Building Academic Excellence through Gender Equity

Joan C. Williams and Donna L. Norton

Melanie was on the fast track—a Ph.D. in biochemistry and molecular biology, and a postdoc at the National Institute of Health. Then she had children.

> For a while, I tried to work with my first child, but with my commute, I only was able to spend about an hour a day with her. And after paying for childcare, I was barely making any money. I watched the hours that my advisor spent at work and knew I couldn't put in those kinds of hours because childrearing was largely up to me. I decided that I had to quit my job. Now I've been home for 5 years and have three children. I'm frustrated because I put in all those years and money into getting a Ph.D. and doing a post-doc—for nothing.[1]

Melanie's story is not uncommon. Though women have fully embraced the challenge of higher education and now receive about half of the Ph.D.s awarded to U.S. citizens, many of these women have brief careers in the academy. In 1920, women comprised only 26 percent of full-time faculty. Today, a full 75 years later, this percentage had grown to only 31 percent.[2] At this rate, it will take only 173 years to reach parity. Mary Ann Mason, in her 2007 book, *Mothers on the Fast Track*, reports that at UC Berkeley women received 46 percent of last spring's doctorates but constituted only 26 percent of the new faculty hires.[3] The low percentage of tenured women is not due to a deficit of women in the pipeline. Rather, the problem is that women are leaking out of the pipeline.[4]

This article documents first how "churn and burn" practices in academia squander increasingly scarce resources, and outlines emerging best practices to prevent those losses. Given current demographic trends, colleges and universi-

ties cannot afford to sideline half the talent pool if they want to maintain their standards of excellence during the upcoming changing of the guard in academe. Currently, 50.5 percent of tenured faculty members are at least 55 years old.[5] This means that about half of the current tenured faculty will be headed toward retirement in the next 10 to 15 years. This will create a strong demand for new faculty, providing a historic opportunity to address the underrepresentation of women in the academy.

Promoting Gender Equity Can Conserve Resources

As any higher education administrator knows, the need to increase resources has emerged as a major challenge for colleges and universities. In the 30 years between 1970 and 2000, the weighted average of institutional expenditures on research per faculty more than tripled.[6] At the same time, state support for higher education has been declining. In FY 2002 and FY 2003, California's education funding shrank by 9.6 percent. During the same period, Colorado's funding was cut by 21.8 percent and Massachusetts' by 23 percent.[7] Despite the recent economic gains of the past few years, all states face potential deficits that will limit the funding of higher education through at least the year 2013.[8] In light of this stark fiscal reality, colleges and universities must take proactive efforts to retain women faculty in order to stay on top and gain the competitive edge.

The High Costs of Attrition

A 2002 survey of over 200 public and private research universities found that the average start-up costs for assistant professors at private Research I universities in physics/astronomy, biology, chemistry, and engineering ranged between $390,237 and $489,000. For senior faculty members, the average start-up costs varied from about $700,000 in physics to about $1,442,000 in engineering.[9] Even a start-up package for an assistant professor of psychology at a public university averages $47,000.[10]

The loss of faculty also can create a substantial secondary cost in lost research grant support. Ronda Roberts Callister, an associate professor at the Department of Management and Human Resources at Utah State University, reports that "it can take ten years for a new faculty member in science or engineering to develop enough of a positive revenue stream from grants to recoup start-up costs. If a faculty member leaves before start-up costs are recovered, the university loses money. [And] must start over again."[11]

Time Lost by Search Committee Members

Any senior faculty member can tally up the many hours of productive research they have lost because of the need to recruit, interview, and mentor new faculty. One dean estimated that, over the life of a search, she spends a full two weeks of her time on reviewing applications, leading search meetings, hosting candidates, and talking with them prior to and after the visit. She also estimated that the average search committee member at her institution spends 25 to 40 hours reviewing applications, attending search meetings, and meeting with candidates.[12] Given that there are often multiple searches being conducted in departments, these searches represent an enormous drain on faculty time.

A Limited Talent Pool

Another academic added that many of the costs associated with loss of faculty are hard to quantify:

> Last year we lost 4 female faculty members, … 1 in history, 2 in Engineering and 1 in Physics. All were excellent performers. Given the fact that women in engineering and physics are especially hard to come by, it was a blow. … I am equally as concerned about the costs we may not be able to estimate. For instance, how many female students lost their role models/mentors when these [female] faculty left? How many potential students chose not to come to my University because we had no female faculty in their disciplines? I don't know how to estimate those costs.[13]

Indeed, the costs of failing to recruit the best faculty are difficult to quantify. But it is clear that without programs and policies to retain women faculty, colleges and universities will fail to achieve their highest potential. As Chancellor Blumenthal at the University of California, Santa Cruz, emphasized, "It is essential to put in place programs to retain women in order to achieve a diverse faculty. If you don't have a department that appeals to women, you will limit your talent pool and may end up with a lesser candidate."[14] Together, the quantifiable and nonquantifiable costs of turnover are too great to ignore.

Failing to Retain Women Is a Risk-Management Issue

Employment discrimination claims are more common than sexual harassment claims in academia. In a survey of 500 colleges and universities, researchers

found that the single greatest and fastest-growing cause of employment claims was employment discrimination—equal to 51 percent of all claims in 1997. This was five times greater than the number of wrongful termination claims and six times greater than the number of sexual harassment claims.[15]

A sobering fact is that employment discrimination also can impose large costs on employers. In 1997, the average costs to settle the 73 percent of employment discrimination claims that did not go to court was $110,000 per claim for public institutions and $175,000 per claim for private institutions.[16] The costs of settlement are only one cost associated with discrimination suits. Negative media may affect the institution's ability to recruit faculty, students, and donors. Also, members of the faculty may spend large amounts of time in litigation, taking away time from research and teaching.[17]

Promising Practices to Promote Gender Equity

The costs of doing nothing to counter the bias and barriers faced by women in academia are too high to ignore. Though this article focuses primarily on discrimination as it relates to family practices and gender bias, we cannot overlook the other forms of discrimination women may experience in academe. Discrimination still occurs around the issues of race, ethnicity, tenure, and discipline for many women and must be addressed. Fortunately, many institutions of higher learning have begun to develop promising practices to recruit, retain, and advance women faculty. The following discussion outlines some the key promising practices that must be part of any institution's efforts to promote gender equity.

