

**Report of the Task Force on the
Integration of Female Faculty
At McMaster University**

to the

Joint Administration/Faculty Association Committee
To Consider University Financial Matters and to
Discuss and Negotiate Matters Related to
Terms and Conditions of Employment of Faculty

November, 1990

Members of the Task Force

May Cohen, Dept. of Family Medicine
David Counts, Dept. of Anthropology
Barbara Ferrier, Dept. of Biochemistry
Fred Hall, Dept. of Civil Engineering & Dept. of Geography
Julia O'Connor, Department of Sociology
Ken Redish, Department of Computer Science

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3. Principles Underlying the Recommendations
1. Introduction	4. Recommendations
1.1 Terms of Reference	4.1 The Principle of Inclusion
1.2 Background	4.2 Visibility of Procedures
1.3 Interpretation of Mandate	4.3 Principles of Equitable Treatment
1.4 Data Collection	4.4 Climate of Support
1.5 Overview of Report Structure	4.5 Hiring More Female Faculty
2. Nature of the Problem	REFERENCES
2.1 The Canadian Context	
2.2 Women Faculty Members at McMaster	
2.3 Attitudes & Environment	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In appointing this Task Force, McMaster University has demonstrated its commitment to bringing about necessary change in the treatment of women faculty members. A problem relating to the perception of inadequate integration of women within the University was identified by the Faculty Association's Committee on the Status of Women. The University has taken the first steps toward resolving these problems by asking this Task Force to identify ways to implement change.

The terms of reference for this Task Force were to examine the Report on the Integration of Female Faculty at McMaster University, to develop policies and procedures that will eliminate inequalities in the treatment of male and female faculty at McMaster, and to reduce dissatisfaction of faculty with the University. The Task Force was established by the Joint Committee, which will direct the recommendations to the relevant University bodies.

In meeting our mandate, we began with the Faculty Association Report "Integration of Female Faculty at McMaster". We collected a modest amount of additional information, in part by way of replies to a letter sent to all department chairs, and in part from the Office of Institutional Analysis.

Prior to formulating specific recommendations, we identified four principles that we believe should govern implementation. These principles are inclusion, visibility of procedures, equitable treatment, and climate of support. The recommendations are grouped under these headings, plus a fifth called "hiring". We begin with two recommendations that do not fit within these five categories. Each recommendation identifies the individuals or groups we consider to be appropriate for implementing the recommendation. To help these entities know which recommendations to focus on, the last page of the Executive Summary contains a table cross-referencing recommendations to office-holders or committees.

These recommendations, even when fully implemented, cannot remove all barriers that are based on deeply entrenched beliefs about sexual stereotypes. However, their implementation can promote a climate in which these beliefs will eventually fade.

Recommendation 1 The Provost should report annually to Senate on the progress made on the various recommendations in this report, and on the integration of female faculty at McMaster. The Provost's report will include elements that Chairs include in their annual reports to Deans, and Deans in their reports to the Provost. The Provost's report to the Senate with respect to these matters should be published in the Courier or otherwise be given wide circulation.

Recommendation 2 The Vice-President, Health Sciences, should ensure that a group be set up within the Faculty of Health Sciences to consider the extent to which the findings in the IFFM Report apply to that Faculty, to undertake a study of the integration of female faculty in Health Sciences, and to recommend ways to implement changes in that Faculty that will further the integration of women within it.

INCLUSION

Recommendation 3 The Dean of Graduate Studies should ensure that the criteria for eligibility for chairing or participating in the examination of doctoral theses are clearly documented for the information of all faculty.

Recommendation 4 The Dean of Graduate Studies should extend to all who meet the formal criteria the opportunity to chair or participate in the examination of doctoral theses. The School of Graduate Studies should include all such individuals in an appropriate rota unless they choose to exclude themselves.

Recommendation 5 The Senate Appointments Committee should consider ways to ensure that their nominations to search committees follow the principle of inclusion, and should report to Senate on the procedures they have adopted to accomplish this goal.

