

TO: Bob Dynes, Chancellor
FROM: Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women
SUBJECT: Annual Report of CSW Activities for AY 2001-2002
DATE: July 16, 2002

The Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women (CSW) is comprised of faculty, staff, and students, and the committee is charged with identifying and analyzing problems relating to the status of women at UCSD, informing and educating the campus community about such problems, and advising the Chancellor regarding policies to ameliorate these conditions.

In any particular year, the particular focus issues of CSW change. While there are some issues (e.g., the Faculty Gender Equity Study) which are of interest primarily to one of our three constituent groups, there are many other topics (e.g., campus lighting, child care) which are of interest to all constituent groups. Accordingly, this report is organized not according to faculty, staff, student issues, but simply is presented as an unprioritized list of issues of concern to CSW.

1 Day Care Oversight

There is usually one member of CSW who serves also on the campus Day Care Oversight Committee, and serves as a liaison between the two committees. This academic year, the liaison was Prof. Alexandra Newton of the Dept. of Pharmacology.

The Day Care Oversight Committee met on April 11 2002 for the first time this year. In addition to minor issues (parking, water filtering), two major issues confronting the daycare were discussed:

1. Salary (teachers are grossly underpaid for what they do)
2. Re-introducing an infant room (one is planned for the new daycare facility)

AVC Gary Matthews was receptive to these issues and agreed to look into them. It was decided that this committee will meet quarterly.

The second, and final, meeting for the year was held on June 21, 2002. As before, the Chair was absent, and the Daycare Director, Jane-Ann Carroll chaired the meeting. She updated the committee on a number of issues: in particular the teacher reclassification will likely go through for regular teachers, but there may be difficulties with the Lead Teachers because they will need to leave the union.

The Committee on the Status of Women considers that there was a crisis in terms of day care oversight; the Day Care Oversight committee did not meet for about a year. The crisis seems to be resolving, as the committee has met twice since April and has identified some key issues, and is taking steps on them. However, we note that the Chair has been absent

at both meetings held this year. The next meeting is Oct 17.

As a group, CSW expresses its strong support of the teacher reclassification petition; we would like to see the teachers better paid for what they do.

2 Campus lighting

On behalf of the A.S. Women's Commission, the undergraduate representative to CSW, Caltherine Algeri, wrote a report that summarized undergraduate concerns, particularly concerning campus lighting and services for rape survivors. This report was forwarded to the Chancellor's office by CSW, and responses were received from VC Joe Watson and VC Steve Relyea.

As a result of the report, Nancy Wahlig, the director of the Student Safety Awareness Program, joined CSW as a consultant, and has been attending meetings throughout the year to keep CSW informed of campus safety issues. Nancy indicated that representatives from all the departments that participate in the lighting survey walks met to discuss the concerns from the undergraduate report, and will continue to meet through the summer to discuss ways for students to report burned-out lights and areas of concern. Nancy will continue working with that committee and will report back to CSW. While the undergraduate representatives to CSW have expressed some frustration at the slow pace of progress, we feel encouraged that the matter is being attended to appropriately at this point.

3 Faculty Gender Equity Study

CSW was instrumental in launching the Faculty Gender Equity Study, and we were very pleased to receive the report of the task force when the study was completed this year. SVCAA Chandler and AVC Miller attended the April 4th meeting of CSW to discuss the report. CSW has some concerns about items that were not covered in the study, as well as concerns about the implementation of corrective action for some identified problems. The response of CSW to SVCAA Chandler detailing these issues is included as an appendix to this CSW Annual Report.

