



WOMEN'S
INITIATIVE
DUKE UNIVERSITY

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

PREFACE 2

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY 4

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS 11

ALUMNAE 17

GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS 21

FACULTY 25

EMPLOYEES 31

BOARD OF TRUSTEES 37

CONCLUSION 39

The Steering Committee for the Women's Initiative was formed in May 2002 and met regularly through June 2003. It was chaired by President Nannerl O. Keohane, with Professor Susan Roth chairing the smaller executive committee that carried out the work of the initiative between meetings, and Jamie Dupré providing staff support. The purpose of the steering committee was to formulate questions and methodologies, oversee the gathering and analysis of data by groups of colleagues from every constituency of the university, and devise policy recommendations based on that data and on our collegial discussions of the issues.

The sixteen members of the committee (listed below) represented all constituencies at Duke. Each one of us has some degree of authority in our specific areas, so that we are able to oversee the implementation of our policy recommendations. We consulted regularly with other bodies in the university, in order to make sure that the policy proposals would have the support and involvement of other decision-makers. We were also helped and supported by colleagues in many parts of the university, to whom we owe heartfelt thanks.

This report is the result of many studies and conversations over the past year. Committee members found it invigorating to devote time and energy to better understand the experiences and needs of Duke women. Too many years had passed where lack of attention and complacency about these issues masked the importance of gender in the everyday life of students, faculty, employees, alumni, and trustees of our University and Health System.

We present this report not only with the aim of improving the climate for women at Duke, but also to improve the experience for all who work or study here. Many, if not most, of our action items, while developed largely in response to the voices of women, will positively affect both women and men. Our Women's Initiative set out to assess, and when necessary, ameliorate the situation of women, but in so doing we have developed a more sophisticated awareness of the ways in which we need to support the work of all members of our community.

At times in this report we reference differences among women's experience owing to race, class, sexual orientation, or to affiliation with the Campus, Medical Center or Health System. While these differences were not always at the heart of our work, we were nevertheless mindful of them at all times, and know that we have not intentionally obscured important variations in experience.

At other times in this report we express our concern about the status of women at Duke, whether in noting the under-representation of women on our faculty, or the relative inattention to work-life balance issues for our women employees, or the dominance of fraternities in undergraduate social life. These are problems that are assuredly not unique to Duke. And these are problems that have developed over a long period of time, making it seem overwhelming to think about creating a different kind of authority and power for women. But we believe these problems have evolved in small steps, accumulating over time, cutting away at a woman's motivation, or confidence, or ability to imagine herself doing those things she could do very well, without having to make impossible choices, and without having to prove herself. And it is our belief that the cumulative effect of the changes we are proposing here will bring, over time, the satisfaction of significant transformation.

This report, written by Professor Roth, with an introductory essay by President Keohane, is a summary of reports that have been prepared by the subcommittees within the Women’s Initiative Steering Committee representing different constituencies at the University and Health System: students, faculty, employees, alumnae, and trustees. Each report describes information gathered and reviewed, and each has its own set of recommendations for institutional change. These subcommittee reports, with a more detailed description of our findings, will prove invaluable to us as we continue the process of developing an institutional response to our work.

This final report represents the collective findings and recommendations of the Women’s Initiative Steering Committee. As we put forward our final action items, we will indicate which are already completed or in progress, and which require immediate attention. As you will see, our action items include putting mechanisms in place that will ensure that what we have learned this year will be imprinted on the consciousness of our leaders and community members, and will bring far reaching influence to our Initiative. We hope that in addition to providing a basis for the formulation of policy, the report of the steering committee will prompt continuing conversations at Duke about the issues that we have identified as important to the future of the University.

Nannerl O. Keohane, Chair
President

Susan Roth, Chair of the Executive Committee
Professor and Special Assistant to the President

Jamie Dupré, Staff
Office of the President

Ann Brown
Assistant Professor
Department of Medicine

Susan McLean
Senior Associate Chief Operating Officer
Hospital Administration

Robin A. Buhke
Assistant Clinical Professor
Counseling and Psychological Services

Ellen Medearis
Director of Major and Leadership Gifts
University Development

Sally M. Dickson
Vice President for Institutional Equity
(formerly at Duke)

Larry Moneta
Vice President for Student Affairs

Allison Haltom W’72
Vice President and University Secretary

Berndt Mueller
Dean of the Natural Sciences in A & S

Mindy Kornberg
Assistant Vice President
Human Resources, Work Environment

John Payne
Professor
Fuqua School of Business

Donna Lisker
Director
Women’s Center

Janice Radway
Professor
Program in Literature

Jacqueline Looney
Associate Dean and Associate Vice Provost
The Graduate School

Judith White
Assistant Vice President
Office of the Executive Vice President

By *Nannerl O. Keohane*
Chair of the Committee

In assessing the situation of women across the various constituencies at Duke University, the year following the merger of our Woman's College and Trinity College, 1973, provides a good benchmark. In almost every area, progress has been made in including women more fully as members of this university, and taking advantage of their talents and creative energies.

Twenty-eight percent of the students in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at Duke in 1973 were women; in 2003, the corresponding figure is 47%. Twenty percent of the candidates for advanced degrees across the university were female in 1973; today, 43%. More than half the professional, technical and managerial staff at Duke today are women, which would surely not have been true three decades ago. About a third of the university's senior administration, including vice presidents, vice provosts, and deans, are female in 2003. Forty-one percent of our alumni/alumnae are women, with larger numbers in the more recent classes. In 2003-2004, fourteen of the active members of our Board of Trustees are female, compared with five in 1973 (and 1993, as well).

The changes during the past few decades at Duke mirror the marked changes in the status of women in American society more generally. Today, many more women now work outside the home on a full-time basis, for most or all of their working lives. The great majority of Duke working families today involve two partners who both have significant jobs or careers outside the home. Women have achieved more than token representation in almost all the professions, and have begun to exercise significant political authority in most of the halls of government in this country.

Changes in the status of women have profound implications for life in the workplace and educational institutions. Individuals, families and institutions are still finding their way through a complex maze of expectations, facing imperatives that are sometimes mutually contradictory. Nor is the change unidirectional. A small but not insignificant number of well-educated young women who might a decade ago have assumed that their lives would include, in equal measure, professional success and nurturing a family, are now explicitly choosing one or the other. At the same time, more and more well-educated young men are committing themselves to substantial involvement with their homes and children in ways that create tensions with the traditional expectations of their chosen professions.

Duke is grappling with these challenges as we attempt to recruit and retain the best possible students, faculty members, administrators and employees. The activities of the Women's Initiative during the past academic year were directed toward helping us understand these challenges more fully, and find better ways to handle them. Both women and men participated in this endeavor, as researchers and respondents alike. A great deal of data was gathered from all constituencies at the university, through surveys, focus groups and individual interviews. The data were carefully analyzed, discussed and collated, and this, along with intensive and thoughtful discussions among the members of the Steering Committee for the initiative and many others, provides the basis for our substantial policy recommendations.



Many of the challenges we have discovered for women at Duke are not unique to our university. They derive from, or are heavily reinforced by, assumptions in our society as a whole, and patterns of gender expectations that far transcend Duke. We are especially mindful of the fact that other colleges and universities are struggling with some of these same issues. We hope that our work may provide some useful suggestions for them, as well.

Throughout the year, we have become increasingly aware that the problems we have identified for women at Duke cannot be fully understood, much less tackled successfully, until we know more about the experiences and attitudes of men. We have included a small number of men in some of our focus groups, but we are convinced that it will be important to learn more about how men perceive their own Duke experience, and about the special problems and challenges that they may face. Our goal is to make Duke a better place to live, work and study, both for women and for men.

WHAT HAVE WE DISCOVERED?

The last time the status of women was explicitly on Duke's university-wide agenda was in 1994-5, when a commission charged by the president considered this issue and commented on the striking absence of information about the situation of women at Duke. The major recommendation of that group was for better methods of data collection, and better guidelines for keeping and comparing data longitudinally. In the intervening years, our institutional capacities for sophisticated data collection and analysis have improved substantially, so the Women's Initiative was able to act immediately to remedy the problem identified in 1995.

To summarize what will be explained in greater detail in each of the subsequent sections of this report, we have learned a number of interesting things about the situation of women at Duke. Today, as in the past few decades, entering classes of undergraduates at Duke are almost equally divided between male and female students, with a slightly higher percentage of women in Trinity College and of men in the Pratt School of Engineering. Today, as in the past, women constitute a very high percentage of the



entering classes in the School of Nursing. Today, unlike what would have been true a few decades ago, women are equally represented in the entering classes of most of our graduate departments in the humanities, social and biological sciences, as well as in several of the professional schools – including Medicine, Law, Divinity and the Nicholas School of Environmental and Earth Sciences. Women are also a substantial and growing percentage in the Fuqua School of Business and the Pratt School, and in the graduate programs in the natural sciences.

