Appendix A

Steering Committee
National Advisory Board
Community Advisory Board
Campus Advisory Board
Steering Committee

Christine Cress
Project Director, Millennium Project
Department of Educational Policy, Foundations, and Administrative Studies/
Postsecondary, Adult, and Continuing Education
Portland State University

Myra Dinnerstein
Co-Chair, Millennium Project
Immediate Past Chair, Commission on the Status of Women
Department of Women’s Studies

Naomi Miller
Co-Chair, Millennium Project
Past President, Association for Women Faculty
Department of English

Mary Poulton
Past Chair, Commission on the Status of Women
Department of Mining and Geological Engineering

Kari McBride
Past Chair, Equity Committee, Commission on the Status of Women
Department of Women’s Studies

Jeni Hart
Graduate Associate, Millennium Project
Center for the Study of Higher Education
National Advisory Board

Helen Astin
Associate Director, Higher Education Research Institute
University of California Los Angeles

Carol Hollenshead
Director, Center for the Education of Women
University of Michigan

Laura Rendon
Veffie Milstead Jones Endowed Chair
Department of Educational Psychology, Administration, and Counseling
California State University, Long Beach

Donna Shavlik
Senior Fellow, American Council on Education

John Slaughter
President/CEO, National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering

Laurel Wilkening
Former Chancellor, University of California, Irvine
Community Advisory Board

Esther Capin
Chair, Udall Center for Public Policies Studies Board

Marty Cortez
Past President, University of Arizona Hispanic Alumni Club

Judy Gignac
Member, Arizona Board of Regents
Vice President, Bella Vista Water Company, Inc.

Margaret Houghton
Judge—Retired, Pima County Superior Court

John Schaefer
Past President, University of Arizona
President, Research Corporation

Noelia Vela
President, Pima County Community College-Downtown Campus

Laurel Wilkening
Former Chancellor, University of California, Irvine
Campus Advisory Board

Gail Burd
College of Science

Elizabeth Ervin
Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

Zelda Harris
Commission on the Status of Women
College of Law

Barbara Hoffman
Past Chair, Equity Committee, Commission on the Status of Women
Interim Associate Director, Center for Computing and Information Technology

Jerrold Hogle
Immediate Past Chair of the Faculty
Department of English

Kay Kavanagh
Associate Dean, College of Law

Jane Korn
Commission on the Status of Women
College of Law

Tsianina Lomawaima
Department of Native American Studies

Jacqueline Mok
Member, President’s Council on Diversity
Associate Dean, College of Fine Arts

Janie Nunez
Associate Vice President, Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action
Loaned Executive, Arizona Board of Regents

Patti Ota
Vice-President, Executive Operations & Senior Associate to the President

Diane Perreira
Co-Chair, Millennium Project, Phase 2
Chair, Commission on the Status of Women
Director, Strategic Alternative Learning Techniques (SALT) Center
Campus Advisory Board (continued)

Kathryn Reed
Chair, Generating Respect for All in a Climate of academic Excellence (GRACE) Project
College of Medicine

Valerie Reyna
Immediate Past President, Association for Women Faculty
College of Medicine

Eugene Sander
Vice Provost, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences

John Wilson
Director, Decision and Planning Support
Appendix B

Generating Respect for All in a Climate of academic Excellence (GRACE) Project Summary of Results and Preliminary Solutions
The GRACE Project of the UA College of Medicine: Summary of Results and Preliminary Solutions

The GRACE Project (Generating Respect for All in a Climate of academic Excellence) was designed to investigate causes of the disparity between women and men faculty in the College of Medicine (COM) in track assignment, promotion to higher ranks, and leadership positions. The project was conducted by the Dean’s Committee on Women Faculty, which was composed of men and women faculty from all COM departments. The COM administration provided access to personnel data and funding for a part-time research assistant.

Methods

Three approaches were utilized to test a series of hypotheses.

- Data regarding rank and salary were obtained from the Appointed Personnel database to provide quantitative information about the status of women faculty at the College of Medicine. Data were obtained for FY 1999-2000 on the 413 faculty in the COM who were ≥50% time on the tenure, clinical suffix or research track and assistant, associate, and full professors located in Tucson. Comparisons between salaries of women and men faculty were adjusted for rank, years at that rank, track, degree, “specialty,” whether section or department head, and, on a subset, publications and clinical revenues.

- Faculty members were surveyed \( n=198 \) using an on-line, structured questionnaire to identify demographic factors, behaviors, attitudes and experiences that foster productivity, advancement and leadership in the COM.

