

Status of Women at The Ohio State University

Autumn 1993 to Autumn 2007

	1993	2003	2007
Board of Trustees	2 (22%)	3 (27%)	3 (17.6%)
Vice Presidents	2 (25%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)
Senior Administrators*	no info	no info	21 (38%)
Non-faculty Executive Staff	252 (42.1%)	566 (50.8%)	740 (59.3%)
Other Professional staff	3,389 (68.1%)	5,449 (65.2%)	6,826 (66.7%)
Deans	5 (20%)	8 (32%)	7 (29%)
TIU Heads	19 (16.5%)	15 (14.39%)	24 (23.5%)
Eminent Scholars	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	2 (9.5%)
Endowed Chairs	3 (7.5%)	11 (13.4%)	13 (15.3%)
Named Professors	2 (5%)	13 (20%)	12 (18%)
Faculty**	746 (26%)	820 (27.67%)	1,125 (31.50%)
Full Professors	121 (11%)	184 (17.6%)	234 (18.66%)
Associate Professors	252 (24%)	310 (29.29%)	403 (34.65%)
Assistant Professors	373 (40%)	326 (36.88%)	488 (42.29%)
Students			
Undergraduates	48%	48%	49%
Graduate & Professional	52%	54%	66%

* Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents.

** The 1993 and 2003 data contain only regular tenure track faculty; the 2007 data include the following faculty categories: regular tenure track, regular research track, and regular clinical track.

Slow but steady progress has occurred in the number of women in most of the categories listed above. Most significantly, the number of women in the non-faculty executive staff, deans, Tenure Initiating Units (TIU) heads, endowed chairs, and named professors—all important leadership-level positions—have moved in a strong, positive direction. The number of women faculty are up in all categories, and the percent of women students in the graduate and professional ranks has increased significantly.

The main area of concern is that the percentage of women at the very highest ranks—vice presidents and members of the Board of Trustees—has declined and, in fact, in October 2007 women were not represented at all at the vice presidential level. However, two women were appointed to vice presidencies in September 2008.

Message from The Women's Place

Frequently, when members of our community talk about the university, they refer to students and faculty. Oftentimes, staff are left out of the discussion as if they do not exist or play only a secondary role. A friend from another university shared with us an analogy it uses to understand the role played by staff, an analogy that illustrates the key and primary role that staff play at any university.

They analogized a university to a forest. Faculty are the trees and flowers that are recognized publicly for their research and teaching. Students and alums are the animals and other critters that run in and out of the forest, both taking and leaving in their wake. Staff are the rich soil that provide the foundation for the trees and flowers to grow, the foundation that students and alums depend on as they scurry in and out.

We must, as a community, recognize the key role played by staff. Part of this recognition involves replenishing the soil through leadership and career development programs.

The Women's Place provides formal leadership development programs for a small number of staff as part of our mission "to make Ohio State a cutting-edge institution which supports and develops women's opportunities for achievement."

The Staff Leadership Series is an annual initiative conducted by The Women's Place. The twelve-month course focuses on enhancing leadership abilities, promoting a supportive, collegial network of staff women, and creating a pool of potential staff leaders from groups that have been traditionally underrepresented in key leadership roles. Applications typically are available in the fall of each year. Two groups of approximately 20 women per group have completed the series. A third series will begin this fall.

The Summer Institute at Bryn Mawr is an initiative supported by The Women's Place as well as the Office of the President. Conducted at Bryn Mawr University, this experience offers women administrators and faculty intensive training in leadership and education administration. Each year for the last three years, one or two staff women have attended Bryn Mawr.

In addition, the Office of Human Resources offers the leadership training program **The Leading Edge** to staff. The Leading Edge is for mid-level staff managers and leaders interested in building their leadership skills. The next class will begin in January 2009. The Leading Edge typically has about 25 participants.

However, all of these programs together serve only a small number of our university staff. Comprehensive, centralized career and professional development support for all staff is critical to creating an environment in which each diverse participant can thrive and make his or her full contribution. Currently, no such program exists at Ohio State.

Yet, such a program is needed. Less than one-half of respondents to the 2001 Staff Development and Work Life Survey Report were aware of what to do to advance at Ohio State, and only one-fourth considered career opportunities at the university to be good. Survey results also noted "...career advancement opportunities are the greatest source of dissatisfaction and therefore [a] priority area for improvement. Career advancement coupled with professional development opportunities presents a promising area of focus that would simultaneously meet organizational and individual needs."