In the faculty, the growth has been slower. In 1973, after Duke became fully “co-educational,” 8.4% of the Duke faculty outside the School of Medicine were women; today, 23% of the tenured and tenure track faculty across the university are female, with somewhat higher percentages among other regular faculty ranks, and in several of the schools of the university. One of the most striking findings of this Report is that the percentage of Duke assistant professors who are women has remained stagnant in the past decade, while the number of full and associate professors has grown less than we might have hoped.

This fact, and the continuing small percentage of women in the ranks of the senior leadership, provide the first evidence that the progress towards full inclusion of women in the faculty and administration of Duke University remains slow and uneven across the institution. These data provide a striking contrast with the progress that has been made and is being made in the admission and graduation of students in each of the schools of the university.



Such findings have often been interpreted as evidence for the “trickle up” or “pipeline” hypothesis, with the connotation of a steady flow – that women are making their way into the professions gradually, achieving equality first in the classroom, then in the ranks of the junior professionals, and eventually will be equally represented at all stages. Our analysis does not support this hypothesis, nor the alternative that the pipeline is “leaky” at every stage along the way. It is clear that the flow through the pipeline now moves smoothly until particular specific points are reached. There is a stubbornly durable blockage at the point when an individual could be moving into the ranks of tenure-track faculty members, and another blockage at the stage of promotion to full professor, or movement into the senior administrative leadership. We suggest that the appropriate metaphor is of a pipeline that is obstructed at specific points, rather than with “leakages” all along the way.

Women and men, our data make clear, increasingly follow the same paths through Duke to the point where they take their final professional degrees. But then striking differences begin to emerge, in terms of the numbers of women who choose to commit themselves to the goal of becoming full members of the tenured professoriate or the senior leadership of the university, and are able to sustain these ambitions to the point where the goal is achieved.

We are aware that these are not exactly the same cohorts – that is, Duke does not recruit most of its faculty and staff members directly from among its graduates. However, we believe that the patterns we have discovered fit within patterns that obtain more generally, in terms of choices made and obstacles faced by women and men who would like to combine demanding careers with family life; the resulting statistics across an entire society and many of the professions are generally quite similar to those we have found at Duke.

To provide the context for these findings, one needs to combine quantitative data analysis with qualitative observations, gleaned from conversations and focus groups. On the basis of such encounters, we have gathered a number of consistent impressions that are less easily quantifiable, but nonetheless worth remarking as we attempt to understand and confront the situation we describe.

We have found that even though women in each of our constituencies report challenges and accomplishments that are distinctive to their work or stage in life, certain themes recur among conversations and focus groups with all constituencies. Women from undergraduate life through junior faculty, employees and administrators report that they would welcome and benefit from more advising and mentoring. Thoughtful advice from any sympathetic and knowledgeable person would be helpful; mentoring from other women who have preceded them on the path they have chosen is something they would particularly wish to have, but in many cases, there are too few such potential mentors.

Women from all constituencies also report that they occasionally face lingering, subtle but nonetheless pervasive and debilitating stereotypes and prejudicial expectations about what they can accomplish. Many of these same women also report that they have found many people here supportive of their efforts and ambitions. Women across Duke also expressed occasional concerns about their personal security and safety, especially in navigating a large campus after dark. Like many of the concerns we have identified, this is hardly unique to Duke, but that does not diminish our responsibility to address the problem.

It is clear, also, that some other forms of identification cut across gender to create particular problems or sources of support for some Duke women. African-American women sometimes experience a rather different Duke from their Euro-American counterparts, with reinforcing stereotypes as well as sources of sisterhood and support. The same is true, to a lesser extent, for women from other ethnic minority groups. Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered women (and men) uniformly comment on the pervasiveness of expectations that life is always organized around a heterosexual norm, and occasionally report outright homophobia as well.

In terms of findings that are more specific to each particular constituency, we have learned a number of interesting things, not all of them, by any means, predictable at the outset of our work.

Most undergraduates come to Duke with a fairly well-developed set of cultural expectations about how women and men should behave, communicated in powerful ways by the messages of contemporary popular culture and formative high school experiences. We have learned that, contrary to what one might wish for in a residential educational institution dedicated to personal growth and exploration of diverse experiences, such cultural expectations are powerfully reinforced for many students at Duke. These norms are clearly not conducive to equal participation as members of a community of scholars; but they run very deep, and are profoundly influential in the lives of our students. They are strongly gender-specific, in terms of everything from what one should eat or how one should dress to romantic and sexual encounters, even reaching into what is regarded as appropriate in terms of intellectual assertiveness or interest in leadership.

The ideal of “effortless perfection” described eloquently by many Duke female undergraduates creates a climate for many students that too often stifles the kind of vigorous exploration of selfhood and development of enlightened respect for members of the opposite sex that one would hope to see at a place of the quality and character of Duke.

Such suffocating norms appear to be considerably less powerful among graduate and professional students. Despite the well-known strains and challenges young people at that age encounter, our research has shown that their lives are in many ways the freest of gender norms, stereotypes and pressures, of any Duke constituency. Such norms and pressures are by no means completely absent; in some departments, schools or programs, they can be perceived as significantly debilitating by some students. However, our information shows that such norms are less dominant in the landscape of many people’s lives than they are for undergraduates, or even for many faculty members and employees.

Faculty members and employees report very little direct sexual harassment, even though such behavior is of course not entirely absent at Duke. But there is a disturbing sense of lack of equal respect or perceived equal opportunity for advancement, surely not across the board, but reported in many situations and by many respondents. Here, as in a number of other instances, race can be a crucial factor along with gender, and the experiences of African-American women, especially, differ in significant ways from those of white colleagues.

Finally, graduate and professional students, faculty members and employees alike report consistently that their lives are very complicated in terms of juggling career and family. The lack of accessible, affordable child care was reported early and often as one of the major obstacles women face to professional development. Child care is not, of course, only a woman’s issue. But at Duke, like most places in our society, it is still most likely to be the woman in any given family who takes primary responsibility for child care, either personally or through making arrangements that allow for professional activity. The same is true for care of elderly parents or sick members of the family. We heard multiple pleas for more help in making Duke more “family-friendly” in such respects.

The arrangements that individual families make to deal with such issues in our society are often complex, tenuous and expensive. Here, as in other ways, economic class reinforces gender differences, since it is easier for highly compensated employees to pay for the kinds of arrangements that make parents feel comparatively comfortable working long hours outside the home. As one medical faculty member put it: “It really does take a village. And I’ve hired a village.” For lower-paid employees, making ends meet and providing opportunities for their children often means that one or both parents work two jobs, and child care arrangements depend on the help of family and neighbors as well as affordable child care providers.

WHAT DO WE PROPOSE TO DO ABOUT IT?

Given this rather complicated picture, the steering committee of the women’s initiative has concentrated on making specific recommendations to improve the situation for women in each constituency of the university. These recommendations are listed at the end of each section of the

report, and gathered as a whole in the concluding section. Some have already been implemented, and others will be implemented in the months ahead.

We are aware that the scale of the solutions we propose at this stage is not by any means commensurate with the complexity of the problems we have identified, especially for undergraduates. We suggest some first steps that we are confident will make a difference. But we are well aware that the work has only begun, and that there is much more to do in order to tackle effectively the varied challenges we have identified for women at Duke. We see this endeavor as a work in progress, not a static set of observations or conclusions, and we hope that it will be so regarded by many of our colleagues now and in the future.



It will be important to establish benchmarks for measuring progress, and institute procedures that will ensure that the work continues, and that we regularly pause to see how much has been accomplished, and what remains to be done. We hope that these actions will be taken in the same spirit of thoughtful analysis, careful data gathering, and deliberative construction of solutions that has marked our initiative.

WHAT KIND OF GOALS MIGHT WE AIM FOR?

On a more personal note, I hope that our successors will keep in mind the kinds of ideals and goals that we occasionally discussed in our meetings as a steering committee, to indicate the directions in which we might hope to move over time. In a speech I gave to the Woman's College anniversary celebration at Duke in November 2002, I tried to explain the characteristics of a more egalitarian ideal toward which we might progress in the future in terms of a "more truly co-educational university."

Duke has, for many decades, described itself as a "co-educational university," but it is abundantly clear, for our university as for all contemporary "co-educational" institutions, that disparities in the experiences of Duke women and men, as students, faculty members and employees, make this term only very partially appropriate. Having in mind some conception of what such an institution might look like can help put our findings and recommendations into context.

In a truly co-educational institution, the numbers of women in the faculty and senior administration would be proportional to the numbers of women receiving advanced degrees and choosing careers in management – that is, 50/50. These women would have equal chances of being promoted, taking positions of leadership, occupying named chairs. Whatever career a young woman aspired to, she would see impressive role models every day at Duke.