Treat Pregnancy Leave the Same as Other Kinds of Disability Leave

If an employer offers disability leave for any purpose, it also must offer disability leave for maternity. Maternity leave is generally six weeks of leave, based on the American College of Obstetricians' guideline for medical recovery from a normal delivery.[18] One common mistake is to provide pregnancy disability leave on terms less generous than for other kinds of medical leave.[19] In a recent survey of 100 U.S. colleges' and universities' maternity and childrearing leave policies for faculty, over one-third of the respondents had policies that either did not comply with state and federal laws or were highly likely not to comply in their implementation.[20] For example, in one law school, female faculty were forced to choose between getting course release or getting paid disability leave

for delivery. It is illegal under the Pregnancy Discrimination Act to condition a leave upon giving up some other benefit. Similarly, under the Family and Medical Leave Act, it is illegal to discourage or penalize someone for taking leave to which they are entitled.

Design Parental Leave Policies Based on Gender Roles, Not Biological Sex

Parental leave needs to be available to both mothers and fathers. The key is to link the leave with the relevant activity—being a caregiver—instead of linking it to biological sex. That means that anyone who is a primary caregiver should be entitled to parental leave. One type of paid parental leave is "active service/modified duties," or reduced teaching policies. Under this policy, faculty members are provided with full or partial relief from teaching with no pay cut. This is important because not all new parents want to stop the clock, but most do want relief from teaching.[21] "I believe reducing the workload is much more promising than stopping the clock," said Robert Drago, professor of labor and women's studies at Pennsylvania State University. "I've never seen anyone turned down for tenure because they've done less teaching. But less research will get you turned down every time."[22]

One frequent complaint about these policies is that they do not link leave with caregiving responsibilities, but rather make parental leave available to anyone who has had a child, regardless of whether the parent is engaged in caregiving. "One of my male colleagues whose wife gave birth on a Tuesday was back in the office at 8 a.m. on Wednesday. He took full advantage of the reduced teaching and stop the clock policy at my university while continuing his regular work schedule. He's now tenured and I'm not," said a former assistant professor at an Ivy League university and a mother of two.[23]

While some men are actively engaged in family care, and should be eligible for parental leave when they are, women often still do more than their fair share. A 1991 study by Biernat and Wortman questioned women who primarily work in academia and corporations. They found that the women carried out more of all the child care tasks than their spouses, except for playing with the children.[24] A survey by the UC Berkeley Family Friendly Edge found that women faculty ages 30 to 50 with children report spending over 15 hours a week more on caregiving activities than their male colleagues with children.[25] Given these gender

inequities, stop-the-clock and modified duties policies that do not require faculty to certify that they are providing at least 20 hours a week of child care during normal working hours can further disadvantage women.

Stanford University is one example of a research institution that has adopted a Reduced Teaching and Clinical Duties policy that allows faculty to remain on full salary with reduced teaching duties. To avoid abuse of the policy, faculty are only eligible if they are the sole caregiver for at least 20 hours during the work-week between 8 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Friday.[26] Similarly, Harvard Law School has adopted a policy that provides paid leave to any faculty member who is "the sole caretaker of his or her newborn or newly adopted child at least 20 hours per week, from Monday through Friday, between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. The applicant for the leave must assert that he or she will be the "sole caregiver" for the requisite period.[27] This kind of policy is not based on biological sex, but rather on gender—namely on the traditionally feminine gender role of being a caregiver. Under this policy, both mothers and fathers can bond with their newborn or newly adopted child.

Preventing Discrimination against Caregivers

"I was [told] by my department chair, as untenured faculty, actually using the stopped tenure clock or leave would be held against me. I was back teaching a day after getting out of the hospital."—Female faculty member[28]

Stop-the-clock policies are another common way that colleges and universities help professors manage work and family conflicts. In theory, these policies allow assistant professors to "stop the tenure clock" to care for a newborn or young child without having to worry that it will undermine their tenure reviews. However, in reality, these policies tend to be underutilized because many faculty fear the consequences of actually using the policies. Almost all these policies require that the faculty member proactively make a request to stop the clock. A 2002 national survey of over 4,000 faculty members revealed that 33 percent of faculty who were parents—mothers and fathers—did not ask for parental leave, and just less than 20 percent did not ask to stop the tenure clock, even though they thought they would have benefited from doing so.[29]

Unfortunately, this fear is not unfounded. Family responsibilities discrimination occurs most commonly when women hit the "maternal wall," a term that refers

to biases that penalize women for being mothers. These biases in academe usually are triggered when a woman becomes pregnant or seeks a maternity leave.[30] For example, Lisa Arkin, the plaintiff in a discrimination lawsuit against her university, was an assistant professor at the University of Oregon who took maternity leave and delayed her tenure review according to university policies. Despite unanimous recommendation from her tenure committee and endorsement from the dean, she was refused tenure upon her return. The provost of the University of Oregon allegedly told another professor that the mother's decision to "stop the clock" was a "red flag," and the department chair wrote in a memo that Arkin "knew as the mother of two infants, she had responsibilities that were incompatible with those of a full-time academician".[31] Arkin's suit resulted in a reported tentative settlement of $495,000.[32]

