even in organizations that tout the importance of collaboration and supportive teamwork, while behaviors that reflect a contrasting set of values--such as individual achievement, autonomy, and specialization--continue to be celebrated and rewarded? The underlying problem is one that

affects many organizations. It is not just a case of outmoded performance appraisal systems that do not align with new organizational objectives. The fundamental issue runs a lot deeper. It is about gender and power and the way relational practice gets "disappeared"--that is, denigrated, ignored, or even penalized--not because it is ineffective, but because it is out of line with deeply held, gender-linked assumptions about good workers, exemplary behavior, and successful organizations. Below I explore why and how relational practice gets disappeared in the workplace. I suggest strategies that individuals and organizations can use to interrupt the cycle.

Relational Practice

What does relational practice look like? As the opening examples illustrate, relational practice is a way of achieving goals and getting the job done using skills such as listening, mutuality, reciprocity, and sensitivity to the emotional context. It is founded on a set of implicit beliefs, for example, the idea that growth, achievement, and effectiveness occur best within a network of connection and support. Another underlying belief is that interdependence is something to strive for. It is powerful and productive to be mutually reliant on others. A third is that important work outcomes include not only what one achieves oneself but also what one enables others to achieve, for example, by facilitating effective relationships between stakeholders, or teaching others, or paying attention to the emotional dynamics in a situation to ensure that a project stays on track. The particular notion of relational practice referred to here is based on the work of Jean Baker Miller and her colleagues at the Stone Center at Wellesley College. First articulated by Miller in her 1976 *Toward a New Psychology of Women*, relational theory poses an alternative to prevailing models of adult development that emphasize autonomy and separation in the growth process. In contrast, the Stone Center model emphasizes growth-in-connection and conceptualizes development into fully functional adulthood as a process of becoming increasingly proficient at connecting to others, as opposed to separating and individuating oneself from others. While it may not seem so initially, this is a radical departure from the established view, in which relational activities are seen as female traits rooted in women's greater emotional needs. By contrast, Miller argues that relational prowess is actually a skill, not an attribute, and a strength, rather than a deficiency. Society socializes women to accept responsibility for relational growth, she says, while men are encouraged to deny it. What makes this dynamic especially pernicious is that neither the skills required to create relational conditions for growth, nor the work of doing so, nor society's need for such relational activity is acknowledged. They remain invisible. Thus, by both requiring and devaluing support activities, society can maintain its belief in independence and individual achievement, even though most people have a (largely female) network of people supporting their so-called individual achievement.

This "myth of individuality" runs deep and forms the basis for much of our conventional wisdom about life, business, and society. As a result, the "logic of effectiveness" that underlies most workplace practices is not a relational logic, but instead emphasizes and reinforces individuation. Conceptualizing growth and development as a process rooted in connection offers a different logic of effectiveness. At least at the level of rhetoric, it would appear that most organizations recognize the need to shift to this more relational model-- one that is more team oriented, empowering, collaborative. But this is where the story gets complicated, because gender/power dynamics actually inhibit this shift in interesting ways.

Disappearing Acts

Appendix 5

Gender and Power at Work

Understanding how relational work comes to be seen as "women's work" helps us to see a similar gender dynamic in the workplace, where relational practice gets disappeared as "real" work and gets constructed as something else--something with personal, rather than task-related objectives and consequences. It is this disappearing dynamic that accounts for the dismay many workers feel in practicing "new" models of working based on collaboration and teamwork. By analyzing the experiences of a variety of workers-- beginning with my study of female engineers and expanding to include women in many different types of work settings-- I have identified three "disappearing acts" that marginalize relational practice: * the misunderstanding of motive; * the limits of language; and * the confusion of relational practice with traditional notions of femininity.

Misunderstanding the motive

The first disappearing act is to misinterpret why someone would be working this way. Although it is motivated by a desire to work more effectively, often relational practice is (mis)understood as a personal idiosyncrasy or trait. These traits sometimes have a negative connotation, such as naivete, powerlessness, weakness or emotional need. But they may also be more positive, as when relational practice is seen as an expression of thoughtfulness, personal style, or being "nice." Take the team member who puts effort into keeping others informed of things that were decided in meetings they missed, or passes on information others need to know so they can understand the rationale behind actions, or takes time off-line to act as a go-between for members who are having difficulty working together. She takes the time to do this because she believes that it is necessary for the success of the project. In other words, she believes the short-term investment of her time and effort will pay off in long-term business results. When other team members talk about her, however, they call her the "glue" of the team and comment about how "nice" and "thoughtful" she is. Notice what happened in this situation. First, the strategic intention of her behavior is lost. Its pragmatic, goal directed purpose to keep the team on track is obscured. Instead, she is seen as acting on her natural tendency to be nice or to care about people or process. As a result, the relational skills she exercised such as anticipating what others will need, or understanding and responding to the emotional context of situations, or exercising her ability to empathize with each party in a dispute, go unacknowledged. Instead, behavior motivated by her belief that maintaining connection is a prerequisite to getting the job done is marginalized. It becomes tangential to work, rather than essential to it. Notice too, the impact that misattributing the intention of relational practice has on traditional assumptions about achievement, success, and effectiveness. They remain unchanged. When team accolades are handed out, it is the technical contributions that will get highlighted. With technical skills as the surest route to success, ambitious engineers have little motivation to develop relational as well as technical skills. The relational practitioner is seen as "nice" to have on a team, yet the beliefs about what is essential to achieve project success go unchanged.