A truly co-educational institution would recognize that individuals have unique gifts, and not pattern or channel women and men into sex-stereotypical slots. If there are consistent genetic or temperamental patterns that differentiate many women from their male colleagues – for example, if they care more, in general, about spending time with their infant children – this would not become the basis for assuming that they are less ambitious for eventual success, or less capable, less interesting colleagues.

The climate in the classroom and the office would no longer be “chilly,” in the sense that the contributions of women are sometimes downgraded and men dominate the conversations. If women turn out to have distinctive voices in these conversations, those voices would be valued, and they would be heard.

Male students would not regard their female classmates as fair game for sexual predation, nor would supervisors regard their female employees in this light. Women students would not assume that their worth is measured by their ability to attract men. The campus would be a safer place for women (and men), in every sense of the word.

Women and men in a truly co-educational institution would receive good counseling about career opportunities and would be urged to set high standards for themselves, even as they are given thoughtful advice about the complexities of combining personal and professional success. Men would be encouraged to take more responsibility for their homes and families, and not be regarded as eccentric or less than serious about their jobs if they choose to do this. Meetings would be scheduled at times that make it easier for people to combine professional and personal lives, and performance would not be measured in the number of hours that a person works at night or on the weekends.

Gender would not be irrelevant in such a world, nor sexual excitement and romance. But gender and sex would not spill over into all areas of life and make it impossible for men and women to live, work and study together as equals, and for women to flourish as human beings.


Those of us who participated in the Women’s Initiative believe that a more truly co-educational institution is not beyond our capacity to achieve, although we do not think it will be easy. Each of us would also describe the goals towards which we might hope to progress in slightly different terms, and not every member of our steering committee would agree with every one of the features in the scenario I have sketched out above. But in general, our recommendations are intended to help Duke become a place that more fully and intentionally includes women at all levels, more effectively and deliberately than we otherwise would, in the years to come.

The image is a monochromatic blue-tinted photograph of a Gothic-style building. The building features large, pointed arch windows with intricate tracery. In the foreground, a group of people, including students, are gathered near a low rope barrier. The overall scene is set outdoors with trees and foliage visible. The text "UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS" is centered in the middle of the image in a white, serif, all-caps font.

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

As a University, we participate in the education and socialization of undergraduate students to fully appreciate the life of the mind, mature in social roles that prepare them to make significant civic contributions as world citizens, enjoy productive careers and loving relationships, and successfully navigate the complex work of living a meaningful life. The college years occur during a critical period of development. It is in this context that we have tried to understand the needs of our undergraduate women students.

We have made several assumptions: (1) that gender plays an important role in the way students experience their years in college; (2) that improving our offerings to women will affect men positively; (3) that the needs of men that differ from those of women are important to study and address in their own right; and (4) that though there is much that goes very well for our undergraduate student body, it is important for us to focus on those things we would like to improve.



INFORMATION GATHERED AND REVIEWED

Duke Inquiries in Gender. Duke Inquiries in Gender (DIG) was formed in the late spring of 2002 in response to the Women’s Initiative. DIG, a working group of a dozen undergraduates chaired by Emily Grey ’03 and advised by Steering Committee members Donna Lisker and Robin Buhrke, designed and conducted research on gender issues amongst Duke University’s undergraduates during the 2002-2003 school year. DIG members sought to understand both social and academic dimensions of gender identity throughout the Duke community, holding twenty focus groups with a wide variety of existing student organizations including sororities, fraternities, cultural groups, living groups and athletic teams. In the fall semester, focus group questions centered on gender issues in the social environment; in the spring semester, on gender issues in the classroom. Analysis of notes and videotapes from focus groups revealed consistent themes and trends.

Undergraduates described a social environment characterized by what one sophomore called “effortless perfection”: the expectation that one would be smart, accomplished, fit, beautiful, and popular, and that all this would happen without visible effort. This environment enforces fairly stringent norms on undergraduate women, who feel pressure to wear fashionable (and often impractical) clothes and shoes, to diet and exercise excessively, and to hide their intelligence in order to succeed with their male peers. Being “cute” trumps being smart for women in the social environment. Men too noted pressure to wear certain kinds of clothes and adapt their bodies to certain ideals, but they felt more freedom to resist these pressures without consequences. Women who do flout the norms often remove themselves from the social mainstream, whether voluntarily or not. Sororities and fraternities play a prominent role in enforcing these norms. Students of color expressed an insider/outsider perspective on these issues; they were aware of norms of dress and body size and felt somewhat constrained by them, but also recognized that their own communities had different standards and, in some cases, greater freedom.

Both men and women expressed dissatisfaction with the dating scene at Duke. Students rarely go on formal dates but instead attend parties in large groups, followed by “hook-ups” – unplanned sexual

encounters typically fueled by alcohol. Men and women agreed the double standard persists: men gain status through sexual activity while women lose status. Fraternities control the mainstream social scene to such an extent that women feel like they play by the men's rules. Social life is further complicated by a number of embedded hierarchies, from the widely understood ranking of Greek organizations to the opposite trajectories women and men take over four years, with women losing status in the campus environment while men gain status. Students of color have different, but equally powerful hierarchies; because of their relative scarcity, African-American men hold power over their female counterparts who vie for their attention. Asian men feel themselves at the bottom of the social ladder, while Asian women move between the mainstream white culture and the somewhat more restrictive (if more welcoming) Asian culture.

Students also expressed concerns about campus safety. Women fear stranger rape, even though it is an improbable event, and wanted greater protection from this. At the same time, they felt ambivalent about the fact that they needed protection, especially from assaults by their peers. Students expressed both support and blame for students victimized by acquaintance rape, disagreeing about personal responsibility but agreeing that it harms the climate for women. Men sought to cast themselves as protectors and allies of women wherever possible, though some men of color (especially African-American men) recognized that stereotypes make them appear threatening even though they are not.

Discussions of campus leadership revealed somewhat separate tracks for men and women, with women more likely found in community service, arts, and sororities and men more likely found in student government and fraternities. Co-educational groups like the Union Board and Project WILD seemed particularly supportive places for women, along with African-American sororities that foster leadership. The focus groups did not reveal widespread gender issues in the classroom, though men and women agreed that men talk more in classes (especially lectures) and worry less about appearing unintelligent in front of peers. Students generally expressed a preference for smaller classes and more female professors.

Gender in Everyday Life at Duke. To complement the work of DIG, Steering Committee members Susan Roth and Janice Radway, with colleague Anne Allison and research assistant Erin Sager '02, conducted a study with a focus group of eight undergraduate women. Participants were chosen to represent the diversity of backgrounds and lifestyles on campus, and met as a group six times, each time for two hours. These conversations led to the conclusion that two intense pressures to conform characterize the lives of many undergraduate women at Duke. On the one hand, students speak eloquently and in depth about the intense pressures to conform to strict norms of femininity. In fact, these pressures are so ubiquitous and intense – and the women themselves are such attentive students of



the practices requisite to proper femininity – that they seem grateful for any opportunity to discuss this crucial aspect of their daily lives. On the other hand, the women also testify about their efforts to conform to standards of academic achievement that have traditionally been associated with masculine performance. They have internalized these norms as their own so completely that they see almost no need to discuss them as norms or to detail the long hours they devote to ensuring their compliance with them. These young Duke women seem intent, then, on demonstrating their femininity even while minimizing how hard they work to prove their intellectual merit.

These polarized standards can confuse women undergraduates unsure how best to establish their power and social acceptance, and can impede their ability to take themselves seriously as complex individuals. At this stage in their lives, they are already working hard to figure out what is important to them, what their strengths and weaknesses are, what their standards and goals might be, and what



the future significance might be of the attachments they have to others. Furthermore, the peer culture is not by any means free of sexism, racism or homophobia, contributing to an environment where women and other groups are often reminded of their need to prove their worth. The peer culture also encourages certain types of unsupportive peer relationships. Relationships with other women can revolve around women’s relationship with men and can be highly competitive. Relationships with men are often sexually intimate but otherwise superficial. There is not sufficient opportunity for close relationships with peers or adults in an environment that would encourage them to resist conformity, and help create experiences affirming women’s autonomy and self-determination.

Experiences of LGBT Identified Women. During the fall of 2003, a Women’s Initiative subcommittee of the Task Force on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Matters was formed for the purpose of data and information gathering on the impact of sexual orientation on one’s experience at Duke. The five members of the subcommittee included Steering Committee member Robin Buhrke, and colleagues Regina deLacy, Laurel Ferejohn, Karen Krahulik, and Tom Lavenir. A total of 13 undergraduate students and 6 undergraduate alumnae participated in focus groups or individual interviews. While these numbers are small, the findings are consistent with conclusions from a national study of 14 universities, including Duke, that included responses from 1, 000 students.¹ Many LGBT students on campuses across the country continue to experience an inhospitable climate. Duke undergraduate women who identify as LGBT find it difficult to come out at Duke for fear of harassment or isolation, and report living “double lives,” being ‘gay’ with some people and ‘straight’

¹ Rankin, Susan R. (2003). *Campus Climate for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender People: A National Perspective*. New York: The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute. www.ngltf.org

with others, frequently taking their LGBT social lives off campus. Virtually all respondents reported that sexual orientation issues remain mostly hidden, only recently and rarely entering into campus discussions of diversity.