Recommendation 6 For all available academic administrative positions within the University it is recommended that the chair of the search committee (who would be the President, one of the Vice-Presidents, or a Dean) make known to all relevant members of faculty information about the availability of the position, the requirements of the position, the criteria by which candidates for the position will be judged and the fact that all members of faculty who meet the criteria have equal opportunity to apply for and be considered for the position.

Recommendation 7 Department Chairs and Faculty Deans should ensure that mechanisms are in place to identify qualified women for participation in important decision making committees and to encourage the participation of such women in these committees. Widespread discussion should take place within Departments/Faculties to develop ways of increasing the participation of qualified women and other under-represented groups at all levels of Faculty governance. Such discussion must take into account the real risk of over-burdening small numbers of women in some departments and address ways of dealing with this problem.

Recommendation 8 The annual reports submitted by Chairs and Deans to the President should include a list of members of important decision making committees, particularly Promotion and Tenure committees and Hiring/Search committees. Such a report should also include information about the process by which members of these committees were selected.

Recommendation 9 The Provost and the Vice-President, Health Sciences, should ensure that orientation and workshops for both Chairs and new faculty address the need to consider all faculty members for inclusion in informal networks and in invitation lists to meetings and informal gatherings with visiting academics.

Recommendation 10 Chairs should ensure that the scholarly and professional achievements of all faculty members be publicly acknowledged and widely publicized in their Departments.

Recommendation 11 Those responsible for organizing University-level lectureships should seek to include speakers who will emphasize gender issues and the new developments in feminist scholarship.

VISIBILITY OF PROCEDURES

Recommendation 12 The Chair of each Department and School in the University should be responsible for developing a written statement indicating the way in which merit recommendations are derived.

Recommendation 13 The Chair of a Department should apprise each member in writing of the merit determination made in his or her case. A person rated below par should also be informed of what must be done to alter future ratings.

Recommendation 14 The Provost's office should make available to all faculty information about the distribution of merit awards by Faculty, by rank, and by gender.

Recommendation 15 Departmental Chairs should make clear to all members of faculty how duties are allocated.

EQUITABLE TREATMENT

Recommendation 16 Chairs and Directors should allocate all teaching, and in particular that done in evenings or in the summer or that is particularly onerous, according to equitable criteria. These criteria should be understood by and acceptable to members of their Department or School.

Recommendation 17 Chairs and Directors should ensure, either directly or by way of the Chair of their Graduate Committee, that graduate teaching is distributed according to their faculty members' qualifications and that information about all qualified faculty members' research interests is made known to potential graduate students and student advisors.

Recommendation 18 The chairs and members of committees, and any other individuals charged with the evaluation of scholarship, whether this evaluation is episodic or ongoing, should systematically consult with experts in the relevant field. If such experts are not available within the University, they should be sought outside. In this case, the conditions of the consultation should be as specified in McMaster University Revised Policy and Regulations with respect to Academic Appointment, Tenure and Promotion (1977, 1980). The chairs of such committees or groups or the individual responsible should be held accountable by their Deans for ensuring that the opinion of appropriate experts has been sought.

CLIMATE OF SUPPORT

Recommendation 19 Each Faculty Dean should be held responsible for ensuring that the Faculty provides an environment that supports and nurtures all its members - and especially new faculty. Deans should hold their Chairs accountable for Departments' roles in the provision of such a supportive climate.

Recommendation 20 Senate should ensure that procedures for the selection of Chairs of Departments and Directors of Schools and Programmes are amended so that the formally constituted Selection Committees interview potential Chairs with particular regard to style of departmental governance and sensitivity to the problems of integration of female and junior faculty.

Recommendation 21 The Provost should ensure that new Departmental Chairs attend a workshop on the topics of this report. Special attention should be paid to the sources of gender discrimination and their corrosive effect on the collegial spirit McMaster works to foster. This workshop should be distinct from any training in the administrative practices of the University. (See also Recommendation 9.)

Recommendation 22 Each Chair should meet annually with every member of the Department to review career progress. This meeting should look forward and go beyond any discussion of past performance involved in explaining the latest merit award.