Limits of language

The second disappearing act has to do with language. Listen to this engineer as she describes what she does in her job. "I know I am doing a good job when people think of me... as someone who is, one, competent and, two, someone who will help," she says. "Most people around here only care about the first thing--competence. They don't care if they are seen as approachable. I do." Notice how she defines doing a good job as having two separate components. One, the technical part of the job, she calls competence. The second, she calls approachability and a willingness to help. In this way, she is--unwittingly-- reinforcing the prevailing view that

enabling others is not part of competence but is something separate, the "soft side" of doing a good job. That's just one example of the way people often undermine relational practice in the way they talk about it. It happens in other ways, too. Using collaborative language to build on others' ideas is a savvy and effective way to build consensus, but it may be labeled as simply "being polite." Maintaining relationships that are critical to accomplishing the task may be dismissed as just "being nice." Language such as this tends to feminize the behavior and, because of longstanding gender norms in the workplace, weakens it. Why is it difficult to use organizationally strong language when describing relational forms of work, such as creating the experience of team or enabling others? The answer lies in the prevailing "logic of effectiveness" described earlier. In workplace parlance, words used to denote effectiveness-such as skill, intelligence, achievement or outcome-have already been defined in ways that exclude relational activity as "real" work. So, like the engineer who struggles to articulate a new definition of competence, it is often difficult to find words to describe relational work powerfully.

Confusing relational practice with femininity

The third disappearing act - how relational practice gets confused with femininity - is where the gender dynamic really kicks in. When men do relational practice, the first two disappearing acts might disappear their work. They might be misinterpreted as weak and they might have trouble finding a language of competence to describe what they do. But for women, something additional happens. When they do relational practice, it often gets confused with a natural expression of their femininity. They are likely to be seen as "mothering" rather than leading, as selflessly giving (expecting nothing in return!) rather than modeling new leadership practices. Once relational practice is feminized, it is often pathologized. For example, people say, "She takes things too personally," or "She has an excessive need to be liked." But the catch is, if women do not do relational practice, the story is not much better. Because of gender expectations, people expect women to be relational, to focus on others, to be helpful, sensitive, caring, and good listeners. When women do not meet these gender expectations, they often pay a price, labeled with the "b" word or called a "man in a skirt." It's not surprising that many women resent this double bind: They are expected to act relationally and then are devalued or exploited for doing it. It does not stop there. When gender expectations get conflated with relational practice, the logic of effectiveness that drives this way of working loses its power to challenge the status quo. The tenets of relational growth - beliefs about interdependence, reciprocity, and mutuality - are lost as general principles and instead become something only a subset of the workforce is expected to provide. The bottom line is: The workplace benefits from this relational way of working but does not change its norms about valuable work, valuable workers, or promotable behavior. Is it any wonder, then, that those who do relational practice often worry that their valuable contributions will mark them as naïve rather than competent? As exploitable rather than leadership material?

Practical Pushing: getting beyond disappearing

The notion of disappearing acts strikes a familiar chord for many workers, especially women. But beyond the validation that comes from being able, at last, to give a name to personal experience, how can individuals and organizations reverse the cycle? When I give presentations on relational practice, the people in the audience have many stories to tell about the dilemmas of working in non-relational environments. Many have become quite adept at challenging dominant norms in small but persistent ways, without being disappeared, exploited, or dismissed. From them, I've learned four strategies for pushing back on the disappearing dynamic: naming, norming, negotiating, and networking.

Naming

Naming is the strategy of calling attention to relational practice as work, by recognizing it as a competency rather than a personal characteristic. It can take several forms. One simple approach is to substitute the word "effective" when someone else notes the "nice" or "sensitive" attributes of a relational practitioner. Another is to name the skills and intended outcomes of your own, or others', relational practice and, in this way, focus organizational attention on invisible work. Take the example of a team leader who was chastised by her mentor for using the pronoun "we" rather than "I" when making a presentation to top management. Using "we" sounded weak and overly general, she was told. She needed to "claim her space." The team leader definitely did not want to disappear her own role. Yet she felt her primary contribution had been to create an environment that encouraged a genuine team effort. She wondered how she might have made the presentation differently. One approach would be to preface the presentation with an announcement that she was using the pronoun "we" intentionally to call attention to something unique: her recommendations were the result of a productive collaborative effort and she wanted to recognize her team's ability to harness all the talent in the group. Naming her intention and tying it to organizational goals of collaboration rescues the practice from obscurity and brings it onto the organizational screen in a powerful way. She is not saying "we" to be nice or because she is uncomfortable calling attention to her accomplishments. Rather, she is saying "we" to signal her competence and the relational skills it took to practice the "new" leadership.

Norming

Norming strategies call attention to organizational norms of effectiveness, point out their potential costs or unintended negative consequences, and offer relationally based alternatives. The team leader in the previous example uses this strategy as well. By acknowledging her credit-sharing as an intentional exception, she calls attention to the dysfunctional norm in that workplace of taking sole credit for group effort. In addition, she is publicly demonstrating an alternative model of competence: a team leader who fosters collective achievement and is unwilling to disappear the contribution of others.