ACTION ITEMS: COMPLETED OR IN PROGRESS

1. The Division of Student Affairs. Since most of DIG’s findings focused on the norms of undergraduate social and residential life, the Division of Student Affairs has begun to develop a strategy to address these issues. The Division of Student Affairs plans to discuss the following recommendations from the DIG report: (a) Provide more mentoring opportunities for undergraduate women to connect them to faculty, staff, and older students, and promote all-female environments such as residence halls, women’s book groups, and retreats; (b) Support efforts to recruit more female faculty, and offer training to all interested faculty and teaching assistants in creating gender-equitable classrooms; (c) Support ongoing efforts to diversify the undergraduate population and better integrate the campus; (d) Devote more resources to eating disorders and sexual assault, in both preventative education and services; (e) Encourage a stronger dating culture at Duke; (f) Provide leadership opportunities for students to develop in an environment that builds confidence and self-esteem, and nurture and develop emerging female leaders, especially in traditionally male-dominated organizations; (g) Challenge fraternities and sororities to focus more on leadership development, academics, and community service, and provide effective programming for their members. Collaboration with the sorority leadership to consider ways to minimize conformity pressures is already underway.

Additionally, under the leadership of Sue Wasiolek and Karen Krahulik, all Student Affairs departments were surveyed to assess the degree to which gender issues were recognized, and services specifically focused on the needs of women. Few departments noted specific attention to women, but the process of engaging in the survey has already prompted a number of changes: The Career Center is currently reviewing gender distinctions from existing data regarding job attainment and career interests, and a women’s health unit in Student Health is now in design to be implemented in the coming academic year. Additional department-specific recommendations following from the survey findings are under discussion.

2. Undergraduate Woman’s Leadership Program. In light of the findings about undergraduate life described above, several members of the Steering Committee decided to formulate a plan for a sustained women’s leadership program. During the spring of 2003, Steering Committee members Susan Roth and Donna Lisker met with colleagues Zoila Airall, Anne Allison, Alma Blount, Judith Ruderman, and Laurie Shannon to discuss the rationale for developing a program for women undergraduates. By creating a sustained woman’s leadership program at Duke, undergraduate women who participate will receive some of the benefits of a single-sex educational experience embedded within their otherwise coeducational college life. The goal is to develop a curricular and co-curricular program that will

encourage and nurture women to set their own norms and standards, and assume positions of leadership in an environment where the undergraduate men still predominantly define and control social and academic engagement. While leadership can take many forms, it rests most significantly on the notions that one must think critically about what one observes and learns, have the courage to make choices that may not conform to normative pressures, and have the confidence to speak out about one's views and convictions. For women, leadership additionally requires an awareness of the significance of gender in everyday life.


The inclusion of both curricular and co-curricular components, the opportunity to put theory into action through internships, the expectation that students show leadership on campus through student organizations, the participation from women who are diverse with regard to backgrounds and interests, and the focus on mentoring from faculty, administrators, and older peers are all key elements of the four-year program as currently envisioned. The program will also include a lecture series and other events that benefit the entire campus community. Donna Lisker, with the help of an advisory board, is currently working on a detailed proposal for the program.

3. Task Force on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Matters. This task force was charged in 1991 by then-President Brodie to make recommendations for changes in the University Community and seek implementation of these recommendations relating to support services, educational programs, and climate for LGBT members of the University and Health System communities. Over the years, the Task Force has been involved in key initiatives, including the establishment of the Center for LGBT Life, the Program in the Study of Sexuality, same-sex unions in the Chapel, and same-sex spousal benefits for graduate students, staff, and faculty. We recommend that this task force continue its leadership role, and work with the Division of Student Affairs and the Office of Institutional Equity in developing recommendations to raise the visibility of LGBT issues and to improve the climate for LGBT students.



ALUMNAE

As research plans for undergraduate students took shape, members of the Steering Committee realized we would better understand their experiences if we spoke not only with current students, but also with Duke alumnae. These women could provide a set of comparative data, helping the Steering Committee understand which undergraduate issues are long-standing and which are relatively new. Alumnae could also reflect on how well Duke prepared them for their subsequent personal and professional lives.



Total	116,817
Women	47,427

INFORMATION GATHERED AND REVIEWED

Women's Steering Committee members Allison Haltom, Donna Lisker, and Ellen Medearis formed the subcommittee conducting this research, with assistance from staff in their offices, other members of the Steering Committee, and other Duke colleagues who served as guest facilitators. They decided to conduct focus groups in seven areas with high concentrations of Duke alumnae: New York, Washington, DC, Los Angeles, Chicago, San Francisco, the Triangle, and Atlanta (though the Los Angeles trip was canceled due to illness). In each location a random sample of Duke alumnae from the classes of 1954 to 2000 was selected, and these women were then invited by letter to participate in 90-minute focus groups at a central location in their city. Between five and seven such groups were conducted in each of the six locations visited. While most alumni events have an acceptance rate of approximately 10%, the acceptance rates in this research ranged from 13%-18%.

Results were consistent across all the cities and featured several common themes. Alumnae expressed overall satisfaction with their academic preparation, but younger alumnae expressed concern that the environment was not sufficiently intellectual. Graduates from all eras complained about a subpar academic advising and mentoring system that left them too much on their own, without benefit of faculty guidance and role modeling. Although they recognized that, as undergraduates, they may have been insufficiently proactive in seeking help, alumnae were nearly unanimous that faculty should be more involved in students' lives and more available as mentors and role models. They also agreed that they would have benefited from the presence of more female faculty.



Conversations about social life tended to divide by class year, with graduates of the Woman's College recalling very different experiences than graduates of Trinity. Those who graduated after 1990, for example, spoke of the toll that eating disorders took on the undergraduate female population, while those who graduated before this date did not perceive that issue as relevant. Alumnae found more common ground on the topic of sororities and fraternities. Virtually all agreed that sororities should not live together in order to preserve the current system where women have multiple social options. Those who belonged to sororities remember them as primarily social, and as good sources for female friendships. Some recalled sorority rush with regret, believing it encouraged superficiality. Alumnae were generally critical of fraternities, though they recognized their importance in the lives of their members. They noted that fraternities controlled the social scene to the detriment of women, and recalled feeling that they had to play by the men's rules, or not at all.

Sexual assault and safety issues came up in every city across many decades of alumnae. Alumnae also talked about personal confidence, although sharp differences became apparent between Woman's College graduates (who felt Duke built their confidence) and many Trinity graduates (who experienced crises of confidence at Duke). Part of the confidence gap for younger alumnae arose from their lack of connection to upperclass women students; they had much less access to them as mentors in their residence halls than did graduates of the Woman's College. Woman's College graduates also expressed greater satisfaction with the leadership opportunities available to them at Duke than did their younger peers.

Focus groups highlighted how rapidly career expectations have changed for women over the past fifty years. Although many Woman's College alumnae started on the traditional path of marriage and motherhood, they also demonstrated great adaptability and inventiveness as opportunities opened to them. Younger graduates had more choices from the start, but also expressed frustration at being channeled into traditionally male roles. Graduates from all decades expressed dissatisfaction with the Career Center for being too focused on business and law careers and not focused enough on other options. They wished Duke had encouraged them to identify and explore their passions. Alumnae also felt Duke could do a better job preparing them for the sexism they would likely face in the working world, and could teach more "real world" skills. They identified work/life balance issues as compelling, and encouraged Duke to start talking about these issues to students early on in their undergraduate careers.



ACTION ITEMS: FOR IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

Many of the recommendations that appear in the Alumnae Report support the recommendations already receiving attention by the Division of Student Affairs (as described above). We list below additional recommendations that are complementary, and focus on the intellectual environment and “life after Duke.”


1. **Extend Classroom Learning.** We recommend that there be an investigation of residential and non-residential structures and programs that could extend classroom learning and conversation. Residential options might include more faculty and/or graduate students in residence halls. Non-residential options might include “conversation” and subject tables in the dining areas that would involve faculty and graduate students.
2. **Improve Academic Advising and Mentoring.** We recommend that there be an investigation of ways to improve the usefulness of the academic advising system, and the importance students attach to it.
3. **Expand and Improve Career Center Outreach to all Students.** We recommend that there be an investigation of ways to improve the Career Center’s ability to prepare students for work in publishing, the arts, the non-profit world, and non-traditional fields, and to prepare women for life in male dominated fields. Sheila Curran, the new Director of the Career Center, has begun some of this investigation.
4. **Continued Alumni Involvement.** We recommend the continued involvement of the Alumni Association in programming for women alumnae, as well as consideration of how alumnae might play a role in the mentoring needs of our undergraduates.