In a more recent study, the 2006 University Staff Advisory Committee Survey, almost half of staff responding indicated that funding for professional development would enhance career development. An almost equal number, however, indicated they were not encouraged to pursue these opportunities. During the same period, fiscal year 2006–07, the university experienced a 12.5 percent turnover rate among all women. National average indicators consider 10 percent or less a "good" turnover rate, suggesting that Ohio State's turnover rate among women is higher than the average.

Consistently over the last ten years, formal survey data, focus group results, and informal feedback all support the need for career and professional development support. Establishing a comprehensive program would support the university in maintaining its status as a "top employer."

We concur with the President's Council on Women recommendation that the university develop a comprehensive career and professional development program. Our staff deserve no less. Our university deserves no less.

* We thank Jamie Mathews-Mead, director of MBA Career Programming, Fisher College of Business, for her invaluable contributions to this message.

The Women's Place

Vision

The Women's Place (TWP) embraces a vision of the university that supports all women to thrive, advance, and make their full contributions within an environment characterized by equity, freedom, and dignity for all people.

Mission

The Women's Place serves as a catalyst for institutional change to expand opportunities for women's growth, leadership, and power in an inclusive, supportive, and safe university environment.

The Women's Place

- Advocates policy changes that provide opportunities and address institutional barriers for women.
- Provides a critical gender analysis of policies and practices that impact the progress of women at Ohio State.
- Collaborates with other groups to craft/refine policies and practices related to our mission.
- Creates/supports initiatives with a direct link to institutional change for university women.
- Supports and enhances the work of Critical Difference for Women as an integral part of TWP.
- Strives to be a visible, available, and inclusive resource.

Guiding Principles

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



Additional Information

Deborah A. Ballam, Ph.D., J.D.
Associate Provost for Women's
Policy Initiatives
Director, The Women's Place
ballam.1@osu.edu

Jennifer Beard
Assistant Director
The Women's Place
beard.140@osu.edu

Phone: (614) 292-3960
Fax: (614) 292-1979

womensplace.osu.edu

Status Report on Women 2008 at The Ohio State University



Prepared by

The President's Council on Women
and The Women's Place

The Ohio State University

October 2008

Message from the Chair, President's Council on Women



Jill Bystydzienski

Last fall, President E. Gordon Gee met with the President's Council on Women and requested that we provide him with recommendations for action to address critical issues facing women at Ohio State. In response, over the course of the year, we developed the following package of interrelated proposals that are consistent with President Gee's goal of forging One University. The president took these under advisement and we will be following up throughout this academic year.

One University Forums

Numerous studies have shown that the culture in which we work is a major determinant of women's success in academia. However, we still lack a solid understanding of exactly how our culture at Ohio State supports or impedes women's success. We recommended convening a series of forums to engage in a university-wide discussion that will facilitate our understanding of the culture in which we operate. The goal is to enhance and support the positive aspects and to address and change the negative ones.

Child Care First Study

Studies consistently show that child care is critical to women's full participation in the academic work force, yet the central Ohio community has a critical shortage of infant care capacity. One of the most important steps the university can take to support the full participation of women is to increase its capacity to provide quality child care. We cannot have a meaningful dialogue about how to do this without cost estimates for both building new capacity and continuing operating costs. We recommended that the president appoint a small work group to determine the cost ramifications of various options to inform the dialogue on how to address the child care crisis.

Single Parent Student Success

Students who are single parents, the majority of whom are women, face unique challenges. We recommended that the president reconvene a task force that examined this issue a few years ago to develop recommendations for future actions in support of this group of students.

Career Development Commitment

A critical factor in promoting and retaining women is the existence of career development opportunities. Currently, comprehensive, centralized career and professional development support for staff does not exist at the university.

The President's Council on Women has recommended to President Gee that the university dedicate human capital and additional resources to develop a comprehensive career and professional development program to include: career coaching, assessment, exploration, career decision making, mentoring/shadowing/on-boarding, networking, job search skill development, and dual career employment services.

Success in Dual Career Hiring

The dual career hiring policy for faculty couples has been in place for several years. We recommended that the president appoint a task force to review the current policy to make improvements to both the process and funding mechanisms.

We look forward to working with President Gee and his leadership team to accomplish these goals, as each is imperative to creating an environment where all are able to make their full contributions to the university.