4 Women Faculty Reception

For several years, CSW and the office of the SVCAA have jointly sponsored one or two receptions each year for women faculty, which on occasion are billed as welcome receptions for new women faculty. In recent years, the reception has attracted about 40-60 people, and has been a low-key socializing event held at the Women's Center. While it has been

viewed as a pleasant event and one with some value from informal networking, it has not had, in the past five years, the kind of visibility, usefulness, and attendance that we would like. This year, in conjunction with the SVCAA's office, we instituted a number of changes. We held the event at the Faculty Club, and CSW members engaged in a time-consuming e-mail and phone campaign to promote attendance. In the past, there has been no formal speaker at the event, but this time we arranged for Katja Lindenberg to discuss the Faculty Gender Equity Report. Approximately 120-150 people were in attendance, and there was tremendous interest in Katja's topic (with questions, the audience held her up front for nearly an hour). CSW is very pleased with the success of this revitalized event which we think is of great value for disseminating information, promoting networking, and raising morale among women faculty, and we intend to hold it as an annual event in the new format.

5 Recognition for UCSD women

For a number of years, CSW has been asked to provide the Chancellor's office with our recommendation for UCSD's nominee for the TWIN (Tribute to Women in Industry) award, a county-wide awards program for recognizing outstanding women, run by the YWCA. This year, our nominee was Jonnie Craig-Winston, who does a superlative job of heading up the Office of Policy Development and Quality of Work-life at UCSD. The UCSD nomination alternates yearly between staff and faculty. For this year's staff nominee, CSW's process involved soliciting nominations from a large group of UCSD staff organizations.

It occurred to us that CSW can and should play a larger role in nominating women for recognition awards. While we did not get notice of it in time to put together a nomination for this year, the new San Diego County Women's Hall of Fame annually inducts 5 women into the Hall of Fame to increase the visibility of women's actions and accomplishments in San Diego County. CSW intends to solicit nominations internally and put forth a nomination for this for next year. Likewise, women faculty have been under-represented in the Faculty Research Lecture Award, and CSW can try to identify excellent candidates for this award. We would certainly appreciate the assistance of the Chancellor's Office in bringing to our attention opportunities of this type where CSW can play a role in promoting recognition of women.

6 Staff gender equity issues

Ever since the Faculty Gender Equity Study was launched, a question that has been persistently raised over the last year and a half has been why the campus has never studied Staff Gender Equity in a similarly careful fashion. Although women are well represented in the UCSD staff workforce in terms of sheer numbers (this is in contrast to the situation among

faculty), there remain serious questions about the compensation and promotion rates of women among the staff. CSW began to inquire into this, and reviewed a number of campus reports which study staff issues such as morale and retention. The reports which we reviewed included the UCSD Career Staff Work Force Representation Progress by VC area, UCSD's Underutilization Report, also by VC area, as well as Maintaining Staff Excellence, a January 2002 report from the Staff Retention and Support Steering Committee. Gender issues were noticeably absent in these reports. CSW was not consulted by the groups conducting these studies. It appears that promotion rates and salary trajectories for women staff compared to men staff have never been studied on the UCSD campus. CSW is at an impasse currently on how to proceed with this issue, and we would welcome advice from the Chancellor's office.

7 Women in Science and Engineering

The Women in Science and Engineering (WISE) committee is a subcommittee of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women. Its charge is to provide programs on topics of interest to women in science and engineering, and to advise CSW concerning the general climate for women scientists on the UCSD campus. One of WISE's important activities is organizing campus events about women in science and engineering. Our programs this year included: an open house reception on Oct. 23rd, a lunch with Gabrielle Wienhausen, Founding Provost for the new Sixth College about the creation of Sixth College (Nov. 9th), a lunch with Laura Greene, Professor of Physics at the University of Illinois Campaign-Urbana (title of her talk was "High-Temperature Superconductivity: From Broken Symmetries to Cell Phones", Jan 11th) and panel discussions on careers in science writing (journalism and intellectual property with Jon Cohen from Science Magazine and Susan Myers from ISIS pharmaceuticals, Feb. 20th). We also provide support for special interest groups related to Science and Engineering for meetings or lunches on specific topics. In the past, we helped sponsor the Graduate Mother's Discussion Group and we continue to co-sponsor with the physics department the Women In Physics quarterly lunches. We also maintain an active Web site (<http://orpheus.ucsd.edu/women/wise/WISE>) and email list for posting information about conferences, events and special funding opportunities that are specifically targeted for women. In addition, we had a special reception and talk on careers in science policy and administration on Dec. 12th with Dr. Donna Dean, the acting head of the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering (NIBIB), a new NIH institute. This was our most successful event this year in terms of interest and attendance and Dr. Dean also relayed to us how much she enjoyed meeting the graduate students, postdocs, scientists and faculty that attended. As a result, we have forged a relationship with Sara Burke, the Project Director for the Office of Science and Technology Policy and Projects, who approached us with this suggestion, to let us know when other important women science administrators are visiting the UCSD campus. Events will then be set up similar to that with Dr. Dean in which