Negotiating

A partner in an accounting firm described how she used this strategy. Women in her firm are often asked to take on ad hoc assignments that entail relational work, such as heading a selection committee or overseeing an employee-appreciation initiative. Because women often have the relational skills to do these jobs and because they recognize the value of doing them well, they often accept. Only later do they discover the negative consequences. While these jobs are described as developmental, they have little career capital. Others who take on more traditional developmental opportunities in line rather than staff positions are often viewed as adding more value to the bottom-line. Recognizing this, the partner felt she was in a bind when her boss asked her to head up a special task force in response to a class action sexual harassment suit. While she wanted to say yes to the request because she knew how important it was that it be done well, she feared that it might not be good for her career. On the other hand, saying no was also fraught with problems. One of the ways to demonstrate commitment in this firm was to "never say no." She feared that if she should turn down this opportunity-especially when the firm was under threat -she might not be considered a team player. Here is how she dealt with this dilemma. When responding to her boss, she decided to negotiate conditions that would allow her to say yes without being penalized. She enumerated the relational competencies necessary to do the job well and expressed pleasure in having those skills recognized. Then since the most important measure of success used by the firm was rainmaking, or generating client revenue-- she proposed a plan for calculating the costs and benefits of the initiative.

She also suggested a formula, using her last year's revenue base, that could be used to assess her contribution. Thus she was able to use two push-back strategies: First, she named the required relational skills using a language of competency. Second, she challenged the disappearing of relational work by calculating its monetary value – the currency of effectiveness in this organization.

Networking

The fourth strategy is to form a growth-in-connection network to support and foster relational practice. As one woman noted, having such a network helps her to identify the systemic issues she is experiencing and devise practical ways of pushing back. Many women prefer that their network be outside their immediate work environment, since "women's groups" are often stigmatized in the workplace.

Conclusion

Many books on organizational learning call attention to the difficulty of advocating change that runs counter to deeply held assumptions about success. But examining how relational practice gets disappeared helps us see that outmoded assumptions are not the only problem. It is the gendered nature of many of these assumptions that complicates the problem in invisible but powerful ways. The disappearing dynamic helps us see that there are potent, gender-linked forces that silence and suppress relational challenges to organizational norms. They do so at a serious cost not only to women and men but, most importantly, to the organization's ability to meet its goals.

References

Fletcher, J. K. (1999). *Disappearing Acts: Gender, Power, and Relational Practice at Work*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fletcher, J. K. and Jacques, R. (1999). *Relational Practice: An emerging stream of theory and its significance for organizational studies*. CGO Working Paper No. 2. Boston: The Center for Gender in Organizations.

Kolb, D. and Williams, J. (2000). *The Shadow Negotiation: How Women Can Master the Hidden Agendas that Determine Bargaining Success*. NY: Simon and Schuster.

Meyerson, D. and Scully, M. (1999). Tempered Radicalism. CGO Insights, No 6.
Boston: The Center for Gender in Organizations.

Miller, J. B. (1976). *Toward a New Psychology of Women*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Copyright 2001, Joyce K. Fletcher.

This document may be linked or reproduced for non-commercial purposes as long as the author is cited and the copyright notice is visibly displayed. For permission to use this document commercially, please contact the Center for Gender in Organizations.

Simmons College Graduate School of Management Center for Gender in Organizations (CGO) Linking gender and organizational effectiveness 409 Commonwealth Avenue / Boston, MA 02215
Phone 617-521-3876 / Fax 617-521-3878 cgo@simmons.edu <http://www.simmons.edu/gsm/cgo>
SIMMONS COLLEGE Graduate School of Management 409 Commonwealth Avenue Boston, Massachusetts 02215 P:617-521-3840 or 800-597-1MBA F: 617-521-3880 E: gsmadm@simmons.edu
mailto:gsmadm@simmons.edu © Copyright http://www.simmons.edu/site_index.html
1996-2000 by Simmons College & others All rights reserved.

Summary of discussion from Staff Work Group

Background

In 1999, Joyce K. Fletcher, author of “Disappearing Acts: Gender, Power, and Relational Practice at Work” MIT Press, introduced the Council and the Office of Human Resources to the concept of relational practice as a set of competencies that can be measured. These competencies had previously been included in both OSU position descriptions and performance reviews but were not treated as competencies but rather personality traits and as result they were removed from the position descriptions and performance reviews. The work with Fletcher informed the thinking of the Council and the work of the staff work group to propose relational practice in ORH documents.

Using Fletcher’s research, the workgroup identified where it could most impact documentation of and measurement of relational practice. The existing performance review document was seen as the most effective place. Larry Lewellen, associate vice president for Human Resources, supported this analysis and effort.

Process

Joyce Fletcher generously provided the work group with the work from Linda Hartling, PhD and Amy Banks, MD who are developing organizational relational health indices. The work group analyzed each section of the current performance review document and identified places where including relational practices in the document would assure that these competencies could be seen and measured. Hartling and Banks work was instrumental in developing language in the document that effectively describes the relational practices as measurable competencies.

Results

In addition to completing the goal to modify the performance review document additional findings were noted. They are important and should be used to set the agenda for next set of outcomes for the work group. They include:

- Staff does not see value in the performance review system as a tool for professional development. In fact, the tool was seen as having little value to good performers, it just reinforced they were doing a good job when they already knew they were.
- Staff that are performing well are frustrated with the lack of institutional support for professional development.
- Training on relational practices, the meaning of them, and how to measure them should be included in management training for managers on both the academic side and administrative side of the university. New training efforts are not needed but rather the information can and should be included in training currently sponsored by OAA and OHR.