Jill Bystydzienski

Chair, President's Council on Women

Professor and Chair, Department of Women's Studies

Faculty of Color Profile

Current Faculty Profile (Men and Women): Race & Ethnicity (Assistant through Full Professor) 2007–08

	Total Number	% of Total Faculty	Total Female	% of Total Faculty
Caucasian	2,823	79%	909	25.45%
Black	138	3.9%	58	1.62%
Asian	403	11.3%	102	2.85%
Hispanic	93	2.6%	31	.86%
American Indian	3	.08%	1	.03%
Other & Undisclosed	111	3.1%	24	.67%
TOTAL	3,571	100%	1,125	31.5%

Faculty of color pool >5% Hiring inconsistent with pool

* Pool data provided by the Office of Academic Affairs, Office of Institutional Research and Planning; hiring data provided by the Office of Human Resources.

Department	Pool '02–'06		Hires '02–'06		Hires 1997–2006	
	People of Color	Total	People of Color	White	People of Color	White
Art	7	74	0	5	0	12
Art History	60	684	0	3	0	4
Dance	4	19	0	4	0	7
Linguistics	68	710	0	4	0	8
Chemistry	691	6,713	0	12	0	20
Anthropology	265	1,668	0	8	0	23
Public Policy	96	753	0	3	0	6
Accounting	14	91	0	4	1	14
Human Development and Family Sciences	45	342	0	8	0	9
Educational Policy and Leadership	704	3,536	2	19	2	26
Social Work	158	845	0	10	1	19
Allied Medicine	738	4,767	1	17	1	22

* Faculty of color are defined using the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) categories: Asian, Black, Hispanic, and American Indian.

Faculty pool data for the Ph.D. completions for institutions with the Carnegie Classification “Very High Research Activity” is available for 72 of our 107 Tenure Initiating Units (TIU). A majority of our TIUs for which we have pool data were able to hire consistently with the pool. However, over the last decade, 25 of those TIUs over-hired male faculty by at least 10 percent of their portion of the pool; some over-hired men by as much as 75 percent. Twelve of those 72 units had pools of at least five percent faculty of color, but eight of those 12 hired zero faculty of color and the other four under-hired faculty of color. Five TIUs under-hired both women and people of color.

Departmental Hiring by Gender 1997–2006

(listed by degree of differential)

Department	Males in National Pool 2002–06	Departmental Hiring of Males 2002–06	Departmental Hiring of Males 1997–2006
Art History	25.6% (175 of 684)	100% (3)	100% (4)
Marketing	47.7% (41 of 86)	100% (4)	75% (6)
Art	21.6% (16 of 74)	60% (3)	50% (6)
African and African American Studies	31.3% (10 of 32)	66.7% (4)	63.6% (7)
Philosophy	68.4% (1,001 of 1,463)	90% (9)	70.6% (12)
Physiology and Cell Biology	51.3% (903 of 1,759)	80% (4)	62.5% (5)
Psychology	32% (1,986 of 6,198)	60.6% (20)	59.6% (28)
Communication	43.8% (559 of 1,277)	70.6% (12)	65.4% (17)
Pharmacy	52.1% (418 of 803)	78.3% (18)	83.3% (10)
Geography	59.8% (453 of 757)	75% (9)	72.7% (16)
Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology	49% (1,094 of 2,231)	63.6% (7)	76.5% (13)
Public Health	33.4% (487 of 1,458)	59.1% (13)	58.1% (18)
Food Science & Technology	43.8% (254 of 580)	66.7% (4)	54.5% (6)
Human Nutrition	20.4% (77 of 378)	40% (2)	57.1% (4)
Anthropology	43.5% (725 of 1,668)	62.5% (5)	60.7% (14)
Spanish and Portuguese	39.8% (279 of 701)	57.1% (4)	61.5% (8)
Chemistry	66% (4,428 of 6,713)	83.3% (10)	80% (16)
Environment and Natural Resources	61.1% (934 of 1,528)	77.8% (7)	73.7% (14)
College of Veterinary Medicine	53.4% (221 of 414)	66.7% (16)	64.6% (31)
Management and Human Resources	46.7% (63 of 135)	60% (3)	60% (9)
Neuroscience	53.7% (518 of 965)	66.7% (4)	75% (9)
Consumer Sciences	30.5% (129 of 423)	42.9% (3)	44.4% (4)
Aerospace Engineering	87.8% (645 of 745)	100% (4)	NA
Public Policy and Management	56.7% (427 of 753)	66.7% (2)	83.3% (5)
English	41.1% (1,360 of 3,309)	51.1% (23)	48.6% (35)

* Pool data provided by the Office of Academic Affairs, Office of Institutional Research and Planning; hiring data provided by the Office of Human Resources.