When stop-the-clock and other policies such as family leave rely on faculty to "opt in" to the policies rather than opt out of them, it leaves mothers and fathers in the uncomfortable position of negotiating with chairs about eligibility to utilize the policies. One faculty member at the University of Washington recounted her experience of requesting to use a family accommodation policy: "I felt like it was sort of a negotiation discussion the whole time, it wasn't automatic." Another faculty member said that she felt she had to accept a lower start-up package in exchange for using the part-time tenure option. "That, I just decided, was part of the price of what I was paying."[33]

One way to lessen the stigma of stop-the-clock policies is to make them trigger automatically, so faculty have to opt out of them if they do not want to stop the tenure clock when an eligible event, like having a child, occurs. At MIT, women who give birth are automatically granted a tenure-clock extension. The policy states:

> In recognition of the effects that pregnancy and childbirth can have on a woman's ability to perform all the tasks necessary and expected to achieve tenure, a woman who bears one or more children during her tenure probationary period will have that period extended by one year. As in all tenure cases, a tenure review can take place prior to the end of the probationary period and that possibility should be assessed annually.[34]

Thus, the MIT policy allows for flexibility if the qualifying employee does not want to extend the tenure clock. Similarly, Vanderbilt University has a comprehensive parental leave policy that provides for an automatic one-year extension of the tenure clock when a faculty member gives birth or adopts a child.[35]

Clearly Communicate Policies to Internal and External Reviewers

Unfortunately, there are many stories of people who have stopped the tenure clock, only to encounter outside reviewers who ignore this fact. This does not just undermine the stop-the-clock program; it also is unwise from a legal perspective because it misleads the job candidate. One faculty member reports, "I was told by my department chair, as untenured faculty, actually using the stopped tenure clock or leave would be held against me."[36] Another academic reports, "All the maternity benefits were lumped under the same heading by the chair as 'unfair advantage.' I saw two other women with young children get punished on reviews for not getting enough published even though they 'had time off and had more time to write.' I wasn't going to risk it."[37]

Because uninformed departmental chairs can undermine even the best policies, department heads need to be trained how to implement policies, including how to clearly communicate to outside reviewers that failure to use the proper standards could lead to legal problems for the college or university.[38] Inside and outside reviewers should be informed that, when a candidate has stopped the clock, the appropriate evaluation of the candidate should not be based on years from the Ph.D., but instead should tally only the countable time. To protect against discrimination, some universities have adopted statements against discrimination. For example, The University of California's Policy on Family Accommodation and Personnel Reviews provides that:

> Academic appointees shall not be arbitrarily disadvantaged in their promotion, advancement or compensation because they have elected to take a childbearing or parental leave, to stop the clock, or to defer a personnel review. Personnel reviews that are deferred due to a family accommodation should be treated procedurally in the same manner as personnel reviews conducted at the usual intervals. The file shall be evaluated without prejudice at the usual intervals. The file shall be evaluated without prejudice as if the work were done in the normal

period of service and so stated in the department chair's or
unit head's letter.[39]

Stop-the-clock and fairly conceived and implemented family-leave polices
can help prevent gender discrimination in academia. However, to make these
policies fully effective, colleges and universities also must work to eliminate the
unexamined gender biases that are triggered when women become pregnant or
go on maternity leave.

Training for All Departmental Chairs on Gender Bias

*"I really felt by having a child I gave up a lot of respect I had worked very hard to
earn."*—Female professor, 2001[40]

Unexamined gender biases can affect the behavior of even well-meaning faculty
and administrators, and can penalize women in general, as well as mothers
and others with caregiving responsibilities.[41] The first type of bias is the famil-
iar "glass ceiling" bias that prevents successful women from reaching the top
rungs of their professions. Glass-ceiling biases follow two distinct patterns. The
first pattern is called leniency bias—when men, but not women, are given the
"benefit of the doubt."[42] While men are assumed to be competent as a group,
women's performance tends to be more closely scrutinized. In a national study,
238 academic psychologists evaluated a resume with a randomly assigned male
or female name. Both male and female participants gave the male applicant
better evaluations for teaching, research, and service experience and both were
more likely to hire the male applicant.[43] Similarly, a study conducted by the
Swedish Medical Research Council of ratings of postdoctoral fellowship candi-
dates found that female candidates had to be 2.5 times more productive than
male candidates to receive the same competence ratings from reviewers.[44]

The second type of glass-ceiling bias occurs when women are perceived as
competent, but are seen as lacking interpersonal skills when they fail to behave
in conventionally feminine ways. While assertiveness in men often is seen as evi-
dence of brilliance, similar behavior in women is viewed as aggressive or distaste-
ful.[45] For example, one recent study showed that women in male-dominated jobs
who were regarded as successful were less liked than equivalently successful men.
The study also showed that this discrepancy led to differences in performance
evaluation and reward allocation.[46] The result of these two glass-ceiling patterns is

that successful women can find themselves in a Catch-22.[47] They either have their competence questioned or are branded as having personality problems.

In addition to the glass-ceiling bias, women who have children often experience "maternal wall" bias. One recent study found that mothers are held to higher performance standards than are other adults. When it comes to promotion, awards, or raises, "[w]omen who give evidence of being a mother [are] held to harsher standards and suffer decreased workplace evaluations" when compared with women without children and men with children.[48] "I am constantly struggling against a perception that I'm not doing enough," says a University of California at Davis professor, "But I'm madly juggling in a way a lot of men can't even imagine."[49] A 2007 Cornell University study found that, when presented with two identical job applicant resumes (one for a woman without children and the other for a woman with children), the mother was 79 percent less likely to be hired than the woman without children.[50]

Common bias avoidance behavior is to defer having children or to hide the fact that you have them. One student reports, "We were told when we were getting ready to go on the job market, you can't be pregnant. You just can't."[51] "Such discrimination can also explain why even very progressive work/family policies might be unsuccessful," reports a Pennsylvania State University study. "Those who utilize the policies may be viewed as uncommitted and, at worst, experience the ultimate failure for an academic in the denial of tenure." Between 1992 and 1999, more than 500 faculty members at Penn State became new parents. Only seven parental leaves were reported, none by men.[52]