Recommendation 23 Each Chair should review annually for tenure all untenured faculty in the Department and review all assistant and associate professors for promotion. (That is, the Chairs should take the initiative and not require faculty to put themselves forward.)

Recommendation 24 The Joint Committee should develop amendments to the time-dependent rules in the Tenure and Promotion documents to allow a modest variety of 'stop-the-clock' choices.

Recommendation 25 Senate should modify the terms of permanent, tenured, part-time appointments to allow a variety of schemes. In all cases the assigned duties should have normal proportions of research, teaching, and administration. When a full-time appointee arranges to be on part-time status, the right to return to full-time status should be preserved. Time-dependent deadlines should be extended proportionately.

Recommendation 26 The Board of Governors should establish a working group to look into possible solutions to a number of issues related to child care for faculty with young children. Three issues that have surfaced in our discussions are the quantity of day care available on campus, the provision of 'after hours' care (e.g. for faculty teaching evening courses, or with lab work that carries on beyond the 8 to 6 time frame in which child care is normally available), and the provision of care for slightly sick children during the normal child care hours.

HIRING

Recommendation 27 The University Appointments Committee (which for any particular vacancy outside of Health Sciences consists of the Provost, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean of the Faculty involved, and the Chair of the Department concerned) should review the treatment and evaluation of all applications, and should require the Department to explain the reasons for their choice when a strong woman candidate is rejected in favour of a male candidate.

Recommendation 28 The Provost should include in the annual report to Senate (Recommendation 1) a review of the percentage of women being hired, by Faculty (and areas within the Faculty where feasible), by type of appointment, and by rank, to ensure that the hiring of women to tenure-track positions does not fall below their proportion in the available pool.

Recommendation 29 Faculty Deans and Department Chairs should ensure that when appointments are to be made at senior levels of the Faculty, every effort is made to find qualified women and to encourage them to apply.

Recommendation 30 Faculty Deans should ensure that all members of hiring committees are familiar with the information on interviewing in the Ontario Human Rights Commission's publication "Human Rights: employment application forms and interviews", and with material on prejudicial perceptions of female candidates.

Recommendation 31 Faculty Deans and Department Chairs should bring to the attention of candidates for faculty positions the implementation of the other recommendations in this report, as an indication of the type of support available at McMaster for all faculty members.

1. INTRODUCTION

This Task Force was set up by the Joint Committee (i.e. the Joint Administration/Faculty Association Committee to Consider University Financial Matters and to Discuss and Negotiate Matters Related to Terms and Conditions of Employment of Faculty) as a response to the Faculty Association Report "Integration of Female Faculty at McMaster". This section identifies the terms of reference for the Task Force, provides a brief summary of the events leading up to the establishment of the Task Force, and then states our interpretation of the charge we were given. The final two parts of this introductory section describe our efforts to acquire some additional data, and the structure of the remainder of the report.

1.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE

In a December 8, 1989 letter to all faculty, seeking volunteers to be on this Task Force, Dr. Heidebrecht stated the terms of reference for the Task Force as follows:

- (a) to examine the Report on the Integration of Female Faculty at McMaster University,
- (b) to develop policies and procedures that will eliminate any inequalities in the treatment of male and female faculty at McMaster, and
- (c) reduce dissatisfaction of faculty with the University. The Task Force will report to the Joint Committee, which will then send the recommendations to the relevant University bodies.

1.2 BACKGROUND

In September 1989, Doctors M. Ahmed, R. Howard, I. Zeytinoglu, and M. Denton completed a report entitled "Integration of Female Faculty at McMaster" (IFFM Report) for the Status of Women Committee of the McMaster University Faculty Association. The purpose of the IFFM Report was (p. 1)

to ascertain the degree and quality of integration of McMaster University's female faculty members into the structure and organization of McMaster University as a whole.

The study represented an extension of a pilot study undertaken in 1986 by the Faculty Association's Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women, dealing only with Social Science faculty. Given the results of the pilot study, the Ad Hoc Committee recommended that faculty from the entire University be surveyed to see if the results from the pilot study were consistent across the University. The IFFM study was supported financially by the Secretary of State.