While a variety of factors enter into specific hiring decisions, a pattern of hiring that extends over a period of years should at least raise questions about hiring practices. Was the pool of candidates representative of the overall pool? Were the women and people of color selected for consideration consistent with the pool? Were they offered positions? If they were offered positions, but declined in a disproportionate number, what factors account for this?

Forty of our 72 TIUs were able to hire faculty in a pattern consistent with the national pool data. If the other 32 had done so over the last decade, clearly the university would have a different faculty profile—one that would place us among the top universities in the nation, a status we must attain if we are to become the eminent university to which we aspire.

Gender and Ethnicity Distribution of Senior Staff Positions October 2007

Position	Race/Ethnicity	Male	Female
President and Executive Vice President	White	2	0
Senior Vice President	White	4	0
Vice President	White	6	0
Associate Vice President	White	12	8
Assistant Vice President	White	9	11
	Black	1	1
	Asian	0	1
Totals		34 (62%)	21 (38%)
Executive, Administrative, and Managerial (All Positions)	White	438 (35%)	593 (47.5%)
	Black	21 (1.68%)	44 (3.5%)
	Hispanic	7 (.56%)	5 (.4%)
	Asian	8 (.64%)	13 (1.04%)
	American Indian	0	6 (.48%)
	Other Undisclosed	34 (2.72%)	79 (6.33%)
Totals		508 (41%)	740 (59%)

For the first time in many years, women were not represented among the highest executive positions of president, executive vice president, senior vice president or, vice president. While these appointments constitute only ten positions, they are the most significant at the university in terms of influence, decision making, and resource allocation.

Conversely, the majority of associate and assistant vice presidents were women (22 of 43). This reflects an increase from past years, yet also emphasizes the discrepancies in the vice president positions. In September 2008, the university announced the appointments of two women, one White and one Black, to vice presidential positions. While we applaud these appointments, two is still low when compared to the total percent of senior staff women at the university.

A review of the executive, administrative, and managerial positions reflects a continuing positive trend of relative gender balance. Unfortunately, however, the demographic data continues to show low numbers of people of color in these positions, which detracts from the optimal experience for our primary constituents, the students. Contributions made by staff to the university’s mission of teaching, research, and public service are vast, and a commitment to improving diversity is critical if Ohio State is to remain competitive and serve as an employer of choice for the most talented executives from diverse backgrounds.

Child Care: A Necessity, Not a Luxury

If The Ohio State University indeed is to move from excellence to eminence, we must create a culture that permits each student, faculty, and staff member to develop and use all of their talents. Part of this culture change must recognize that our personal lives impact our professional lives. The 2005 final report of the Faculty Career Enhancement Committee concluded that “[t]he professional and personal lives of faculty intertwine, and . . . they evolve over the course of a career. Thus, when discussing career enhancement one cannot ignore the effects that personal and professional lives have on each other.”

We long have recognized that because individuals have differing needs, the support we provide to ensure success differs among individuals. A new faculty member in the sciences, for example, will need a \$1 million start up package to equip a lab, while most faculty members will not. A student who experiences difficulties with math can seek help from university-provided tutors, while some students may not need additional help. A staff member who must travel extensively to perform his or her work will need a university car, while most staff members do not. The university provides the lab, the tutor, and the car because these are necessities for these individuals to perform up to their full potential as students, faculty, and staff members. **And, it must be stressed that, far from being a burden to the institution, recognizing and responding to these different needs has allowed Ohio State to compete for—and retain—the most talented faculty, staff, and students.**

Despite our greater sensitivity to the different needs of individual members of our community, one critical need is not adequately addressed. That need is access to affordable, high-quality child care. The group most affected by this lack of child care is women. At Ohio State, women comprise two-thirds of our staff, one-half of our students, and one-third of our faculty. It is time we recognize that quality child care is just as much a necessity for women students, faculty, and staff to perform up to their full potential as it is for the scientist to have the laboratory, the student to have the tutor, and the staff member to have the car.

Both national and local studies provide evidence that family responsibilities have a differential impact on male and female faculty. The same studies do not exist with respect to students and staff, but logic would suggest the same effect.

In a 2004 study using the 160,000 recipients in the Survey of Earned Doctorates data base, Mason & Goulden from the University of California concluded that having children during the pre-tenure years helps male faculty in their careers but hurts female faculty. Male faculty are more likely to obtain full-time tenure track positions at four-year colleges or research institutions, and male faculty are 38 percent more likely to achieve tenure than their female counterparts. Partnered women with children who leave academia are far more likely than others to cite children as one of the reasons they changed their careers.