To make family-friendly policies effective, it is essential that chairs be trained to recognize unexamined gender bias and act to prevent it. The University of Michigan STRIDE program has created innovative programs to educate key faculty about the impact of unexamined bias. STRIDE has recruited full professors at the University of Michigan to participate in an ongoing committee that provides advice on strategies to recruit a diverse and well-qualified faculty. Each member studies a recommended reading list and attends three half-days of training on diversity issues.[53] The committee leads workshops for departments, search committees, and other groups where they educate their peers about unexamined gender and other bias.[54] The STRIDE program has been particularly effective because the committee members are so well-respected in their fields

and training is provided only upon request. These efforts to raise awareness of gender bias are essential and have contributed to the STRIDE program's success in increasing the percentage of female hires in science and engineering from 14 percent to 34 percent in a period of four years.[55] Other groups, including the Center for WorkLife Law, also have developed trainings on gender bias.

Part-Time Tenure Track

The model of traditional tenure-track jobs grows out of a norm of an ideal worker—someone who works full time and overtime, and takes little or no time off for childbearing and childrearing.[56] In fact, the years when most women are striving for tenure are the years when women are most fertile. It no longer is a viable strategy for women to wait until they have tenure to start a family. While this might have been possible in 1985, when the mean age at which people achieved tenure was 36, this mean age had grown to 39 by 1999, making waiting to achieve tenure a very risky strategy.[57] And in fact, only one in three women in fast-track university jobs ever become mothers.[58] This would not be an issue if these women were happily child-free, but in fact, 40 percent of faculty women past the age of likely fertility said that they had fewer children than they wanted.

The rigidity of the tenure clock keeps mothers from succeeding in academia and dissuades many women from even initiating a career in academia. Married women, both with and without children, are leaving academia at disproportionately high rates at every stage of the academic career.[59] In a survey of postdoctoral fellows at the University of California at Berkeley in 2000, a full 59 percent of married women with children indicated that they were considering leaving academia.[60] The University of Colorado at Boulder found in its 2001 Task Force Report on Faculty Recruitment and Retention that women represented 48 percent of the departing faculty for the previous five years, but only 25 percent of the total faculty in 1998-99.[61] It is an important reality that jobs that require extensive overtime exclude virtually all mothers (93 percent).[62]

Women who stay in academia tend to be clustered in the lower-pay, lower-prestige ranks of academia. Women are twice as likely as men to be in nontenure-track positions[63] What is needed is not a "mommy track" of low-paying, nontenured jobs, but a restructuring of academic jobs to reflect the legitimate claims of family life. A part-time tenure track can create a viable pathway to success for men and women with significant caregiving responsibilities.

In "A Half-Time Tenure Track Proposal," Robert Drago and Joan C. Williams outlined a new model for faculty employment. Under this model, any tenure-track faculty members with caregiving responsibilities for children, or for elderly or ill family members or partners, could request that he or she be placed on half-time status for a period from one to 12 years.[64] Workload, including research, teaching, advising, and committee work, also would reduce by one-half. Salary and benefits reduce proportionally and the tenure clock runs at half-speed as well. To ensure that the half-time policy is not used to gain extra time on the tenure clock, faculty members must document that the requested leave is necessary for caregiving purposes. Abuses of the policy are more likely to occur under current parental leave policies that provide full pay for less work. The half-time tenure option requires sacrificing half of one's pay and benefit, a loss that most faculty are able to manage for only relatively short periods of time.[65]

This half-time tenure-track policy already has been implemented at a number of research institutions. In 1998, the University of Washington developed a part-time faculty policy containing many of the provisions of the Drago-Williams model.[66] The University of Washington has two policy options for tenure-track faculty who want to work part time: 1) a permanent part-time tenure track, and 2) a temporary part-time option, using partial leave and tenure-clock extension. The University of California, Berkeley, also has instituted a part-time tenure track and found in a survey of UC faculty that even the majority of men supported this option, especially if it could be taken at any time during a career.[67]

Training for All Chairs in Managing with Flexibility

"I was extremely ill during my 2nd trimester, requested leave, then the chair yelled at my ears for ½ hour and asked me to find replacement teachers for my classes. I was tenured. If not, I'd have gone back to work and lost my baby."—Female professor, 2007[68]

While department chairs have critical roles in hiring, evaluating, and retaining faculty, they traditionally have had minimal training in management and often know little about important university policies like family leave. Absent training, they can undermine family-friendly policies if they manage "by overload." There is no better way to create a backlash against a faculty member who is using family leave or reduced teaching duties than to ask his or her colleagues to cover extra teaching responsibilities with no compensation. An untrained

chair may unknowingly violate the Family and Medical Leave Act by conditioning leave on a faculty member finding his or her own teaching replacement. It is essential to train all chairs on how to implement family-friendly policies and manage with flexibility.

The UC Berkeley Family Friendly Edge also conducts a "School for Chairs." These university leaders are taught how to discount resume gaps attributable to parenthood, mentor new parents through the tenure process, find a second job for dual-career couples, create a more family-friendly climate through small changes such as ending faculty meetings by 5 p.m., and ensure that stopping the clock or taking family leave is not counted against candidates. These policies and practices have helped UC Berkeley to increase its hiring rates for new women faculty from 26 percent to nearly 40 percent in the last few years.[69] At the University of Washington, the ADVANCE Center for Institutional Change (CIC) has instituted quarterly half-day leadership workshops for chairs and emerging leaders. These workshops are a chance to discuss best practices and strategies to advance women and underrepresented minorities in science, engineering, and mathematics.[70] Past topics include family leave and tenure-clock extensions, dual career hires, and building job offers. The CIC has found that holding regular gatherings, using case studies, and asking faculty members to lead the discussion have been critical to their workshops' success.[71]