A blue-tinted photograph of a group of people walking on a path. In the foreground, a sign is visible with the word "DUKE" on it. The background shows a large, leafy tree. The overall scene is a campus setting.

GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS

As they begin graduate or professional training, students enter a time of intense focus on and commitment to the studies that will prepare them for their future careers. To stay confidently on course, they must effectively deal with a variety of challenges to their commitment, whether from the pull of family responsibilities, the uncertainty of future prospects, the strain of a tight budget, the insecurity grown from changing values and interests that naturally occur at a young age, or simply from the amount of hard work involved in obtaining an advanced degree. Women and minorities face some special challenges with regard to comfort in their programs of study, which underscores the need for support from individual faculty mentors, as well as from individual school and university resources.

GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS



INFORMATION GATHERED AND REVIEWED²

Steering Committee member Jacqueline Looney, along with colleague Tomalei Vess, led the research effort on graduate and professional students in collaboration with the Council on Graduate and Professional Student Affairs. The Council is made up of representatives from the student affairs areas of each of Duke's eight graduate and professional schools: Fuqua School of Business (Pam Brown), Divinity School (Greg Duncan), Pratt School of Engineering (Hadley Cocks), Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Science (Cynthia Peters), The Graduate School (Jacqueline Looney), Law School (Jill Miller), School of Medicine (Caroline Haynes), and School of Nursing (Terris Kennedy). The purpose of the research was to examine gender, mentoring, and the academic support system as experienced by Duke graduate and professional students.

A Web-based survey, generating both quantitative and qualitative data, and focus groups were employed to identify areas of concern to students. The survey was sent to approximately 3900 post-first year students, with a response rate of approximately 20%. Female students responded at a higher rate than male students (approximately 60% of the respondents were female). In addition, 69 women and 27 men participated in 16 focus groups, conducted in all schools except Medicine. Participants expressed appreciation for the opportunity to share their experiences with other students and the University, stating that the discussion reduced fears that their experiences with graduate and professional school were unique.

Student awareness and use of campus services vary with the resource itself, by school, and by gender. In general, female students are both more aware than males of the specific ways in which campus resources can help, and more likely to take advantage of these resources. However, female students feel significantly less safe than male students in academic buildings, parking lots, and when walking or

² We did not systematically study house staff and other post-doctoral students and fellows. However, we are aware that there are inconsistencies surrounding employee benefits to which they are entitled that are being discussed in the Office of the Provost and the Office of the Dean in the School of Medicine.

biking on and off campus. Student satisfaction with mentoring varies significantly by school. Overall, more than a third of the students expressed that communication with faculty is often difficult. Up to 19% of the students in a given school reported that they were without mentors. While both quantitative and qualitative data point to mentoring as an area of concern, there is also consistent evidence that Fuqua and the School of Nursing provide two different, effective models of good mentoring that are worthy of study.

Faculty mentoring is particularly important to female students as they evaluate their performance and progress. Focus group data indicate that the experiences of women and students of color are particularly shaped by their interaction with faculty, and that generally the schools have not yet been successful in creating a comfortable environment for their graduate and professional students who are diverse with regard to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation,³ culture, language, marital status, and parental status. In the survey, while male students reported feeling less satisfied with feedback from faculty and staff, and less satisfied with support from their school, department, or program, they also reported feeling that they fit into their department or school more often than female students. Similarly, a higher percentage of male students reported feeling confident in their academic and professional environment. According to the survey, the confidence of female students decreases more significantly than that of their male counterparts upon entering graduate or professional school.

Survey questions dealing with obstacles to success and career plans also revealed both school and gender differences. Perhaps most striking, however, are the generalizations one can make about graduate and professional students: “financial commitment” and “maintaining motivation” emerge as the most significant obstacles for success; more than one-third of the respondents indicated that their career plans changed since entering their graduate program; and though students are generally satisfied with their overall graduate experience, a third of students have seriously considered leaving their program. Focus group results indicated that students also feel that family obligations present significant obstacles throughout their career, with women shouldering the greater burden here. Finally, focus group results point to the importance of role models for women and students of color.



³ Three graduate students and four graduate alumnae were interviewed in the study mentioned previously on the experiences of LGBT identified women. While the climate for LGBT graduate and professional students reportedly varies across schools and departments, the environment is not generally described as hospitable.

ACTION ITEMS: COMPLETED OR IN PROGRESS

1. Security Task Force. President Keohane has formed an ad hoc Security Task

Force whose charge is to develop a plan for improving security problems in the University and Health System by December 15, 2003. The task force is composed of University and Health System administrators with expertise to make and implement decisions relevant to improving security and perceived safety at Duke.

2. Child Care. In response to the work of the Women's Initiative Steering Committee, the Children's Campus is expanding from 76 to 153 slots. Twenty-four slots will be added for infants, and fifteen slots will be available for toddlers. For the first time, the Children's Campus will be open to children of graduate and professional students. Furthermore, an annual subsidy of \$100,000 will be available to help Ph.D. students to underwrite childcare expenses at Duke Children's Campus and other childcare facilities.⁴ In addition, the current Child Care Scholarship Fund has received additional funding for two years, and a commitment to pursue sustained funding. Finally, the viability of a child-care cooperative run by student parents is currently being investigated.

ACTION ITEMS: FOR IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

1. Deans' Cabinet. We recommend that the Deans of the Schools, with leadership from the Provost, develop a strategy to deal with the following broad recommendations from the graduate and professional student report for each department or school:

(a) Establish a formal mentoring process for graduate or professional students, along with mechanisms for evaluation, that is sensitive to the broad range of diversity issues; (b) Support ongoing efforts to diversify the graduate and professional student population and better integrate the campus; (c) Continue to provide and improve career services; (d) Maintain good communication with the Council on Graduate and Professional Student Affairs' representatives to ensure assessment and provision of necessary resources for student needs; (e) Maintain good communication with graduate and professional students about university and school services available to them, including services for student parents.




2. Expand and Improve Career Center outreach to Graduate Students. We recommend that there be an investigation of ways to improve the Career Center's outreach to graduate students.

⁴These subsidies are in keeping with the length of time it takes to complete the Ph.D., as well as with the educational funding afforded Ph.D. students by the Graduate School. In combination, these factors discriminate the needs and expectations of Ph.D. students from those of other graduate and professional students.



FACULTY

There is a strong commitment to increase the representation of women on our faculty. The commitment arises out of considerations of equity and the search for the best faculty possible, and from the recognition that excellence in teaching and research and in the preparation of our students requires a broadly diverse faculty. Improving the gender balance in our faculty requires success in both recruitment and retention.



Total	2,362
Women	671

INFORMATION GATHERED AND REVIEWED

Women’s Faculty Development Task Force. As a part of the Women’s Initiative, a Task Force was charged by President Keohane and Provost Lange with proposing strategies to address issues of recruitment and retention of faculty women. The Task Force met regularly across a three month period beginning in December, 2002 to (1) discuss quantitative data that had already been collected by Steering Committee member Susan Roth, working with the Provost’s office, on behalf of the Women’s Initiative; (2) discern the availability of women faculty in different disciplines; (3) discuss interview data already collected on behalf of the Women’s Initiative Steering Committee, as well as additional interview data collected by the Task Force members; (4) evaluate information on the status of women faculty that had been provided at the request of the President and Provost by the Deans; (5) develop recommendations regarding the recruitment and retention of faculty women. Five members of the Task Force (Ann Brown, Berndt Mueller, John Payne, Janice Radway and Susan Roth, chair) were also members of the Women’s Initiative Steering Committee. With the additional members (April Brown, Carla Ellis, Peter Euben, Karla Holloway, and Trina Jones), the Task Force provided good representation of the faculty in the professional schools and the divisions in Arts and Sciences.

Women are not well enough represented on the regular rank faculty. At the Assistant Professor rank, there have been little or no gains in the percentage of women over a 10-year period starting in the fall of 1991, and this is NOT the national trend. While there has been improvement over time across the schools in the percent of women at both the Associate and Full Professor levels, women at the Full Professor rank still represent a small percentage of the regular rank faculty. In Arts and Sciences, there has been substantial improvement between 1991 and 2001 in the number of women in the upper ranks, although the percentage of women is substantially less as one moves up in academic rank from Assistant to Full Professor, similar to our peer institutions. Of the regular rank faculty in Arts and Sciences, women total 17% in the Natural Sciences, 29% in the Social Sciences, and 43% in the Humanities.