- The Office of Human Resources will be revising its performance management system for the institution starting next year. The Council must be an active participant in the redesign in order to assure that the learning from the process of applying the knowledge of relational practice and of the understandings of gender schemas be included in the redesign of the performance management system.

*Suggestions for the improvement of the
OHR performance review document*

2004



**FIRST DRAFT—WC STAFF WORK GROUP
PERFORMANCE REVIEW**

For Classified Civil Service
and
Unclassified Staff

Note: Suggestions from the staff cohort work group are based on relational practices. Suggestions are designated by the red text.

Guidelines for Conducting an Effective Performance Review

Prepare yourself and your employee.

- review employees work accomplishments, projects and any supporting documentation (notes, letters, files, etc.) before working on the review
- schedule ample time and a private place for the discussion
- ~~notify the~~ schedule a mutually workable time with the employee in advance, in writing
- ~~review documentation (notes, letters, files, etc.) before working on the review~~ • remember that performance management is a key ~~service~~ opportunity and tool to:
 - solicit input from the employee regarding their suggestions for goal setting and methods to meet expectations
 - clearly communicate the goals and expectations agreed upon for the coming year or review period
 - link the work of the employee to the unit's mission and strategy
 - empower employee to develop and grow professionally
 - encourage employee feedback to candidly assess their competency levels
 - recognize the efforts and contribution of your employees to the success of your unit and energize them to use their talent for the betterment of The University.

Make it “priority time.”

- create an agenda for the meeting
- minimize interruption

Set a tone of collaboration.

- start the discussion on a positive note
- ~~encourage~~ ask for your employee's participation

Be clear about your purpose. **The performance review is tool for reviewing past accomplishments, identifying work goals for the next review period, and assessing areas for improving skills.**

- reinforce that the discussion will ~~address strengths~~ highlight accomplishments
 - jointly identify areas for ~~improvement~~ improving skills

Review performance expectations.

- discuss the position description, units' reasons for needing the position
- define performance in the position that is below, meets, and exceeds expectations using clear and specific language and examples
- be clear about performance standards within your unit

Discuss **current** performance that is below, meets, and exceeds expectations.

- use clear language ~~language that is clear and specific; use~~ and provide specific examples
- describe performance, not personality
- acknowledge and recognize employee efforts, performance, and accomplishments that meet and exceed expectations

Ask employee what he/she thinks.

- ~~allow~~ ask for employee input and assessment of their performance

- encourage employee to speak freely and share their perspective before responding to his/her comments
- actively listen to your employee
- clarify your employee's concerns, then address them with respect for their perspective
- if there is a conflict in opinion regarding performance, work to a mutually beneficial understanding and resolution

Set goals and expectations for the next year to:

- motivate employee to improve performance in targeted areas
- build on strengths
- identify opportunities to develop the employee's knowledge, skills, and abilities (training classes, attendance at seminars)
- align the employee's work with the needs of the unit

Agree to follow up.

- schedule at least one interim check-in on performance during the year
- ask how your employee prefers to receive feedback (written, verbal)
- discuss how your employee likes to be recognized for good work

Close with positive reinforcement and encouragement.

- recognize the work accomplishments of the employee over the current review period
 - offer your help and support to employee in any area identified for improvement
- end on a positive note by summarizing employee strengths and contributions
 - thank employee for their efforts which contributed to the unit's success during the period of the review

Section 1: Employee Information

Employee Name _____

Working Title (if used) _____

Classification _____

Employee ID# _____

Department _____

Department # _____

Appraisal Period From _____ to _____

mo/day/yr mo/day/yr

Type of review:

- Probationary (at the end of the probationary period)
 - Interim (as check point during the year, or before the end of probation)
 - Annual (at the end of the performance year)
-

Section 2: Review Employee Performance on University Competencies

Use the following ratings to evaluate performance in each area:

Well Above Performance is *repeatedly above* expectations.

Above performance is *sometimes above* expectations.

Meets Performance *meets* expectations.

Below Performance is *sometimes below* expectations.

Well Below Performance is *repeatedly below* expectations.

The following performance competencies reflect the University's core values. Each employee is accountable for performance in these areas.

A. Quality Service

- listens carefully and responds to customer requests and problems
- delivers friendly, courteous service to internal and external customers
- demonstrates a commitment to increasing customer satisfaction
- **creates a working environment that encourages others to seek assistance**
- **~~looks for and makes continuous improvements~~ goes beyond formal job requirements or role to contribute to the success of the unit or project by recommending new approaches and assisting in their implementation**
- performs with accuracy, thoroughness and effectiveness

Describe the employee's performance in this area, using specific examples:

Check one rating for Quality Service:

Well Below Below Meets Above Well Above

If you rated the employee's performance "Below" or "Well Below," how will you and the employee work to improve this?

B. Respect and Community

- establishes and maintains respectful and cooperative working relationships, **fosters a team/collaborative work environment**
 - considers the needs and objectives of others
 - solicits input from coworkers
 - offers alternatives to reach resolution
 - demonstrates willingness to compromise when appropriate
 - accepts shared responsibility and ownership of projects
 - supports goals of others even when not directly related to one's own goals
 - shares knowledge and experience with others both inside and outside of immediate workgroup
- demonstrates respect for individuals in all forms of communication
- supports unit and university goals and priorities
- demonstrates respect for a positive, diverse work environment and university community
 - utilizes the skills and abilities of others effectively
 - delegates responsibilities and activities appropriately
 - acknowledges the contributions of others
- ~~handles interpersonal conflicts constructively~~ solicits cooperation and participation from others to accomplish or achieve goals without incurring hostility or without the use of formal authority
 - gains the confidence and trust of others
 - obtains cooperation and commitment from others
- handles interpersonal conflicts constructively

Describe the employee's performance in this area, using specific examples:

Check one rating for Respect and Community:

Well Below Below Meets Above Well Above

If you rated the employee's performance "Below" or "Well Below," how will you and the employee work to improve this?