Providing Cafeteria-Style Benefits

Another key way to control backlash against family-friendly policies is to provide cafeteria-style benefits. Benefit managers must recognize that employees will have a range of caregiving responsibilities—some faculty will need assistance with child care and others with elder care. One inevitable outcome, when a work environment is inhospitable to faculty with caregiving responsibilities, is that many faculty choose not to have children at all. These academics without children may feel that their own struggles with balancing their work life are being ignored, if the emphasis of new benefit policies solely addresses the needs of faculty with children. For example, a tuition benefit for children of faculty may seem—to those faculty without children—like unfair allocation of benefits. To minimize backlash, benefits administrators should provide cafeteria-style benefits so that each employee can choose which benefits they want to purchase with their allocated benefit dollars. At the University of Delaware, for example, employees are allowed to choose from a cafeteria-style benefit program to suit their personal circumstances.[72] Flexible

benefits programs also can help ease the financial challenges of having dual careers in academia. In a dual career couple, each spouse could purchase complementary benefits to maximize their benefit dollars.

Fostering Dual Careers with Central Financing

While both men and women in academia struggle to find work in the same geographic area as their partners, this challenge disproportionately affects the careers of women academics. A full 68 percent of female physicists are married to other scientists, as compared with only 17 percent of male physicists.[73] Similarly, 80 percent of female mathematicians are married to men in their own fields.[74] One study of dual career accommodation cases at a major university showed that 70 percent of the primary hires were male.[75] The "trailing spouse" often ends up with a much less desirable position than the primary hires. One such spouse lamented about her offer:

> My husband's department had resources enough—and
> students enough—to offer me a "part-time" teaching job. The
> tiny salary made me wince, but with the ink still wet on my
> diploma, it didn't occur to me to negotiate. Never mind that I
> hadn't yet tested my Ph.D. on the job market. Never mind that
> I'd held better and more lucrative teaching posts as a gradu-
> ate student. My partner and I felt lucky. Unlike so many other
> academic couples, we would have the privilege of living in the
> same city.[76]

Moreover, women with children who are unhappy with their positions have less latitude to move their families in order to land a better job. A survey of University of California faculty revealed that 53 percent of married women with children, compared with 24 percent of married men with children, agreed that "I have been unable to consider job offers outside of my current geographical location because of family reasons."[77]

If colleges and universities want to advance women, they must put in place a dual career program that is centrally funded and provides real opportunities for accompanying spouses. To facilitate dual careers, Purdue University introduced the Bridge Program in 1992 to assist couples who both want to be on the faculty. This program is run by the executive vice president for academic affairs and can

provide funding if a department cannot fund a full-time position for one of the spouses. The program also assists accompanying spouses who are not academics with contacts in the surrounding job market and help with relocation issues.[78]

Re-entry Programs for Academics

One way to undo the damage caused by the lack of institutional support for families in academia is to create re-entry programs for the men and women who have left academia because of their caregiving responsibilities. Right now, many talented researchers—like Melanie, whose story is described at the beginning of this article—feel as if there is no way for them to re-enter the promising career path they left. Colleges and universities must create re-entry programs to realize their investments in the many academic mothers who already have been fully trained, and who are languishing in the second tier of academia or are out of the workforce because of the lack of family-friendly policies.

The private sector already has started to realize that it is in their bottom-line interests to create these kinds of re-entry programs. For example, in 2005, Lehman Brothers launched its Encore Program in New York City. This program is designed to foster networking and professional development opportunities for women who formerly worked in finance and are interested in re-entering.[79] "We recruit at undergraduate schools, grad schools, and competitors, but in terms of achieving diversity goals, there's just not enough talent there. If you want more women applying, you have to look at the at-home pool."[80] Academia can learn from the bottom-line interests of business to increase the talent pool of women.

Indeed, academia is beginning to become aware of this untapped talent pool. For example, the National Institute of Health sponsors re-entry grants for scientific research, which target women who have been away from research for at least two years, but no more than eight years.[81] However, these kinds of programs are few and far between. To bridge this gap, colleges and universities also can help assist candidates seeking to re-enter academia by encouraging faculty hiring committees to discount resume gaps due to caregiving responsibilities.[82] And federal and other research funders can mitigate the impact of caregiving responsibilities on academic careers by restructuring research grants to include family accommodation policies, including discounting resume gaps due to caregiving responsibilities. One University of California academic commented, "If you depend on grants for your research, at least in the biomedical fields, it

seems that irrespective of UC's [family accommodation] policies, it would be hard to come back once one takes time off for kids. Gaps in productivity are hard to overcome when one depends on grants."[83] Moreover, most federal grants do not specifically address family policies. Canadian agencies, in contrast, provide Principal Investigators with grant extensions of up to two years to support parent, medical, or "care and nurturing" leave.[84] Federal agencies and private foundations that fund research must ensure that their policies help caregivers successfully complete their research and maintain their competitiveness.

If we are to achieve excellence in academia, we must find ways to realize the potential of the female half of our talent pool. Despite the gains of the women's movement, the fact of the matter is that women still shoulder the lion's share of caregiving responsibilities. We must restructure the academic workplace to recognize the legitimate claims of family life, so both men and women can realize both their professional and their personal goals. Only then will we be able to harness the full intellectual potential of academia. Fortunately, many institutions have started to develop promising practices to recruit, retain, and advance women. Increasingly, leaders of academia are realizing that adopting these practices is not only the right thing to do, but also the course of action most likely to produce the best return on limited resources.

ENDNOTES

[1] Anonymous Woman in Science, interview by author, July 25, 2007.

[2] Robert Drago and Joan Williams, "A Half-Time Tenure Track Proposal," *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 32 (November/December 2000): 46-51.

[3] Mary Ann Mason and Eve Mason Ekman, *Mothers on the Fast Track* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), IX.