- Ethnographic interviews were conducted with a representative sample of men and women at the COM \( n=54 \). Topics included reasons behind career choices and personal definitions of success, advice received, promotion experiences, leadership opportunities, interaction with department leaders, and treatment.

Results have been presented to and discussed with the COM dean, the faculty and the University administration.

Results (of rank/salary and survey analyses)

I. Salary and Resources

Hypothesis 1: Women faculty in the College of Medicine are paid equally and have equal access to resources.

The Facts: Salary
• The average salary for women was 89% of the average salary for men, after adjusting for rank, track, degree, specialty, etc. as described above.
• Adjusted average salary was $14,000 less for women than men in clinical departments, and $7,000 less in basic science departments.
• The salary differential increased with rank, from $9,600 for assistant professors to $30,300 for full professors in clinical departments, and from $7,500 for assistant to $24,000 for full professors in basic science departments.
• The gender difference in salary existed for virtually all departments.

The Facts: Resources

• There were no gender differences (either overall or when adjusted for rank) in perceived difficulty of obtaining secretarial or technical support, operating resources, or office space.
• However, women full professors were significantly more likely to share research space with other faculty (women - 73%, men - 40%; p < .05)

II. Gender Differences in Rank and Track

Hypothesis 2a: The distribution of women in the COM reflects the “pool” of available women.

The Facts: Rank and Track Assignment

• The percent women in the COM declined with rank, from 45% of assistant professors to 25% of associate professors, and 14% of full professors.
• Women were also less represented on the tenure track. They were 45% of the research faculty, 39% of the clinical faculty, and 26% of faculty on the tenure track.
• The majority of men (55%) were promoted, tenured associate or full professors, while only 22% of women in the COM had this distinction.
• The lack of women at higher ranks and on the tenure track could not be explained by the “pipeline effect” since 27% of assistant professors nationwide in 1989 were women, while only 22% of associate and 11% of full professors at the COM were women, ten years later.

Hypothesis 2b: There are fewer women at more advanced ranks because they are less committed to their careers (and therefore less productive) than are men.
The Facts: Career Commitment and Productivity

- There were no reported differences between women and men in 1) importance of career advancement; 2) importance of balancing work with personal life; 3) extent to which work and personal life conflict; or 4) desire to work part-time (among full time faculty).
- There were also no significant gender differences in the self-reported number of publications when adjusting for rank and track (mean peer-reviewed publications: 37 women, 46 for men; \(p=.25\)).

The Facts: Promotion

- Despite the lack of gender differences in productivity or reported commitment, the time to promotion to associate professor tended to be greater for women than men (6.0 years vs. 5.1 years, \(p<.10\)), after adjusting for track and publications.
- Women on the tenure track were more likely to have considered changing tracks (46% vs. 9%, \(p<.00001\)), but were no more likely to delay the tenure clock.

III.  Leadership Skills and Opportunities

Hypothesis 3: Women don’t have the “right stuff” to be leaders.

The Facts: Leadership Potential

There were no significant gender differences in:

- Aspiration to a leadership position (women - 61%, men - 57%).
- Importance of having a leadership position (1-5 scale, 5 as “very important”: women - 3.0, men - 3.3).
- Perception that they had the qualities of a good leader (women - 91%, men - 95%).
- Willingness to take on time consuming tasks (1-6 scale, 6 as “very willing”: women - 4.33, men - 4.55).
- Perception of being undermined in a leadership role (women - 42%, men - 44%).

The Facts: Leadership Opportunity

However, women were significantly less likely to be asked to serve as a:

- Committee chair (women - 48%, men - 68%; \(p<.006\)).
- Section or division head (women - 12%, men - 45%; \(p<.00001\)).
- Department head (women - 6%, men - 26%; \(p<.0007\)).
- Comparisons for section and department head were statistically significant when analyses were limited to associate and full professors.
The Facts: Leadership Experience

- Women felt significantly less effective in influencing departmental decisions (1-6 scale, 6 as “very effective”: women - 3.6, men - 4.2, p<.01).
- Women were less likely to have decision-making authority over promotion of colleagues (women - 27%, men - 48%; p<.005) or over allocation of resources (women - 22%, men - 47%; p<.0006).
- Women were less likely to offer advice to the department chair (1-5 scale, 5 as “always”: women - 2.7, men - 3.2, p<.001).
- Gender differences in decision making authority and advice to the chair remained significant when analyses were limited to associate and full professors.

IV. Gender Discrimination

Hypothesis 4a: Women and men are treated equally by colleagues and supervisors.