C. Learning and Development

- constructively uses feedback from multiple sources
- seeks new challenges and increased responsibility
- demonstrates willingness to try new approaches
- seeks and participates in learning and development activities
 - applies knowledge gained through developmental activities to work projects
 - shares knowledge gained with others within and outside immediate workgroup to assist others in improving their skills

Describe the employee's performance in this area, using specific examples:

Check one rating for Learning and Development:

Well Below Below Meets Above Well Above

If you rated the employee's performance "Below" or "Well Below," how will you and the employee work to improve this?

D. Focus on Results

- sets goals in alignment with unit and university priorities
- organizes work to achieve goals
- identifies and solves problems
- achieves targeted results
- accomplishes a fair and agreed-upon workload
- accepts responsibility for own actions
- acknowledges the assistance and contributions of others in reaching results

Describe the employee's performance in this area, using specific examples:

Check one rating for Focus on Results:

Well Below Below Meets Above Well Above

If you rated the employee's performance "Below" or "Well Below," how will you and the employee work to improve this?

E. Job Knowledge

- understands job requirements and responsibilities
- demonstrates ability to perform necessary tasks and procedures
- keeps informed on up-to-date job methods, skills, and techniques
- **displays ability to think beyond the parameters of immediate job responsibilities to connect to others to accomplish the goals of the unit**

Describe the employee's performance in this area, using specific examples:

Check one rating for Job Knowledge:

Well Below Below Meets Above Well Above

If you rated the employee's performance "Below" or "Well Below," how will you and the employee work to improve this?

F. Job-Specific Competency (optional) _____

The supervisor and employee create a job-specific competency area to supplement the University competencies (A-E above).

Describe the employee's performance in this area, using specific examples:

Check one rating for _____:

Well Below Below Meets Above Well Above

If you rated the employee's performance "Below" or "Well Below," how will you and the employee work to improve this?

G. Performance Management (*complete for supervisors only*)

- conducts effective and timely performance reviews
- sets realistic goals and solicits input from staff regarding their suggestions for goal setting and methods to meet expectations
- ~~sets clear expectations with staff~~ clearly communicates goals and expectations to staff
- encourages staff to be direct and share their perspective even when there is a difference in opinion or approach to an issue
- encourages feedback from staff members to assist them in candidly assessing their competencies levels
- encourages innovation and creativity from staff
- gives feedback to staff in a respectful, constructive way
- ~~recognizes excellent performance~~ recognizes the efforts and contributions of each staff member to the success of unit
- ~~encourages staff to seek feedback from multiple sources~~ seeks feedback on staff and unit performance from multiple sources
- ~~promotes self-development and responsiveness to feedback~~
- uses coaching skills effectively to improve staff performance
- identifies opportunities to develop employee's knowledge, skills, and abilities and actively assists staff in pursuing such opportunities
- encourages staff to engage in learning and development opportunities

Describe the employee's performance in this area, using specific examples:

Check one rating for Performance Management:

Well Below Below Meets Above Well Above

If you rated the employee's performance "Below" or "Well Below," how will you and the employee work to improve this?

H. Leadership (*complete for supervisors only*)

- builds commitment to mission and priorities of unit and university
 - encourages personal involvement from staff to share the "vision" by clarifying and communicating the significance and contribution of their role toward successfully accomplishing the mission

- aligns goals of immediate work unit to university goals and mission
- fosters teamwork across all work units in the university
- actively involves staff in planning and decision-making
 - shares information with staff
 - shares decision making with staff
- actively listens and understands what peers, subordinates, and others are saying
- seeks consensus and builds an environment that favors consensus
- delegates authority and power to the staff doing the work
- ensures a focus on core performance competencies
 - clearly defines staff job roles and responsibilities
 - communicates goals and expectations on a regular basis
 - shares knowledge with workgroup to assist in improving their skills
- fosters a work environment characterized by mutual respect
 - delegates responsibilities and activities appropriately balancing the needs of employees and the workload
 - solicits cooperation and participation from staff to accomplish or achieve goals without incurring hostility or using formal authority
 - creates a working environment that encourages staff to seek assistance when needed
 - encourages employees to be direct in expressing concerns or disagreements
 - works to achieve mutually beneficial resolutions to differences of opinion
 - uses diplomacy in dealing with others
- provides direction and defines priorities
 - identifies critical tasks and sets priorities based on all relevant factors
 - makes correct inferences from available data
 - considers alternative solutions and their impact
 - takes a position and makes timely decisions
 - develops new, creative solutions to traditional problems
 - modifies strategies and adjusts to changing or unstructured conditions
 - encourages innovation from others
 - tries alternatives to reach desired goals
- acts with integrity
 - acknowledges the assistance and contributions of others in reaching results

Describe the employee's performance in this area, using specific examples:

Check one rating for Leadership:

Well Below Below Meets Above Well Above

If you rated the employee's performance "Below" or "Well Below," how will you and the employee work to improve this?