[4] UC Faculty Family Friendly Edge, "Leaks in the Academic Pipeline for Women" (2003), http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/leaks.html.

[5] Mason and Ekman, *Mothers on the Fast Track*, 111.

[6] Ronald G. Ehrenberg, Michael J. Rizzo, and George H. Jakubson, "Who Bears the Growing Cost of Science at Universities?" (NBER working paper no. 9627, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2003), http://www.nber.org/papers/w9627.

7 Mark F. Smith, "Growing Expenses, Shrinking Resources: The States and Higher Education," *Academe* 90, no. 4 (July-August 2004), http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2004/JA/Feat/smit.htm.

8 Dennis Jones, "State Shortfalls Projected to Continue Despite Economic Gains" (Policy Alert, National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, February 2006), www.highereducation.org.

9 Ehrenberg, Rizzo, and Jakubson, "Who Bears the Growing Cost of Science?"

10 University of Colorado at Boulder, "Faculty Recruitment and Retention Task Force Report" (2001), http://www.colorado.edu/AcademicAffairs/fac_recruit/fac_recruit.doc.

11 Committee on Maximizing the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering et al., *Beyond Bias and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering* (Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2007).

12 Sherri Lind Hughes (Ph.D., Dean of Graduate and Professional Studies, McDaniel College), e-mail interview by Center for WorkLife Law NSF Advance Project Advisory Committee member, July 18, 2007.

13 Tina Recascino (vice president for Research and Institutional Effectiveness, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University), e-mail interview by Center for WorkLife Law NSF Advance Project Advisory Committee member, July 24, 2007.

14 George Blumenthal (chancellor, University of California Santa Cruz), interview by Donna Norton, August 3, 2007.

15 Saranna Thornton, "Maternity and Childrearing Leave Policies for Faculty: The Legal and Practical Challenges of Complying with Title VII," *Southern California Review of Law and Women's Studies* 12, no. 2 (Spring 2003): 170.

16 Ibid.

17 Ibid.

18 Charmaine Yoest, "Parental Leave in Academia" (Charlottesville, VA: The Family, Gender and Tenure Project, University of Virginia, February 2004), http://www.faculty.virginia.edu/familyandtenure.

19 Thornton, "Maternity and Childrearing Leave Policies," 161-2.

20 Ibid., 177.

21 Joan C. Williams, "Putting the AAUP's Family Friendly Policies into Practice," *Chronicle Careers*, January 28, 2002.

22 Ibid.

23 Anonymous woman in academia, interview with Donna Norton, July 13, 2007.

24 Monica Biernat and C. B. Wortman, "Sharing of home responsibilities between profes-

sionally employed women and their husbands." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, no. 60 (1991): 844-860.

25 Karie Frasch et al., "Creating a Family Friendly Department: Chairs and Deans Toolkit" (July 1, 2007), http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/ChairsandDeansToolkitFinal7-07.pdf.

26 Stanford University, Office of the Provost, "Sabbaticals and Other Leaves of Absence," *Faculty Handbook* (September 1, 2007): Section 3.5.

27 Joan C. Williams, "Are Your Parental Leave Policies Legal?" *Chronicle of Higher Education,* February 7, 2005.

28 University of California, Faculty Family Friendly Edge 15, (February 2005), http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/ucfamilyedge.pdf.

29 Robert Drago et al., "Bias Against Caregiving," *Academe* 91, no. 5 (September-October 2005): 2.

30 Joan C. Williams, "Hitting the Maternal Wall," *Academe* 90, no. 6 (November-December 2004): 2.

31 Joan C. Williams, Tamina Alon, and Stephanie Bornstein, "Beyond the 'Chilly Climate': Eliminating Bias Against Women and Fathers in Academe," *Thought & Action* (Fall 2006): 91.

32 Ibid.

33 Kate Quinn, Sheila Edwards Lange, and Eve A. Riskin, "Part-Time Tenure-Track Policies: Assessing Utilization" (conference paper, Women in Engineering Programs and Advocates Network 2004 national conference, Albuquerque, NM, June 6-9, 2004).

34 Gilia C. Smith and Jean A. Waltman, *Designing and Implementing Family-Friendly Policies in Higher Education* (Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Education of Women, University of Michigan, 2006), 8.

35 Judith M. Gappa, Ann E. Austin, and Andrea G. Trice, *Rethinking Faculty Work: Higher Education's Strategic Imperative* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2007).

36 Williams, Alon, and Bornstein, "Beyond the 'Chilly Climate,'" 90.

37 Ibid., 91.

38 Williams, "Putting the AAUP's Family Friendly Policies into Practice," 5.

39 Smith and Waltman, *Designing and Implementing Family-Friendly Policies*, 14.

40 Committee on Maximizing the Potential of Women in Academic Science, "Beyond Bias and Barriers."

41 Joan C. Williams and H. C. Cooper, "The Public Policy of Motherhood," *Journal of Social Issues* 60, no. 4 (2004); C. Etaugh and C. Moss, "Attitudes of Employed Women toward Parents Who Choose Full-Time or Part-Time Employment Following Their Child's Birth," *Sex Roles* 44 (2001): 611-619.

42 Williams, "Hitting the Maternal Wall," 2.

43 R. Steinpreis et al., "The Impact of Gender on the Review of the Curricula Vitae of Job Applicants and Tenure Candidates: A National Empirical Study," *Sex Roles* 41 (1999): 509-528.

44 C. Wenneras and A. Wold, "Nepotism and Sexism in Peer Review," *Nature* 387 (1997): 341-343.

45 Williams, "Hitting the Maternal Wall," 2.

46 Madeleine Heilman et al., "Penalties for Success: Reactions to Women Who Succeed at Male Gender-Typed Tasks," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89, no. 3 (2004): 416-427.