these funding agency directors speak to the WISE community about their career paths. Any additional contacts that could help us with our programming from the UCSD administration would be very helpful in providing quality talks and networking opportunities for our women graduate students, postdocs, staff and faculty.

Last year, support for our outreach efforts was obtained from the offices of six deans in the University (School of Medicine, SIO, Engineering, Biology, Physical Sciences and OGSR) at UCSD. This support allowed us to have a full program of events. Next year, and in future years, WISE will obtain its funding from the Women's Center budget. This is a very welcome change, as it will help us maintain continuity from year to year and through changing WISE and CSW chairs.

8 CSW administrative issues

This year there was a notable absence of administrative support for CSW, and it has been detrimental to our efforts. The main problems were as follows:

1. Minute taking: In previous years, a consistent staff member from the Chancellor's Office was present at the monthly meetings to take minutes, and minutes were typed up and delivered in a timely fashion. This year, some months a tape recorder was used to take minutes. The sound quality was poor for transcription, it was generally unclear who the speaker was at any given time, and a lot was lost. The transcription was rarely done in a timely fashion, and minutes were often not available at the time of the next meeting. This hampered our ability to follow up on the action items listed in the minutes.
2. Finances: There was apparently no financial report filed by the co-chairs last year for the expenditures of CSW during AY 2000-2001. We were told that, as a result, the CSW account was frozen for this year. It was unclear to us what needed to be done to correct the situation, and which person to turn to. As a result, we were unable to spend anything on the account during almost the entire year. Updating the CSW web site and our brochure were deferred. Even the snacks for our end-of-year meeting were paid for from Prof. Cosman's personal industrial gift account.
3. General administrative support: CSW's needs for administrative support are quite minimal, amounting perhaps to one hour per week. Nonetheless, it is essential to have that support provided in a one-stop shopping way, where the co-chairs can always ask one single person to take care of all administrative functions, or else our functions are taken care of in a haphazard or inefficient way.
4. Solutions: It was felt that having co-chairs serve synchronous two-year terms contributed to the problem, because every two years there is a sudden gap in continuity.

Having the faculty and staff co-chairs serve staggered terms should help ensure that financial reports and end-of-year reports are written, and that there is more institutional memory for CSW. Partly as a result of dissatisfaction with the administrative support for CSW, and partly with the intent of implementing the solution of staggered terms, Prof. Cosman is resigning as faculty co-chair of CSW, effective at the end of August 2002, which is the mid-point of her expected two-year term of service as co-chair. Lupe Cook will finish out her own two-year term as staff co-chair of CSW, and we recommend that a new faculty co-chair be appointed for a two-year term, thus beginning an arrangement of staggered terms for the co-chairs which we think will be beneficial for CSW.

5. In addition, the co-chairs have had two productive meetings with AVC Linda Williams and Irma Martinez from the Chancellor's Office, and with Nancy Loevinger of the Women's Center regarding standardizing minute-taking, and regarding the use of a Women's Center staff member to provide one-stop shopping for all administrative functions for CSW. We feel this represents a good solution to the problem, and are hopeful that the administrative support situation will be fixed for next year.

APPENDIX A: RESPONSE OF CSW TO THE REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON
GENDER EQUITY

(response sent April 29, 2002)

TO: Marsha Chandler, Senior Vice Chancellor

FROM: Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women

SUBJECT: Report of the Task Force on Gender Equity

The members of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women were very pleased to receive the report of the gender equity task force, and to have a chance to discuss the report with you and VC David Miller at our April meeting. We are here providing comments on the report as requested in your letter of March 11.