In the last two studies completed by the Provost’s Office in March ’01 and January ’03, neither gender nor race is significantly associated with salary differentials at any rank. However, at the Full Professor rank, being a distinguished professor proves significant in both studies, accounting for between a 25% and 30% increment in this group. In July 2002, only 18 women held this distinction (as compared to 166 men), although there has been some improvement since 1997 in the percentage of named chairs that are women. Most recently, in 2003, 6 of the 22 (27%) named chairs approved by the Board of Trustees were women, a threefold increase from 1997.

A larger percentage of women (19%) than men (12%) were denied tenure during the academic years '94-'95 through '01-'02, although women were not promoted at a lower rate than men to Full Professor during that same period (4.5% of women, and 7% of men were denied promotion). For faculty in Arts and Sciences, the time to promotion from Associate to Full Professor indicates a difference by gender, with women taking longer on average (6.3 vs. 5 years).

At Duke, women are well represented in Ph. D. programs in the vast majority of disciplines. However, additional pool data indicate that some departments in Arts and Sciences need to address the small number of women in their applicant pools in order to increase the likelihood of recruiting women faculty, while others may be able to make headway in increasing the number of women in their departments without special efforts to increase women in their applicant pools. The Deans' help is needed to establish the actual availability of talented women faculty in all disciplines, and thus the realistic hiring opportunities faced by individual units at Duke.

Faculty interview data⁵ brought forward six issues of note: (1) the fall off in the number of women Ph.D.s choosing to pursue academic research careers; (2) narrowly defined searches that significantly restrict the pool of eligible women, and decrease the likelihood of recruiting women faculty; (3) the sense of isolation among some faculty women; (4) the desire for mentoring on the part of some women faculty around women's issues; (5) the need for recognition of extraordinary service on the part of tenured faculty women; and (6) the problem created by partner hires for the recruitment and retention of faculty women.

Medical Center Focus Group Project.⁶ Under the leadership of Steering Committee member Ann Brown, and with the support of Medical Center Dean R. Sanders Williams, the Duke Academic Program in Women's Health, in collaboration with the Human Resources Office of Learning and Organizational Development, conducted 17 focus groups in March and April of 2003. Participants were randomly selected, and represented various stages of training and professional rank from senior medical student to senior faculty. One hundred and five (105) individuals participated, including 68 women and 37 men. The purpose of the focus groups was to explore the gender climate in the Medical Center with particular questions probing professional development; gender, diversity and respect; and work life balance. Findings for the School of Medicine are summarized here.⁷

⁵ In an effort to provide qualitative data on issues pertaining to the recruitment and retention of faculty women, interviews with Duke faculty in Arts and Sciences were conducted in four different contexts: (1) a case study with a social science department chair, by Steering Committee member Janice Radway and Task Force member Peter Euben; (2) meetings with groups of women faculty, as well as with individual faculty, in the natural sciences, by Steering Committee member Berndt Mueller; (3) discussions with the chairs of departments in the natural sciences, by Steering Committee member Berndt Mueller and Task Force member Carla Ellis; and (4) three consecutive focus group meetings with the same group of faculty women, nominated by the Dean, and diverse with regard to race and ethnicity, rank, and disciplinary affiliation, by Steering Committee members Susan Roth and Janice Radway, and colleague Anne Allison.

⁶ While this project included participants representing various stages of training and professional rank, we have included the description of the project in the faculty section because of its emphasis on sustained careers in academic medicine.

⁷ While the summary findings reported here are for the School of Medicine, the study did include one focus group from the School of Nursing. It is worth noting that participants in the School of Nursing agreed that there had been conscious efforts to make mentorship and professional development a priority in the School, and that the environment is one in which non-work obligations are expected, respected, and accommodated.

Changes in how the academic medical center is financed demand more time of faculty in writing grants, seeing patients, and meeting administrative requirements. Faculty have little “discretionary time,” and senior faculty are finding it more and more difficult to carve out time to teach and mentor. This change has affected both men and women at all levels and in all disciplines, and reflects an important and inescapable evolution in academic medicine. In this evolution, important elements of mentoring are shortchanged. Furthermore, with the evaporation of any financial cushion, the bar for success has been set higher, and in the basic sciences, training has lengthened to such an extent that post-doctoral students are not entering their first professional position until their late 30s. Finally, flexibility has been curtailed, creating particular hardship for individuals who need flexible work arrangements temporarily, such as for childrearing, illness, or caring for a sick family member.

While academic medicine has changed greatly in recent years, it has not kept up with changing gender norms with regard to family life. Gender norms that supported career development for many senior faculty members are very different from those operating for their junior colleagues. While women continue to take on more responsibility for the daily tasks of family life than their male partners, in the focus groups, both men and women expressed a need for institutional support for work-life balance. The desire to be a good parent and family member is no longer reasonably presumed to be a women’s issue, but rather an important concern for both men and women entering medical careers. Nevertheless, the culture of academic medicine is described as supporting a code of behavior that is partial to a conventional male model, and that equates the desire for more balance with a lack of seriousness, commitment and capability. One of the important elements of mentoring that is shortchanged, participants say, is advice from senior mentors about how to adapt to the growing need for faculty to find strategies to balance work and life responsibilities.



Prolonged training, curtailed flexibility, and a code of conduct that minimizes the importance of work-life balance all disproportionately impact women in academic medicine. The relative unavailability of women mentors, and the importance of informal mentoring also put women at a disadvantage. Focus group participants recognized the critical importance of informal mentoring, and often commented about the use of after-hour events such as poker or basketball

games to facilitate the informal exchange of information about work. Women are often left out of these informal networks. Instances where women are related to in a sexualized way (e.g., by a comment about their appearance) further undermine professional confidence and strain relationships that might provide mentoring. It is plausible that these disadvantages, along with a norm of silence around gender issues, significantly affect career development for women. While the basic and clinical sciences are attractive fields for women who are beginning their career training, there is a significant disparity in academic medicine career development between women and men.

ACTION ITEMS: COMPLETED OR IN PROGRESS

1. Parental Leave and Tenure Clock

Relief. Under the leadership of Provost Lange, a new university-wide parental leave and tenure clock relief policy was adopted by the Academic Council in May 2003, to become effective July 1, 2003. This new policy took shape as a result of a collaborative effort between the campus and the Medical Center, and represents a significant accomplishment on behalf of those who care for children, and those who experience other significant life



events that can be expected to markedly delay the research process. In bringing forward this new policy, the Provost acknowledged a broad definition of parenting and families, and endorsed greater flexibility in the timing of the tenure review. Specifically, the new policy accomplishes three significant improvements for our regular rank faculty: (1) Maternity leave, in the instance of a pregnancy and birth that do not involve a serious health condition, is no longer considered a temporary medical leave, but rather a temporary parental leave; (2) A one semester or three month leave with pay is now granted to a faculty member in the event of a birth of a child, the adoption of a child, or the birth of a domestic partner's child; (3) Tenure clock relief is now available under a number of circumstances in addition to when a faculty member is seriously ill, including when a child is born or adopted into a faculty member's household, when a faculty member is required to act as the primary caregiver for a seriously ill parent, child, spouse or domestic partner, or when a faculty member suffers the death of a parent, child, spouse or domestic partner.

2. Provost's Response to the Women's Faculty Development Task Force Recommendations:⁸

Provost Lange has set forth the following plan for his office in response to the recommendations of the Task Force: (a) Repeat the data collection process reported in the Task Force report every 3 years;⁹ (b) Establish a mechanism whereby Deans provide documentation annually on the number of women in the finalist pools of faculty searches; (c) Develop a proposal for the Deans to provide exit interviews of all departing faculty (except retirees); (d) Form and charge a standing committee advisory to the Provost, composed of faculty and administrators, to advise the Provost on faculty diversity issues and to review the difficulty and success of unit efforts to recruit and retain women faculty; (e) Provide central resources to facilitate the hiring of women faculty when appropriate; (f) Develop a proposal

⁸Provost Lange's response to recommendations put forward by the Provost's Task Force on Faculty Diversity (dealing with underrepresented minority faculty, and also convened during the 2002-2003 academic year) was coordinated with his response to the Women's Faculty Development Task Force. Here we only discuss the Provost's plan as it pertains to women faculty.

⁹We note that Duke University is currently part of a national pilot study of junior faculty that will assess professional factors that enable productive, successful and satisfying careers. This "Study of New Scholars" by Cathy Trower and Richard Chait from the Harvard Graduate School of Education is part of their effort to enhance efforts at self-reform with regard to faculty diversity in the Academy.


to ensure that a formal mentoring process is in place for faculty, graduate and professional students, and post-doctoral students; (g) Develop mechanisms to improve recognition of faculty women as distinguished chairs, and as recipients of awards and honors from professional societies, and service awards; (h) Provide resources for faculty development of personal and professional connections among women faculty that cross departmental boundaries; (i) Provide ongoing leadership and encouragement to Deans and department chairs regarding all diversity goals with regard to women.