47 Williams, "Hitting the Maternal Wall," 3.

48 Ibid., 84.

49 Ibid.

50 Shelley J. Correll, Stephen Benard, and In Paik, "Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty?," *American Journal of Sociology* 112, no. 5 (March 2007): 1297-1338.

51 Ibid.

52 Robert Drago et al., "Faculty Families Project Background and Hypotheses" (background paper, Department of Labor Studies and Industrial Relations, Penn State University, 2004).

53 Lotte Bailyn et al., "Site Visit Report," http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance/files/sitevisit.pdf, (September 19-21, 2004).

54 See STRIDE Web site, "Strategies and Tactics for Recruiting to Improve Diversity and Excellence" (2002-2007), http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance/STRIDE.

55 University of Michigan News Service, "Women in Science, Engineering: U-M Makes ADVANCE Permanent," December 14, 2005, http://www.umich.edu/news/index.html?Releases/2005/Dec05/r121405a.

56 Joan C. Williams, *Unbending Gender* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 1.

57 Marc Goulden, "Women in Academe: Gender Equity and the Maternal Wall," (presentation to ACE Fellows meeting, 2007).

58 Williams, Alon, and Bornstein, "Beyond the 'Chilly Climate,'" 91.

59 Nicholas H. Wolfinger, Mary Ann Mason, and Marc Goulden, "Problems in the Pipeline: Gender, Marriage and Fertility in the Ivory Tower" (conference paper, annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, August, 14-17, 2004).

60 Mary Ann Mason and Marc Goulden, "Do Babies Matter?" *Academe* 88, no. 6 (November-December 2002): 25.

[61] University of Colorado Boulder, "Faculty Recruitment and Retention Task Force Report."

[62] Williams, *Unbending Gender*, 2.

[63] Mary Ann Mason, "Do Babies Matter? Closing the Baby Gap" (lecture, American Physical Society Gender Equity conference, College Park, MD, May 7, 2007), http://www.aps.org/programs/women/workshops/upload/Mason_Mary_Ann_APS_Gender_Equity_Conference.pdf.

[64] Drago and Williams, "A Half-Time Tenure Track Proposal," 48.

[65] Ibid., 50.

[66] Quinn, Lange, and Riskin, "Part-Time Tenure-Track Policies."

[67] Mason and Ekman, *Mothers on the Fast Track*, 113.

[68] Anonymous female academic, ACE Fellows Questionnaire, 1/9/07.

[69] Ibid., 108.

[70] Joyce W. Yen et al., "Leadership Development Workshops for Department Chairs" (conference paper, Women in Engineering Programs and Advocates Network 2004 national conference, Albuquerque, NM, June 6-9, 2004).

[71] Ibid.

[72] University of Delaware, "Flexible Benefits Program," http://www.udel.edu/Benefits/flex/summary.html.

[73] L. McNeil and M. Sher, "Dual Science Career Study," http://www.physics.wm.edu/~sher/survey.html.

[74] Ann Gibbons, "Key Issue: Two-Career Science Marriage," *Science* 225 (March 13, 1992): 1380.

[75] Vera Taz, "Not Dead Yet," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 24, 2005.

[76] Ibid, 3.

[77] Mary Ann Mason and Eve Mason Ekman, "University of California Work and Family Survey" (2003), http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/Sloan%20Federal%20Grants%20Proposal.pdf.

[78] Margaret Mannix, "Take Me, Take My Spouse," *ASEE Prism* 11, no. 3 (November 2001): 26-28.

[79] Carol Fishman Cohen and Vivian Steir Rabin, *Back on the Career Track: A Guide for Stay-at-Home Moms Who Want to Return to Work* (New York: Warner Business Books, 2007), 217.

[80] Ibid., 218.

81 Ibid., 232.

82 UC Faculty Family Edge, "Addressing Academic Climate Issues that May Disadvantage Faculty with Family Caregiving Responsibilities" (2003), http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/Academic%20climate.pdf.

83 Mason and Ekman, "University of California Work and Family Survey."

84 Ibid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailyn, Lotte, Nell Dale, Jennifer Glass, Satish Udpa, Barbara Waugh, and Joan Williams. "Site Visit Report." http://www.umich.edu/~advproj/sitevisit.pdf, (September 19-21, 2004).

Cohen, Carol Fishman, and Vivian Steir Rabin. *Back on the Career Track: A Guide for Stay-at-Home Moms Who Want to Return to Work*. New York: Warner Business Books, 2007.

Committee on Maximizing the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering, National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine. *Beyond Bias and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2007.

Correll, Shelley J., and Stephen Benard. "Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty?." *American Journal of Sociology* 112, no. 5 (March 2007): 1297-1338.

Drago, Robert, Carol Colbeck, Kai Dawn Satauffer, Amy Pirretti, Kurt Burkum, Jennifer Fazioli, Gabriela Lazarro, and Tara Habasevich. "Bias Against Caregiving." *Academe* 91, no. 5 (September-October 2005): 22-25.

Drago, Robert, Ann C. Crouter, Mark Wardell, and Billie S. Willits. "Faculty Families Project Background and Hypotheses." (background paper, Department of Labor Studies and Industrial Relations, Penn State University, 2004).

Drago, Robert, and Joan Williams. "A Half-Time Tenure Track Proposal." *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 32 (November/December 2000): 46-51.

Ehrenberg, Ronald G., Michael J. Rizzo, and George H. Jakubson. "Who Bears the Growing Cost of Science at Universities?." (NBER working paper no. 9627, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2003), http://www.nber.org/papers/w9627.

Etaugh, C., and C. Moss. "Attitudes of Employed Women toward Parents Who Choose Full-Time or Part-Time Employment Following Their Child's Birth." *Sex Roles* 44 (2001): 611-619.