Section 3: Review Goals (Optional)

If appropriate, attach a copy of the employee's performance goals for this year. Review and make comments below.

Section 4: Summarize Performance and Make Additional Comments

Check one rating for overall performance:

Well Below Below Meets Above Well Above

Supervisor's summative or additional comments (*add sheets if needed*):

Employee's comments (*add sheets if needed*):

Section 5: Complete the Employee Professional Development Plan

Write down 1-4 professional development goals and specific action steps to achieve the goals.

Section 6: Signatures and Processing

Sign below and:

1. Give a copy to the employee
2. Place the original in the employee's personnel file

Employee check here:

- My supervisor and I have reviewed this document together.
(Signing the form indicates only that the form has been reviewed with you and that you have received a copy. It does not imply agreement.)

Employee's Signature _____ Date _____

Supervisor's Signature _____ Date _____

This document was

reviewed by _____ Date _____

(dean or administrative office signature)

Retention of Performance Review Form:

- **Do not** return a copy of this form to the Office of Human Resources
- You are **required** to retain a copy in the employee's personnel file within your unit.
- Performance review forms **must** be retained for each employee for six years after separation from the University.

For questions or comments, please call the Office of Human Resources, Consulting Services, at 292-2800 to speak to the primary contact person for your area.
--

Office of Human Resources
Revised 2/98

Recommendations from student cohort workgroup to Council

- Student nominees for 2003-2004 need to be re-notified about this year's focus and rationale for not appointing students
- Appoint a minimum of 3 students to next year's Council with at least 1 undergraduate represented
- Student Cohort project workgroup should continue as an ongoing work group of the Council and have representation from student, faculty and staff
- Student Council members would automatically be invited to join the student cohort workgroup, and any other work group of their choice
- Student Council member's role will be to support the student cohort workgroup, and therefore the Council, in surfacing student concerns via formal (surveys, focus groups, etc.) and informal (organization representation, collaborations, etc.) methods

Email sent to students and summary responses May 2004

EMAIL:

Dear Current and Newly Elected CGS Officers:
(or Dear previous nominees for the President's Council on Women's Issues:)

The Student Cohort work group of the President's Council on Women's Issues invites your feedback on the role and involvement of students serving on the council.

The President's Council on Women's Issues was formed in 2001 to serve as an advisory group to the President and Provost on issues related to the life and work of women faculty, staff, and students at The Ohio State University. For your information, the Council mission is attached along with a list of current work groups.

The Student Cohort work group has been charged with investigating the role, nomination process for the council's student candidates, and their perception, role and value received by their service on the committee.

Your feedback is requested in the form of e-mail responses to the questions below, and/ or by attending a focus group session Monday, May 24, from 3 - 5 p.m. at the Multicultural Center on the fourth floor of the Ohio Union. Refreshments will be provided.

Your participation in this inquiry also will assist the council in acquiring nominations of interested student candidates for its 2004-05 academic year, as we will solicit your recommendations for candidates. Both men and women of all college levels (undergraduate, graduate and professional) are encouraged to apply.

Please forward your responses to the following questions, or R.S.V.P. to attend the focus group session by noon Friday, May 21. We look forward to your contribution.

Thank you ,
Student Cohort Workgroup Members:
Jeri Kozobarich
Sarah Brackmann
Rebecca Nelson
Joni Bentz Seal
Anindita Sunder
Jeanie Tao

Current and newly elected CGS officer questions:

- Have you heard of the President's Council on Women's Issues prior to this e-mail? (If so, where?)
2. Do you feel there are areas of women's or diversity advancement at Ohio State that, as a member of the President's Council, you or a representative from your group could influence? If so, what are they?
3. What would be some of the immediate and long-term results you would expect from student service on this council?
4. *What would you like to see as the student-representative role on such a council, especially one that is supported by the president of Ohio State and is in existence to advise her on policy change and guide initiatives and advancement of women and other diverse groups at Ohio State?*

Previous student nominee questions:

1. How/Where did you heard of the President's Council on Women's Issues?
2. *Why were you interested in joining?*
3. What do you perceive as the purpose of the council?
4. What role were you expecting to play as a member of the council? (In other words, what were you hoping to gain from your service?)

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES:

Student leader questions:

1. Have you heard of the President's Council on Women's Issues prior to this e-mail? (If so, where?)

- No
- No, I have not heard of the President's Council on Women's Issues before the email
- I have heard of this in passing from others

2. Do you feel there are areas of women's or diversity advancement at Ohio State that, as a member of the President's Council, you or a representative from your group could influence? If so, what are they?

- I think the main area would be acceptance and sensitivity to women in professions that were formerly dominated by males esp. health fields like medicine, dentistry, optometry, etc. (This comment coming from a prof. student of course!)
- I am not sure of what types of groups could be influenced
- I think that it's important to put more of a focus on retaining women (especially Asian women) faculty as that has been a real issue in some departments in the past. I think additionally, I student member would have some good insight on the recent sexual assault issues happening at OSU...not sure if the council considers this issue, though

3. What would be some of the immediate and long-term results you would expect from student service on this council?

- Possible forums, meetings given to faculty/staff on this issue. Long term wise I would expect education to all OSU'ers about these issues
- I am very unfamiliar to the program or as to how I was placed on the Council
- Short-term: Better connection and input into women's issues at Ohio State. In the long-term, eliminating inequality for women students, faculty, and staff

4. What would you like to see as the student-representative role on such a council, especially one that is supported by the president of Ohio State and is in existence to advise her on policy change and guide initiatives and advancement of women and other diverse groups at Ohio State?