This report was subsequently endorsed by the Faculty Association. Two of the recommendations in that report led directly to the establishment of this task force. Recommendation 13 was that

Incumbent and immediate past senior academic administrators (the President, Vice-Presidents, Deans) and Chairs and Directors should attend the Fall 1989 Workshop to be presented by the Faculty Association and members of its Status of Women Committee, to discuss this report and identify further means to ensure that women are fully integrated into McMaster University.

A workshop to discuss the IFFM Report was held on October 26, 1989, and personal invitations were sent to all senior administrators, Chairs and Directors by Dr. Maurer, President of the Faculty Association, and Dr. Ahmed, Chair of the Status of Women Committee. Many of them were present, including the President, Vice-President Academic, and Vice-President Health Sciences.

Recommendation 16 in the IFFM Report was that

McMaster University should develop a task force to implement the recommendations contained in this report.

There was some discussion at the workshop about how best to implement this particular recommendation, and in particular what body such a task force should report to. One possibility was that this should be a Senate Committee. Another was that it be a Faculty Association Committee. The decision finally was made that the IFFM Report in fact dealt with conditions of employment, which is exactly the mandate of the Joint Committee. Therefore, the task force should be established by the Joint Committee, and should report to it, as outlined in the terms of reference above.

1.3 INTERPRETATION OF MANDATE

At the first meeting of the Task Force, we looked closely at the terms of reference, and interpreted them in a way that seemed both reasonable and workable to us. It may be helpful to identify those decisions.

Our first charge was "to examine" the IFFM Report. We did not interpret "examine" to mean that we should produce a critique of the report. It was clear from the discussion at the October 26th workshop that there were limitations in the report, due to small sample sizes in many categories. Dr. Maurer discussed many of these in an article in the McMaster Faculty Association Newsletter of December 1989. More important than some of the details, however, is the overall picture provided by the report. It is consistent with findings from other universities, in showing that there are general problems. Our examination of the report was intended to consider each of its recommendations not only in light of its internal evidence, but also in the light of experiences elsewhere, and our own knowledge. In this context, we felt that our charge also included going beyond the specific recommendations of the IFFM Report, if that was warranted.

Our second charge was "to develop policies and procedures that will eliminate any inequalities in the treatment of male and female faculty at McMaster". This charge confirmed our understanding that we were free to go beyond the specific recommendations in the IFFM Report. However, despite the fact that the particular IFFM Report recommendation that led to the formation of this task force called for us to implement the recommendations, we recognized that we could only begin that task. Implementation would have to proceed through the Joint Committee, back to the various affected units of the University. To facilitate this, we have identified with each recommendation which University body or office should have responsibility for it.

The final charge might be seen to be Herculean (or perhaps Sisyphean is more appropriate): "to reduce dissatisfaction of faculty with the University". Nonetheless, we have addressed this issue. It has taken us into the realm of merit pay recommendations (that area corresponding to the outer edges of medieval maps, on which it was written, "Here be dragons"), which may not be what was intended by the Joint Committee, but is the place in which much dissatisfaction seemed to arise according to the responses in the IFFM Report. There were further concerns regarding the internal governance of Departments, an area to which we have been led time and time again.

We decided early on, however, that we could not deal properly with the Faculty of Health Sciences within our mandate. As was pointed out by several speakers at the October 26th workshop, and has been further discussed during the Task Force deliberations, the situation in that faculty is quite different

from elsewhere on campus. A large number of faculty have clinical responsibilities and there is a variety of methods by which such faculty are remunerated. Such remuneration may include base salary plus clinical earnings (bases derived either from MCU funding or from faculty clinical earnings in excess of ceilings), total dependence on clinical earnings, or funding by external agencies. Because of this, the IFFM sample excluded members of the Faculty of Health Sciences who have clinical earnings. As a result, the statistics reported in the IFFM Report under Faculty of Health Sciences may be disproportionately influenced by members of the School of Nursing who may have different experiences from other women in the faculty in that they are a dominant majority within their school. Of even greater significance is the fact that the experience and perceptions of a large group of faculty are omitted from the IFFM Report. Such experiences and perceptions are of particular interest since medicine is one of the professions in which there has been a very significant increase in the number of women over the past two decades. Therefore, we believe that a study within the Faculty of Health Sciences is necessary to provide a full picture of integration of female faculty throughout the entire university. Dr. Bienenstock, at the October 26 workshop, promised strong support (including financial) for such a study within the faculty.