Frasch, Karie, Mary Ann Mason, Angy Stacy, Marc Goulden, and Carol Hoffman. "Creating a Family Friendly Department: Chairs and Deans Toolkit." (July 1, 2007), http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/ChairsandDeansToolkitFinal7-07.pdf.

Gappa, Judith M., Ann E. Austin, and Andrea G. Trice. *Rethinking Faculty Work: Higher Education's Strategic Imperative*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2007.

Gibbons, Ann. "Key Issue: Two-Career Science Marriage." *Science* 225 (March 13, 1992): 46-47.

Goulden, Marc. "Women in Academe: Gender Equity and the Maternal Wall." (presentation to ACE Fellows meeting, 2007).

Heilman, Madeleine E., Aaron S. Wallen, Daniella Fuchs, and Melinda M. Tamkins. "Penalties for Success: Reactions to Women Who Succeed at Male Gender-Typed Tasks." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89, no. 3 (2004): 416-427.

Jones, Dennis. "State Shortfalls Projected to Continue Despite Economic Gains." (Policy Alert, National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, February 2006), www.highereducation.org.

Mason, Mary Ann. "Do Babies Matter? Closing the Baby Gap." (lecture, American Physical Society Gender Equity conference, College Park, MD, May 7, 2007), http://www.aps.org/programs/women/workshops/upload/Mason_Mary_Ann_APS_Gender_Equity_Conference.pdf.

Mason, Mary Ann and Eve Mason Ekman. *Mothers on the Fast Track*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Mason, Mary Ann, and Eve Mason Ekman. "University of California Work and Family Survey." (2003), http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/Sloan%20Federal%20Grants%20Proposal.pdf.

Mason, Mary Ann, and Marc Goulden. "Do Babies Matter?." *Academe* 88, no. 6 (November-December 2002).

McNeil, Laurie, and Marc Sher. "Dual Science Career Study." http://www.physics.wm.edu/~sher/survey.html.

Mannix, Margaret. "Take Me, Take My Spouse." *ASEE Prism* 11, no. 3 (November 2001).

Quinn, Kate, Sheila Edwards Lange, and Eve A. Riskin. "Part-Time Tenure-Track Policies: Assessing Utilization." (conference paper, Women in Engineering Programs and Advocates Network 2004 national conference, Albuquerque, NM, June 6-9, 2004).

Smith, Gilia C., and Jean A. Waltman. *Designing and Implementing Family-Friendly Policies in Higher Education*. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Education of Women, University of Michigan, 2006.

Smith, Mark. "Growing Expenses, Shrinking Resources: The States and Higher Education." *Academe* 90, no. 4 (July-August 2004), http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2004/JA/Feat/smit.htm.

Stanford University, Office of the Provost. "Sabbaticals and Other Leaves of Absence." *Faculty Handbook* (September 1, 2007).

Steinpreis, Rhea, Katie A. Anders, and Dawn Ritzke. "The Impact of Gender on the Review of the Curricula Vitae of Job Applicants and Tenure Candidates: A National Empirical Study." *Sex Roles* 41 (1999): 509-528.

STRIDE Web Site. "Strategies and Tactics for Recruiting to Improve Diversity and Excellence." (2002-2007), http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance/STRIDE.

Taz, Vera. "Not Dead Yet." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (October 24, 2005).

Thornton, Saranna. "Maternity and Childrearing Leave Policies for Faculty: The Legal and Practical Challenges of Complying with Title VII." *Southern California Review of Law and Women's Studies* 12, no. 2 (Spring 2003): 161-190.

University of Colorado at Boulder. "Faculty Recruitment and Retention Task Force Report." (2001), http://www.colorado.edu/AcademicAffairs/fac_recruit/fac_recruit.doc.

University of Delaware. "Flexible Benefits Program." http://www.udel.edu/Benefits/flex/summary.html.

UC Faculty Family Friendly Edge. "Leaks in the Academic Pipeline for Women." (2003), http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/leaks.html.

UC Faculty Family Edge. "Addressing Academic Climate Issues that May Disadvantage Faculty with Family Caregiving Responsibilities." (2003), http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/Academic%20climate.pdf.

University of Michigan News Service. "Women in Science, Engineering: U-M Makes ADVANCE Permanent." December 14, 2005, http://www.umich.edu/news/index.html?Releases/2005/Dec05/r121405a.

Valian, Virginia. *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999.

Wenneras, Christine, and Agnes Wold. "Nepotism and Sexism in Peer Review." *Nature* 387 (1997): 341-343.

Williams, Joan C. *Unbending Gender*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

---. "Putting the AAUP's Family Friendly Policies into Practice." *Chronicle Careers*, January 28, 2002.

---. "Hitting the Maternal Wall." *Academe* 90, no. 6 (November-December 2004): 16-20.

---. "Are Your Parental Leave Policies Legal?." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* February 7, 2005.

Williams, Joan C., Tamina Alon, and Stephanie Bornstein. "Beyond the 'Chilly Climate': Eliminating Bias Against Women and Fathers in Academe." *Thought & Action* (Fall 2006): 79-96.

Williams, Joan C., and H. C. Cooper. "The Public Policy of Motherhood." *Journal of Social Issues* 60, no. 4 (2004) 849-865.

Wolfinger, Nicole H., Mary Ann Mason, and Marc Goulden. "Problems in the Pipeline: Gender, Marriage and Fertility in the Ivory Tower." (conference paper, annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, August, 14-17, 2004).

Yoest, Charmaine. "Parental Leave in Academia." (Charlottesville, VA: The Family, Gender and Tenure Project, University of Virginia, February 2004), http://www.faculty.virginia.edu/familyandtenure.

Yen, Joyce W., Sheila Edwards Lange, Denice D. Denton, and Eve A. Riskin. "Leadership Development Workshops for Department Chairs." (conference paper, Women in Engineering Programs and Advocates Network 2004 national conference, Albuquerque, NM, June 6-9, 2004).