3. Medical Center Response to Focus Group Project. Dean Williams, in consultation with his Advisory Committee on Women, and in collaboration with the Academic Program in Women's Health, has begun to consider the findings of the focus group project and to set forth a plan to address areas of need. Currently, Professional Development Seminars, for women and mixed gender audiences, building on the success of seminars provided this year by the Academic Program in Women's Health, are being designed.

A blue-tinted photograph of a woman with dark, curly hair, smiling warmly. She is wearing a light-colored, button-down shirt. Her hands are resting on a dark surface in front of her. The background is slightly out of focus, showing what appears to be an office or meeting room with a window and a computer monitor. The word "EMPLOYEES" is centered in the image in a white, serif, all-caps font.

EMPLOYEES

Women make up the majority of non-faculty employees at Duke. In 2002, women staff members in exempt and non-exempt positions comprised 70% of the workforce, totaling approximately 15,000 employees. These women work on Campus, in the Medical Center, and in the Health System in a wide variety of job categories and pay levels, and represent a racially and ethnically diverse group. It is a daunting but critical task to envision enhancing the quality of work life for these women, so they are better supported and equipped to provide the best possible service, and are valued, respected and empowered to contribute at their highest potential.



INFORMATION GATHERED AND REVIEWED

Background to Employee Roundtables. Steering Committee members Sally Dickson, Mindy Kornberg, Susan McLean, John Payne and Judith White formed a working group to review available Duke employee survey and interview data in preparation for conducting a set of focus groups or roundtables.¹⁰ The information reviewed included data from (1) the 1999 and 2002 Duke University Health System Work Culture Surveys; (2) the Administrative Women’s Network (AWN) Forums; (3) the Women of Color Focus Groups; and (4) the report on the Status of Women in the Office of Public Affairs and Government Relations. Data from the last three sources were collected at the impetus of the Women’s Initiative.

The Work Culture Surveys identified five areas in need of improvement most important to employees: benefits relating to child birth and child care; pay equity; professional development, inclusive of mentoring; career mobility; and mutual respect. The AWN Forums, with over 120 participants, identified a similar set of “top” concerns: benefits relating to child birth and child care; pay equity; professional development, inclusive of mentoring; mutual respect; flexible scheduling; safety; and communication. Focus groups with approximately 70 women of color from across the University and Health System, both bi-weekly and monthly personnel, conducted by Steering Committee member Sally Dickson, identified similar concerns. Notably, women of color felt that their contributions were not acknowledged to the same degree as those of white women, and that development opportunities should be extended to women of color in lower level positions. Finally, the report of staff interviews from the Office of Public Affairs and Government Relations provided additional confirmation of the same issues as key to Duke employees.

Employee Roundtables. In order to extend the validity of the above information, a set of focus groups was conducted posing a standard set of questions to a racially and ethnically diverse group of women from all locations and job categories. The Roundtables were simultaneous focus groups meeting over lunch, with each focus group consisting of a small table of participants, a facilitator, and a recorder. The participant group was selected from a random stratified sample of employees chosen to represent

¹⁰ Steering Committee members would like to acknowledge the assistance of colleague Inderdeep Chathrath, and research assistants Erin Sager ’02, Amanda Glover and Barbara Condit in conducting the research.

proportions of women by place of employment (Campus, DUMC, Duke Hospital), by type of employment (professional/managerial, technical, clerical, and service), and by racial/ethnic category (minority and white). Of 260 invited women, 85 participated, and reflected the desired distribution of employees across categories. The top issues cited by participants in these Roundtables as most critical for improving the lives of women employees at Duke reflected the same themes in data gathered from other sources. In addition, these focus group sessions allowed the Committee to gain a deeper understanding of the issues and their relation to each other. The four themes that organize the findings are (1) work-life balance; (2) pay equity; (3) professional development; and (4) workplace environment.

The Roundtables revealed a deep concern about the demands of balancing family and work responsibilities. Women employees realize that men also have family responsibilities, and that, like them, men want to be more involved with their family than current policies and practices allow. They believe all staff, regardless of gender, would be better satisfied and more productive employees if they had more support from the University in the form of access to quality child-care, parental leave, and flexible scheduling.

While Duke is committed to salary equity, women staff members raise frequent questions about policies and fairness in setting pay rates. Equally important to women staff is the desire for professional development. This encompasses job mobility, as well as learning more in order to do a better job at a current position. For some, the desire for job mobility means being able to gain education and retraining so that they can move to another type of work. For others, it means assuming more responsibility within the fields where they currently serve the University. They are ready to continue their education if necessary, or to earn credentials through various formal and informal professional development activities. Appropriately, good mentoring is seen as critical to the success of all attempts to develop professionally.

Under the theme of workplace environment are concerns about safety and security, and respect. While women recognize safety is also a concern for men, they feel that more needs to be done to protect women in special settings where they are exposed to potential sexual harassment or assault. Some women also express concerns about security from workplace violence where their roles put them on the front lines in dealing with volatile individuals. Finally, women staff members report a lack of personal and professional respect. Regrettably, many employees have experienced disrespectful behavior from others.¹¹ Many women described incidents of overtly rude behavior. Just as often, women employees reported being treated as invisible. Most women in these sessions made a strong connection between treated with respect and expecting open communication from managers and supervisors and from senior leadership. They want to know more about what is expected of them and about their part in serving the University's missions. The larger meaning of respect for many women is the desire to be taken seriously and be seen as critical to the work of the University.

¹¹ Thirteen current or former staff members were interviewed in the study mentioned previously on the experiences of LGBT identified women. Participants indicated that the climate for LGBT identified individuals varies greatly across departments and offices, and that comfort depends to a large extent on the individual in charge. Overall, employees, like students, report experiences of an inhospitable climate. One specific concern expressed was in how the same sex spousal equivalency benefits are implemented.

ACTION ITEMS: COMPLETED OR IN PROGRESS

1. Work-life Balance. There are four significant changes that have been made to address work-life balance concerns of Duke employees: (1) maternity/ paternity leave; (2) expansion of Duke Children's Campus; (3) contract with Child Care Services Association; (4) flexible work arrangements.

In order for Duke to demonstrate a strong commitment to family needs, staff members who have a child or adopt a child, and are the primary caregivers for the child, will be eligible for a three-week maternity/paternity leave that is paid at 100% of the staff member's salary, with benefit continuance.



This benefit will go into effect September 1, 2003. In addition, as mentioned previously, the Children's Campus is expanding from 76 to 153 slots, and adding 24 slots for infants. A target has been set for 40% of Children Campus families to receive subsidies from Duke and/or the Department of Social Services. Also, in an effort to further increase access to and space for high quality childcare, Duke will be partnering with Child Care Services Association (CCSA). In exchange for a \$200,000 Duke donation to

CCSA, they will provide grants to selected area child care centers to improve their quality of care and to increase their star rating. Duke will then gain a commitment to a set number of spaces from these centers for Duke staff members. Duke's donation will provide additional access to childcare for Duke employees, while at the same time improving the quality of care for the greater Durham community. Finally, to ease the challenge of competing work-life demands, formal guidelines that allow for flexible work arrangements have been developed by Human Resources. These guidelines take into account best practices, and include arrangements, as appropriate, such as flextime, telecommuting, compressed work schedules, abbreviated schedule, part-time work, and job sharing. The current program, "A Guide to Managing at Duke," includes training for managers and supervisors in following the guidelines.

2. Pay Equity. Duke has been and remains committed to salary equity. Salary equity is achieved when an employer pays comparable pay (or salary) to individuals performing similar functions at similar levels of performance who have comparable skills, experience and education. Determining equitable starting salaries for new hires and promotions follows prescribed guidelines that call for a comparative review, at the time of selection, of the qualifications of incumbents and proposed new or promoted staff.

Salary review is an ongoing endeavor and reviews are routinely conducted as part of the design and implementation of new job evaluation/salary administration systems such as the IT Broad Banding system of 2000 and the DUHS Pay & Performance system of 2003. Additionally, classification and department specific reviews have been conducted as a result of reorganizations and competitive pressures, and as part of unit organization studies.

More generally, a 1999 study by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance found Duke's salary practices compliant with audit standards. In spite of this very favorable outcome, to further demonstrate Duke's commitment to internal equity, Duke elected to complete further equity analysis. In particular, a detailed personnel file review is ongoing to determine whether there are explainable nondiscriminatory factors that would influence any indicated pay disparities, e.g. performance, relevant experience, skills, education, etc. In the event that discrepancies are identified that are not justified, adjustments in salary will be addressed.