First of all, we were impressed with the quality of the study and of the report. While necessarily limited in scope, the study and associated report are quite rigorous, well-conducted, and clear on those aspects of the issue that were covered. The task force is to be highly commended.

We were pleased to hear that a task force is being established specifically to focus on the School of Medicine (SOM). The magnitude of the gender disparity (49%) that was uncovered in the negotiated and clinical salary components at the SOM was one of the most disturbing findings of the study. Clearly it is of utmost importance that this be looked into further. Given the large number of non-LRF in the SOM, it is crucial that they be included in any follow-on study.

On the general campus, there were individual departments and divisions that were found to have significantly large disparities, and the recommendation is made in the report that these be examined in more detail on a case-by-case basis. Indeed, it is recommended in the report that an annual review be conducted of all faculty salaries by the method identified, with chairs addressing those falling outside normal limits. This is clearly a high-priority goal, and we are pleased that you said the case-by-case review is likely to be pursued during this upcoming summer.

During our April 4 meeting, we discussed the possibility of having each new woman faculty member offered a woman faculty mentor who might be inside or outside of the person's department. While this is not one of the recommendations in the report, it seems like an

excellent idea that would complement those presented in the report. CSW could perhaps be of assistance in maintaining a list of senior women faculty who agree to serve as mentors for new women faculty. Mentors on the list could receive occasional informational updates that would help the mentoring process, for example, information on changes in policies that affect women. Attendance at events such as the Women Faculty Reception could also be boosted by these mentoring relationships.

We note that the study was limited in examining committee service. The study examined Academic Senate committee service, which leaves out service at the department, school, and college levels, and also ignores valuable service on committees which are campus-wide but not under the purview of the Academic Senate (e.g., Chancellor's Advisory Committees). In particular, it would be interesting to examine service on search committees. While further study of total service contributions does not seem like a high priority item, nonetheless it would be good to know whether Academic Senate service in fact constitutes a tiny fraction or a large majority of faculty service activities, because it is possible that a significant gender issue remains and has simply not been looked at.

Regarding childbearing issues, we agree that a full quarter of maternity leave is a desirable goal, although clearly this is in part a financial decision. CSW members were surprised to see how infrequently the Active Service / Modified Duties (ASMD) option is used by faculty. There are a number of important questions which were left unanswered. While this study was understandably limited in scope, we hope that some of these issues will be examined in more detail. There are many possible reasons why the ASMD option is used so infrequently, for example, because faculty have had very few births, because certain women have been unable to negotiate an acceptable ASMD arrangement with their department chair, because childbearing leave was seen as a better alternative, or because the ASMD option was not properly understood, among others. It is important to understand which reasons are actually present, since the remedies are different. For example, perhaps the negotiation for what constitutes modified duties should not be handled by the department chair alone, or perhaps the policy simply needs to be better stated and disseminated. We are concerned about the (unknown) uniformity with which department chairs handle ASMD. CSW also supports the idea that there should be day care slots for recruits, as well as some guaranteed slots for childcare for current faculty.

At our April 4th meeting, there was some discussion about the recruitment of dual-career faculty. Several faculty members on CSW were not aware of the arrangement by which the FTE funding for a spouse can potentially be split in equal thirds among the office of the SV-CAA and the two departments of the spouses. Simply improving communication about this policy with department chairs and search committees would be a good step. The problem can crop up in retention as well as in initial recruitment, as sometimes a faculty member

who is already at UCSD has a spouse who is either a faculty member at another university, or who completes training and looks for a job. It is not clear whether the same mechanism applies in such retention situations.

In conclusion, the members of CSW are very pleased that this study was conducted, and are impressed with the manner in which it was done. Clearly many questions remained unanswered, and many issues require prompt action. We are enthusiastic about the prospects for improvement, and we look forward to the opportunity to assist in this process.

Cordially,

Pamela Cosman, Associate Professor
Co-Chair, Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
University of California, San Diego