The Facts: Differential Treatment by Colleagues and Supervisors

- There were no gender differences in frequency of 1) colleagues/supervisors questioning one’s expertise or authority; 2) being criticized by colleagues or supervisors on appearance or style of communication, or 3) respectful treatment by staff.
- Nevertheless, women were less likely to feel like they “fit in” (women - 72%, men - 85%, p<.03).
- Women were significantly less likely to feel they were given appropriate credit for their work (1-6 scale, 6 as “always”: women - 4.2, men - 4.5; p<.06).
- Women were significantly more likely to report that safety concerns had deterred them from working at certain times (women - 10.1%, men - 1.6%; p<.01), or in certain places (women - 11.6%, men - 4.7%; p<.07).

Hypothesis 4a: There is little discrimination in the College of Medicine, but when it occurs, the system responds effectively.

The Facts: Differential Treatment by Department and College

- Women were significantly more likely to state that their department treated men and women differently, either somewhat or to a great extent (women - 54%, men - 21%; p<.00001).
- Women were significantly more likely to report they had been discriminated against (women - 32%, men - 5%; p<.00001).
- More women than men felt that the COM responds inappropriately to charges of discrimination (women - 68%, men - 15%, p<.00001).
Summary of Problems/Preliminary Solutions

Some proposed solutions to the problems identified through the GRACE Project follow. It is anticipated that there will be an Advisory Council of Women Faculty that will oversee the collection, analysis and reporting of data and the implementation of solutions. Accountability for improvement in the status of women faculty will reside with the department heads and deans. Rewards, in the form of additional discretionary funds, faculty lines and research support for faculty, will be apportioned to those deans and department heads that demonstrate significant progress in the equitable support, promotion, and retention of women faculty, and the advancement of women leaders.

I. **Salary and Resources**: Women are less likely than men to receive the rewards of the system, such as salary or research space.
   - Track and report salary by gender, with funds from the administration.
   - Track and report resources provided to faculty members, including space and start-up packages, by gender.
   - Rectify differences in salary, space and support for women faculty.

II. **Rank and Track**: Women are underrepresented at higher ranks and on the tenure track, despite the lack of differences in commitment or productivity.
   - Monitor and report gender differences in distribution of faculty by rank and track.
   - Track gender differences in recruitment and retention of faculty.
   - Collect exit interview data on all COM faculty.
   - Create a structure for appropriate, effective mentoring of faculty.

III. **Leadership**: Women are interested in, and capable of taking on leadership positions, but are rarely given the opportunity.
   - Track and report gender distribution of leadership appointments within departments and colleges of the Arizona Health Sciences Center.
   - Educate search committees for leadership positions about subtle discrimination.
   - Train existing leaders in alternate leadership styles.
   - Foster leadership development in all faculty.

IV. **Gender Discrimination**: Discrimination against women faculty is common, and few feel the COM adequately addresses discrimination.
   - Educate leadership and faculty about subtle discrimination.
   - Research perceptions of discrimination and the institutional handling of discrimination among women and men faculty.
   - Address issues of life/work balance to enhance the working environment for all.
   - Facilitate peer-peer and faculty-leadership interaction to identify creative solutions to the issue of discrimination (Promote Equity Awareness and Climate Enhancement, PEACE).
Conclusion

The GRACE Project has documented substantial differences in the treatment of men and women faculty in the College of Medicine. Current objectives are to 1) continue with analysis of the data collected, particularly the ethnographic interviews with faculty and department chairs, and 2) continue to meet with faculty and administration to identify additional strategies for solving the problems identified. The ultimate goal of the project is to achieve parity for women and men faculty in an environment of academic excellence.
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List of Focus Groups
Focus Group Dates
Focus Codebook
Discussion Group Schedule
Focus Groups

Academic Cluster Focus Groups -- (Women Only)

- Engineering and Physical Sciences
- Biological Sciences and Agricultural Sciences
- Social Sciences and Education
- Humanities, Arts, Architecture and Arizona international
- Law and Business
- Health Professions--Medicine, Pharmacy, Nursing

Academic Rank Focus Groups --(Men Only Groups and Women Only Groups for each)

- Full Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Lecturer, Non-Tenure Track

Race/Ethnicity Groups

- Women of Color
- Men of Color

Mixed Gender Groups

- Mixed Gender Focus Group
- Mixed Gender Group in Executive Decision Technology Lab
Focus Group Dates

Male Associate Professor Focus Group
Monday, April 10, 2000
Anthony Antonio, Facilitator

Men of Color Focus Group
Monday, April 10, 2000
Anthony Antonio, Facilitator

Male Assistant Professor Focus Group
Tuesday, April 11, 2000
Anthony Antonio, Facilitator

Male Non-Tenure Track Faculty Focus Group
Tuesday, April 11, 2000
Anthony Antonio, Facilitator