The independent salary equity review, conducted subsequent to the OFCCP audit, is the first step for an institutional review of salary equity. With the development of the new SAP Human Resource Information System now underway, routine automated analysis of compensable factors, e.g. education, years of experience, skills and performance, will be possible. With this warehouse of information available, ongoing reports for hiring managers comparing salary by gender and race will enable timely analysis of salary equity for both selection and ongoing salary administration.

In order to conduct a systematic ongoing review of its pay practices, as well as provide better communication about its practices, Duke has committed to accomplishing the following within the next three years: (1) Expand the current job classification review study to include the Schools of Medicine, Nursing, and Campus; (2) Populate the SAP HR information system with historical performance data that has not previously been input, such as educational background, relevant experience, performance appraisal rating and other factors related to pay, to facilitate pay equity analysis, and allow managers to conduct periodic reviews and monitor pay for their individual units; (3) Implement a training program, within "A Guide to Managing at Duke," for all supervisors and managers to equip them with requisite skills and competencies for effective and equitable salary setting and salary administration; (4) Charge a committee to develop a plan for addressing pay equity on a regular basis across the institution, to include representation from OIE, HR, and units who have recently completed equity studies (e.g., Student Affairs); (5) Develop a communications strategy that affirms Duke's commitment to salary equity; what is meant by salary equity; and the specific actions being taken by the institution to ensure salary equity.

3. Professional Development. Currently in the Health System, all supervisors and managers attend, "A Guide to Managing at Duke." Participants learn and experience consistent messages about what is expected of those in a managerial or supervisory role. Additionally, those attending the program gain a deeper understanding of Duke's desired work culture. Currently, Learning and Organizational Development is working with the Provost's Office to develop "A Guide to Managing At Duke" for supervisors and



managers in the academic units, as well as for faculty and physicians in administrative roles. Better management practices will necessarily create an environment where staff development is more competently and creatively addressed. In addition, to enhance the effectiveness of current informal mentoring practices, Learning and Organizational Development will launch a pilot program in January of 2004 to evaluate a more formal process of establishing mentoring relationships, along with a training program specifically designed to orient and train mentor “pairs.” Finally, to further augment current professional development opportunities, a revised tuition reimbursement program for employees will be instituted in fiscal year 04-05 in the form of a two-year pilot program that will allow up to \$2500 a year per staff member at Duke or other accredited institutions. The current tuition reimbursement program is for Duke employees who take classes at Duke University only, and this necessarily limits participation of Duke staff members.

4. Workplace Environment. As mentioned previously, President Keohane has formed an ad hoc Security Task Force whose charge is to develop a plan for improving security problems in the University and Health System, and this work will benefit all members of our community. With regard to the issue of respect, we are hopeful that the increased focus on good management, and the greater participation in, “A Guide to Managing at Duke,” will improve the climate with regard to the occurrence of disrespectful behavior. To enhance these efforts, the Office of Institutional Equity is developing an educational offering entitled, “Respect in the Workplace,” that will be made available to all members of the Duke community. Finally, Human Resources is currently addressing disparities between what is required to sign up for same sex spousal equivalency benefits, and for marriage benefits.

ACTION ITEMS: FOR IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

1. Professional Development. Duke currently offers many opportunities for professional development, expending significant resources as testimony to the value the institution places on supporting and developing its employees. And as a result of the Women’s Initiative, as described above, additional efforts will be made. However, we believe that there is benefit to forming a strategy committee led by Human Resources to ensure a more structured approach to professional development that is linked and aligned with other human resource practices and institutional needs. One specific area on which this committee could productively focus is the performance appraisal process. While managers and supervisors are expected to discuss developmental opportunities for professional mobility or current job enhancement with all employees, this process is inconsistently applied across Duke.

2. Oversight Committee. We recommend that the President create an oversight committee to monitor progress and challenges in implementing the action items described above. In the best case, if carefully implemented, these action items can result in a significant change in the work culture. We recommend that this committee include representation from the Task Force on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Matters.




BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Women’s Initiative provided an opportunity for the Board of Trustees to take a look at the role of women on the Board. Kimberly Jenkins, a member of the Board, surveyed her women colleagues about their experiences as Duke trustees. Dr. Jenkins talked by phone with eight current trustees and two trustees emeritae. The survey included a discussion of the following questions: Do you feel comfortable asking questions or making comments in a board meeting? Do you feel that your input is taken seriously? Do you feel represented by the leadership of the board (attitude, inclusiveness, etc.)? Do you have any expectations about your service that have not developed as you expected? Are there any suggestions, recommendations or concerns that I haven’t mentioned?

The responses indicated that women on the Duke board are positive about their overall experiences as trustees; however, they offered a number of constructive recommendations to ensure that discussions in the boardroom are fully inclusive. These recommendations have been shared with the Board’s Executive Committee and will be discussed with the Board in the fall, 2003.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES



Total	37
Women	14

An aerial, monochromatic blue-tinted photograph of a large Gothic cathedral, likely the University of Notre-Dame de Namur. The central feature is a tall, slender tower with two spires. To the right is a larger, more complex structure with multiple gables and windows. The foreground shows a courtyard with some figures and a small structure. The word "CONCLUSION" is centered in white, serif, all-caps font.

CONCLUSION

Our report conveys the incredible amount of work that has been done by many engaged individuals, and overall reflects well the spirit of our institution. As we present the work of the Women's Initiative Steering Committee, we are proud of our accomplishments, and we are eager to facilitate the work of following through on our action items. The attached table summarizes the status of our recommendations as of August 2003. Steering Committee member Susan Roth will be working as a Special Assistant to the President this fall for the purpose of providing oversight with regard to follow-through, and to assist in the dissemination of information about our Initiative.

For some of our constituencies, the mechanisms for follow-up are clear, as in the case of faculty outside the Medical Center, where the Provost has already established a response plan to the Women's Faculty Development Task Force Report, including the formation of a Standing Committee advisory to the Provost on faculty diversity issues. For other constituencies, some mechanisms for follow-up need shoring up, and for still others, decisions about how best to implement action items need to be made. In order to ensure successful implementation of our recommendations, we propose that the President form a commission on the status of women, with representation from each of the constituency groups responsible for the action items. In addition to the charge of follow-up, this commission would also be charged with establishing ongoing benchmarks of progress, providing annual reports to the President, and serving as an advisory board to the President on women's issues.

One of the rewarding aspects of our work this year has been the collaboration among Steering Committee members working on behalf of students, faculty, employees, alumni and trustees. This collaboration made us aware of both the similarity of certain concerns, and the special needs of the constituency groups. It also has given us a big picture look at the interrelatedness of the members of our community, and an appreciation for the need to be respectfully engaged with one another. Respectful engagement, whether between undergraduate peers, students and their mentors, junior faculty and their senior colleagues, employees and their managers, or faculty and staff, is the foundation on which we expect to build change.

We present this report with the knowledge that our findings and recommendations will lead to an improved climate for women and men at Duke. Our findings create a rich opportunity to generate hypotheses about what maintains the status quo, and an imperative to focus our attention on the creation of a balanced, pluralistic community. Our report also underscores the need to come to a better understanding of the experiences of Duke men. We trust that our report will stimulate an ongoing dialogue on our campus and other campuses about the role of gender in the life of our communities.

ACTION ITEMS	CONSTITUENCIES	STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
1. Work-Life balance	graduate and professional students	childcare (ffl)
	faculty	parental leave/tenure clock relief (ffl)
	employees	childcare/parental leave/flexible work (ffl)
2. Safety/Security	undergraduates	security task force (++); sexual assault (+)
	graduate and professional students	security task force (++)
	employees	security task force (++)
3. Mentoring and Professional Development	undergraduates	mentoring (+); leadership (+); career center (++); Woman's Leadership Program (++)
	graduate and professional students	mentoring (*); career services (*)
	faculty	mentoring (++); recognition (++)
	employees	Managing at Duke (++); mentoring pilot (++); tuition program (++); strategy committee (*)
4. Gender and Diversity	undergraduates	all female environments (+); LGBT Task Force (+); diversity issues (+)
	graduate and professional students	focus on diversity (*)
	faculty	recruit and retain women faculty (++); women's community (++)
	employees	Managing at Duke (++); LGBT issues (+)
5. Undergraduate Affairs	undergraduates	extend classroom learning (*); dating culture (+); fraternities/sororities (++); academic advising (*); women's health unit (++); eating disorders (+)
6. Pay Equity	employees	review and communication (++)
7. Respect and Communication	graduate students	open communication about needs and services (*)
	employees	focus on management (++); OIE prog (++); same sex spousal equivalency benefits (++)
8. Oversight Committees	faculty	Provost Standing Committee (++)
	employees	Oversight Committee (*)
	LGBT community	LGBT Task Force (+)

() no action yet taken
 (+) under discussion
 (++) work has begun
 (ffl) work completed*