- I would like to see a study, ratios, stats, etc. done on the percentage of women in 'positions' here at OSU compared to other universities. I would also like to see the effects a high/low percentage has on other aspects of those departments or grouping
- I do not know. I would like more information about this council. I am unaware if I missed a previous explanatory email
- I'm not sure what this question is getting at? I suppose in general, I'd like to see a student-rep be treated just as any other rep. on the council

Previous student nominee questions:

1. How/Where did you hear about the President's Council on Women's Issues?

- I learned of the council via the OSU main website
- Internet
- I probably heard about the President's Council on Women's Issues through OSU Today, OSUWeekly, and possibly visits to the website of Women's Student Services
- I heard about the council from an email circulated in our department asking for nominations for participants for 2004

2. Why were you interested in joining?

- I am interested in increasing awareness of women's issues and enhancing strength and confidence in the voice and opinions of women who are in graduate level positions at OSU
- I was interested in serving the university, and I was quite disappointed when I never heard from my application to the position for a whole year. Now I have moved on and have taken an assistant professor position with another university. It is a shame that I could not serve OSU when I was interested
- Although definitely interested in joining, I am unaware of how I communicated this to you (maybe not so surprising given that my generals begin next week). I am interested in joining for several reasons. My Ph.D. will be in Education, Policy & Leadership with an emphasis in Higher Education. My cognate area is gender and higher education, and therefore my interests lies with the intersection of gender, race (and other issues) with a woman's identity and her educational experiences. I am concerned about data trends in the academy: although women students equal (or are greater than 50%) of degree recipients, women are not as well represented in the faculty ranks (tenure-track) and senior level administrative positions. I am particularly interested in giving voice to OSU women students as well as staff and faculty
- I was interested because I am involved with GWIS here at OSU (graduate women in science) and I think that it would have given me a good opportunity to contribute to the council as well as learn about new ideas and opportunities for GWIS

3. What do you perceive as the purpose of the council?

- To establish a forum for women of all positions at OSU to discuss challenges and issues women face on campus and to create learning opportunities to cope with these challenges
- Help the president to get perception from a variety of people
- I perceive the Council's role as a vehicle to inform the President (as well as the University Community) to the needs of women on OSU's campus. This includes giving voice to women who usually are not heard. The Council may do this through both qualitative and quantitative research studies & investigations
- Perhaps dealing with university wide issues for women, such as discrimination, increasing participation in specific disciplines, outreach to middle and high school students, and providing public outreach programs for the university community

4. What role were you expecting to play as a member of the council? (In other words, what were you hoping to gain from your service?)

- I was hoping to gain insight into how women of all races and of all leadership roles on campus are dealing with workplace challenges and was hoping to share my challenges and successes as a graduate student on campus; I was hoping to gain the experience of formulating and implementing programs on campus which support and promote women's achievements
- Help the president to see the female graduate students perception of the university
- If chosen to serve on the President's Advisory Council on Women's Issues, I hope to gain several things. First, I would seek to improve conditions and lived experiences for women of all races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, religions, socioeconomic statuses, (etc) who serve in numerous roles and capacities here at OSU. Second, I hope to contribute my knowledge as an OSU graduate student & G.A.A. along with my research interests of women in higher education to this role. Lastly, I hope to collaborate with a new community of individuals who share a common purpose of seeking to better the lives of OSU's women students, faculty, and staff
- I was hoping to share ideas and meet other participants, perhaps to network and to contribute to the projects initiated by the council

Focus Group on the role of students for the President's Council

Background

The President's Council on Women's Issues was implemented by President Kirwan in 2000. The plan for the Council was based on the recommendations of campus leaders and included student members. During the first three years of the Council, student participation varied and there was limited satisfaction with the established role of students on the Council. For the 2003/4 Council, unfilled student positions remained and the Council formed a work group to determine the most effective role for students on the Council. Data to determine the most effective role is informed by two sources: data available from Student Affairs on gender issues related to women students and feedback from student leaders on the role of students on the Council.

Rich Hollingsworth and Mary Daniels have indicated that data concerning issues facing women students will be available from the most recent climate survey, however this has not been completely analyzed to date. Daniels and Hollingsworth also suggested that data on issues be collected from the administrators who work most closely with women students. Hollingsworth and Daniels provided a list and notified these administrators of the effort. As a result, on June 10, 2004 a group of student affairs administrators participated in a focus group hosted by The Women's Place and facilitated by Jan Allen. The goal of the focus group was to generate feedback on the issues of women students and the role of the Council to women student issues. A full expression of ideas around issues of women students was sought rather than consensus on issues.

Participants included Christine Ballengee-Morris, Director of the Multicultural Center; Chris Rideout, Psychologist and Director of Career Connection; Barbara Rich, Assistant Vice President and Outreach; Rebecca Nelson, Associate Director Multicultural Center; Anindita Sunder, Coordinator of Women's Student Services; Deb Schipper, Coordinator of Rape Education; Jennifer Klein, Associate Director, Housing and Food Service; Kerry Hodak, Graduate Administrative Associate; and Judy Fountain, Director of The Women's Place. Invited but unable to attend were Louise Douce, Director of the Counseling Center; Karen Kyle, Director of the Student Advocacy Center; Willa Young, Associate Director Multicultural Center; and Connie Boehm, Director of the Wellness Program.