Engineering and Physical Sciences Female Faculty Focus Group
Thursday, April 13, 2000
Christine Cress, Facilitator

Bio Sciences and Agriculture Female Faculty Focus Group
Thursday, April 13, 2000
Christine Cress, Facilitator

Women of Color Focus Group
Thursday, April 13, 2000
JoAnne LaGasse-Long, Facilitator

Humanities, Arts, Architecture, AIC Female Faculty Focus Group
Friday, April 14, 2000
Christine Cress, Facilitator

Law and Business Female Faculty Focus Group
Wednesday, April 19, 2000
Christine Cress, Facilitator

Health Professions Female Faculty Focus Group
Thursday, April 20, 2000
Christine Cress, Facilitator

Female Full Professor Focus Group
Thursday, April 20, 2000
Christine Cress, Facilitator

Female Associate Professor Focus Group
Friday, April 21, 2000
Christine Cress, Facilitator

Social Sciences and Education Female Faculty Focus Group
Friday, April 21, 2000
Christine Cress, Facilitator

Female Assistant Professor Focus Group
Wednesday, May 3, 2000
Christine Cress, Facilitator

Male Full Professor Focus Group
Thursday, May 4, 2000
Robert Wrenn, Facilitator

Non-Tenure Track Female Faculty Focus Group
Thursday, May 4, 2000
Christine Cress, Facilitator

Mixed Gender Faculty Focus Group
Thursday, May 4, 2000
Christine Cress, Facilitator

Executive Decision Lab Mixed Gender Faculty Focus Group
Friday, May 5, 2000
Jeni Hart, Facilitator
Random Sample Information

Sample Groups:
Each number identifies one of the 16 different samples that were selected with forty individuals in each group. A description of the sixteen groups follows.

1- ETHNICITY GROUPS (2 groups)
  1.1- Women of color  SMPLGRP=1  40 selected out of 117
  1.2- Men of color  SMPLGRP=2  40 selected out of 236

2- ACADEMIC CLUSTER GROUPS (6 groups of females only)
  2.1- Engineering and physical sciences  SMPLGRP=3  40 selected out of 68
  2.2- Biological sciences and agriculture  SMPLGRP=4  40 selected out of 112
  2.3- Social sciences and education  SMPLGRP=5  40 selected out of 188
  2.4- Humanities, arts, architecture & AIC  SMPLGRP=6  40 selected out of 193
  2.5- Law and business  SMPLGRP=7  40 selected out of 52
  2.6- Health professions  SMPLGRP=8  40 selected out of 212

3- ACADEMIC RANK GROUPS (4 female groups and 4 male groups)
  3.1- Female full professor  SMPLGRP=9  40 selected out of 85
  3.2- Female associate professor  SMPLGRP=10  40 selected out of 122
  3.3- Female assistant professor  SMPLGRP=11  40 selected out of 145
  3.4- Female non tenure track (C/CE)  SMPLGRP=12  40 selected out of 233
  3.5- Male full professor  SMPLGRP=13  40 selected out of 691
  3.6- Male associate professor  SMPLGRP=14  40 selected out of 343
  3.7- Male assistant professor  SMPLGRP=15  40 selected out of 285
  3.8- Male non tenure track (C/CE)  SMPLGRP=16  40 selected out of 349

There is a total of 640 observations corresponding to the 80 selected in the 2 ethnicity groups, the 240 selected in the 6 academic cluster groups and the 320 selected from the 8 academic rank groups.

Sample Information:
- First name
- Last name
- Department name
- Building name
- Room number
- Campus mail address
- Department address
- Department city
- Department state
- Department ZIP code
- Office phone number
- Area code
- Department phone number
Discussion Group Schedule

*Humanities Women Faculty*
March 29, 2000 and May 3, 2000

*Women in Science*
April 3, 2000

*Association for Women Faculty*
April 12, 2000

*College of Education Women*
April 13, 2000

*Women’s Studies Affiliate Faculty*
April 18, 2000

*Commission on the Status of Women Faculty*
April 20, 2000

*Appointed Personnel Organization*
April 24, 2000

*Women of Color*
April 25, 2000

*Women in Business*
May 2, 2000

*Faculty Senate*
May 5, 2000

*Women in Academic Medicine*
May 25, 2000

*Faculty with Disabilities*
October 4, 2000

*Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Faculty*
October 5, 2000

*Administrative Groups*
*CAAC (Associate Deans)*
April 18, 2000

*Academic Deans Council*
April 24, 2000

*President’s Council*
May 8, 2000

*Heads Up (Department Heads)*
May 8, 2000