What accounts for this difference?

“I supervise a staff member who is expecting a baby soon. She placed herself on the waiting list for Ohio State’s child care center as soon as she became pregnant, yet she was told the earliest she could hope for a spot would be a year after the birth. . . . We are faced with losing this staff member as an employee, as there is next to no infant care in the Columbus area.”
—Supervisor, The Ohio State University

The average age for obtaining a Ph.D. is 33, and the average age for obtaining tenure is 40. For women, the prime childbearing years are devoted to college, graduate school, and obtaining tenure. Male faculty do not have the same age limitations for becoming fathers. Moreover, male faculty are more likely to have a spouse/partner available full-time or part-time to help with family and household-related responsibilities. Faculty women who want to have children generally must do so prior to obtaining tenure.

Lack of quality child care is one of the primary stressors for women who are both mothers and in the workforce. Data from the 2008 faculty and staff surveys show the following for Ohio State.

For female assistant professors (regular faculty) responding to the survey (a 54 percent response rate):

- 54 percent have at least one child under the age of two
- 67 percent report that child care is a significant or some source of stress
- 66 percent said that on-site or near-site child care would be of great or some value in improving the quality of work life at Ohio State

“I have been on the wait list at the Ohio State child care center for a year. . . . Other facilities in Columbus have similar wait lists. Given these circumstances, it is very difficult for women faculty to balance work and family life. . . . This year, I received an offer from another college and one of the reasons I considered the job was the guaranteed placement at an excellent child care and preschool facility on campus.”
—Assistant Professor, The Ohio State University

For faculty as a whole, male and female (38 percent response rate):

- 48 percent report they have children under age 12
- Nearly all faculty currently using or anticipating needing child care would find on-site or near-site child care valuable

For staff, male and female (52 percent response rate):

- 31 percent of staff respondents reported they have children age 12 or under. Of these, 12 percent report they currently need child care or expect in the near future to need child care
- Staff report low levels of satisfaction with child care availability

Considering all regular faculty and staff, male and female, 304 report that they currently need child care or expect in the near future to need child care. The response rate for the 2008 surveys was sufficient to expect that the results are reasonably representative of the entire population. Thus, we can expect that close to 600 of our faculty and staff currently need or will need child care in the near future. We do not have current data for students, and thus cannot estimate their need. However, we do know that students’ children currently fill 30 percent of the spots at our centers, and thus it is safe to assume that students also have unmet need.

Ohio State child care facilities simply cannot address this need. For many years, our child care center typically has had 1,000 families on the wait list. As the Faculty and Compensation Benefits Committee noted in its 2004 annual report, “Generations of Ohio State faculty and staff leaders have spoken of the inadequacy of university child care opportunities. . . . **This need is felt most keenly by female faculty and staff who continue to have the primary responsibility for making the arrangements for child care in their families.**”

“I have been concerned on behalf of our women faculty for years now about the real problems they face in finding child care, particularly for the 0–2 age range. It is a problem for our assistant professors who need to remain productive scholars in the tenure process.”
—Associate Dean, The Ohio State University

And we cannot simply refer people to private child care centers. The Central Ohio community cannot meet the demand for university families. Our community has a critical shortage of child care slots for infants 24 months and younger—wait lists for this age group in our community range from 12 to 18 months.

We recognize that increasing our child care capacity is not an inexpensive proposition. However, Ohio State provides many benefits that are expensive and utilized by only a small percentage of our community. One example is the tuition waiver for dependents. Only the faculty and staff whose dependents can be admitted to Ohio State can use this benefit. Moreover, the annual benefit amount per dependent—50 percent of tuition—exceeds the subsidy per dependent that the university provides per child for the child care center. For fall quarter 2007 alone, the university waived \$1.68 million for 1,294 dependent fee authorizations. This translates into an academic year average of \$3,900 per person—\$900 per year more than the subsidy the university provides per child at the child care center.

Despite its cost, increasing the availability of child care at Ohio State, like the other efforts to help faculty, staff, and students, will provide practical advantages to the university that go beyond providing support for the women who work and study here. A system of high-quality, readily available child care will provide a powerful recruiting tool for both male and female candidates for positions at the university. Given the inadequacy of child care systems at the institutions with which we compete for the best talent, a significant expansion of the child care program at Ohio State could well prove the deciding factor for many prospective hires.

We must recognize that quality child care is a necessity for our women students, faculty, and staff. We must address the child care crisis.