Feedback from the focus group is listed below as recorded during the meeting.

What is the "value added role" of the Council related to students?

- Council represents a clear-cut place with leverage to identify and create policy
- Having one voice for all women at OSU eliminates faculty, staff, student demarcation
- Opportunity for faculty and staff to hear and act on issues of students
- Assures that issues of women students are connected to the office of the President

- Ability to focus on cross cutting issues that impact all women (ie: issues of safety)
- Applying a gender lens to issues that could impact women differentially (i.e.: changes in transportation routes)
- Focusing on data means that the Council can be a clearinghouse for and collector of data that assures a global assessment of the true experience of women students...
 - Expert gender analysis on data
 - Reference was made to the kind of analysis made on faculty women is a format that is respected and desired for students
 - Surface issues in the data could rise to policy issues
 - Policy and practice changes that need to happen in units when the demographic in a unit have shifted. What needs to be examined and what are the policy implications?
 - Showcase best practices related to women students

What are the policy issues facing women students?

- The lack of consistently examining institutional policies with a gender lens
- Sexual assault and implementation of policies associated with sexual assault
- Classroom climate
- Training and support regarding the management of classroom climate
- Grading policies and impact of gender on grades (i.e.: data from law school on blink grading)
- Grades – implications of OAA data regarding differential grading by course, faculty etc.
- Grades by residence hall
- Grade appeals
- Recruitment and retention of women in particular colleges
- Appropriate retention for success not just keeping women students but assuring their success
- Dual role of students and their needs (i.e.: women who are staff and students)
- HR policy regarding gender identify and gender expression impacts students who are working at OSU
- Computer lab policies
- Non-discrimination policy in student code
- Classroom climate changes following demographic changes – what happens when more women enter classes that were previously all male?

OSU Assistant Professor Retention Study

Our work this summer will take place over the course of two stages. The first stage will involve a post hoc descriptive analysis of the Women's Place Cohort Project. During this stage we will gather descriptive data about the effectiveness of the current cohort experience. Qualitative data will be gathered through interviews conducted with both members of the cohort and individuals who were invited to be a part of the cohort but chose not to take part. We will solicit information from these individuals with regard to their opinions and perspectives about the working climate here at OSU, the cohort project, and other issues related to retention. In addition, where possible, we will obtain and evaluate retrospective quantitative data for the purpose of gaining additional information regarding the potential effectiveness of the cohort project. The data gathered will be evaluated and summarized in a report.

The second stage will involve the preparation of a study designed to evaluate those factors that relate to retention and turnover within the assistant professor population here at OSU. While decisions regarding the actual sample of interest remain to be determined, the designed study will be future-focused targeting mainly new or current OSU assistant professors. The variables that contribute to these individuals' choices to stay or leave OSU will be of key interest. To that end, an extensive literature search will be completed to provide information into current theory and knowledge on the issues of retention and turnover. This information will be combined with the descriptive data gathered during the first stage to provide a basis for choosing to measure certain variables as important predictors. By using the information gathered from the current cohort we can be better assured that the design is complete and not deficient. The outcome of this stage will be the drafting of a research proposal that describes the purpose, approach, design, timeframe, and budget of the proposed study. This proposal would then be given to OAA for approval and implementation.

NSF ADVANCE Institutional Transformation Indicators

1. # and % of women faculty in science/engineering by department
2. # and % of women in tenure-line positions by rank and department
3. Tenure promotion outcomes by gender
4. Years in rank by gender
- 5a. Time at institution
- 5b. Attrition by gender
6. # of women in S&E who are in non-tenure-track positions (teaching & research)
7. # and % of women scientists and engineers in administrative positions
8. # of women S&E faculty in endowed/named chairs
9. # and % of women S&E faculty on promotion and tenure committees
10. Salary of S&E faculty by gender (controlling for department, rank, years in rank)
11. Space allocation of S&E faculty by gender (with additional controls such as dept., etc.)
12. Start-up packages of newly hired S&E faculty by gender
(with additional controls such as field/department, rank, etc.)

Sample Population and Patterns for an OSU Department

Current Faculty Population (date):

- # assistant professors (#M - #F)
- # associate professors (#M - #F)
- # full professors (#M – #F)
- There are no minority faculty members

Historical Patterns:

- No female has ever been promoted to the rank of full professor (% of all males have)
- No female had ever been hired above the rank of assistant professor (% of males have)
- No minority faculty member has ever received tenure
- Males have earned tenure at a faster pace and more frequently than their female counterparts
- All females who terminated their position left prior to tenure – % of the males who terminated their position left prior to tenure

Recent Patterns (July 1997 – March 2003):

- # faculty members (both male) have received promotions, both to full professor
- # faculty members have been hired – all at the rank of assistant professor (# M – #F)
- Of the # assistant professors, # have terminated prior to tenure (#M – #F)

Future State if Current Patterns Persist:

- The proportion of women that historically have earned tenure will worsen
- Younger tenured faculty will not be available to replace faculty who are eligible to retire within 5-10 years

Areas to Focus:

- Current Assistant Professors being considered for tenure (# M – #F)
- Current Associate Professors potentially ready to be promoted to full professor (# M – #F)
- # Assistant Professors, all female, to be considered for promotion in 1 year
- Searches for new hires at the Associate and Full Professor ranks – should also consider diversity candidates