1.4 DATA COLLECTION

One of our early activities was to contact all the individuals who had expressed an interest in being on this Task Force, to ask for their ideas. Several responded, and their contributions were very much appreciated.

Given that we had decided it was not our task to re-do the IFFM Report, the only additional data needed to deal with our first two terms of reference were some recent data on faculty hiring and progress. These were provided to us by the Office of Institutional Analysis, whose help we gratefully acknowledge. To deal with the third term of reference, we began from the information in the IFFM Report, namely, that a major source of faculty dissatisfaction seemed to be the determination of merit pay. Asked if merit increases were awarded equitably in their Departments, only 21% of female respondents and 37% of male respondents agreed (Table 3.4.6D, p. 65). That it is the hidden nature of the procedures that is at issue here is an implication that we have drawn from the differences in the very high levels of dissatisfaction implicit in these numbers, compared with the evidence in table 3.4.1 (p 51) of the report. In the latter case, a slim majority of sampled faculty -- 57% of both males and females indicate that they feel that they have personally been fairly treated. The fact that 43% of those surveyed do not feel that they have been fairly treated personally with respect to merit should be a cause for concern.

Consequently, we decided that it was necessary to try to identify how Departments determine merit pay recommendations. To accomplish this, we sent a memo to all Department Chairs on March 13, 1990, requesting: "a statement of the procedures and/or guidelines used in your Department to decide on merit increments; and an indication of the procedures you use to identify nominees for various Faculty committees." Replies were received from Departments in all Faculties, but certainly not from all Departments. The Departments and Areas that replied, listed by Faculty, are as follows. The assistance of these Departments/Areas is appreciated.

Business	Accounting; Finance; Human Resources/Labour Relations; Marketing, International Business and Business Policy
Engineering	Mechanical Engineering
Humanities	Dean's office, English, History, Philosophy
Health Sciences	Biochemistry, Biomedical Sciences, Medicine, Nursing, Pediatrics
Science	Geography, Mathematics, Physics, Psychology
Social Sciences	Anthropology, Economics, Gerontology, Labour Studies, Religious Studies, Social Work

1.5 OVERVIEW OF REPORT STRUCTURE

The remainder of this report is divided into three sections. The first (section 2 of the report) describes the nature of the problem regarding the status of women in the University. The first part of this section briefly reviews the overall Canadian context of the problem; the second part provides and interprets some numbers describing the situation at McMaster. The next section (section 3) discusses the four principles that underlie the recommendations in this report: inclusion, visibility of procedures, equity, and provision of a climate of support. The final section contains our recommendations, organized according to these principles. Each recommendation identifies the University body we believe to be responsible for implementation. The final part of that section addresses the issue of the hiring of more female faculty members, a topic that transcends the several specific principles. It is important to point out clearly that the recommendations are not listed in order of importance, but are organized by the principles that govern them.

2. NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

2.1 THE CANADIAN CONTEXT

Over the past decade several reports in Canada and elsewhere have addressed issues associated with the status of women in universities. A brief review of these reports is instructive since they indicate that the problems identified at McMaster are neither unique nor insoluble. Four inter-related themes can be identified in these reports:

- (1) the marked under-representation of women faculty;
- (2) the low level of integration of women faculty;
- (3) the issue of apparent versus real integration;
- (4) the negative consequences of under-representation and poor integration not only for women within universities but for men and women at a wider societal level.

2.1.1 Under-representation of Women Faculty

Despite the fact that women now make up over 50% of undergraduates in Canadian universities they are still under-represented at the graduate and faculty levels and the under-representation increases with level. In 1987 women comprised 50% of undergraduate students, 43% of masters students, 38% of Ph.D. students and 17% of faculty within Ontario universities. These figures are similar to the national figures. A review of the historical patterns indicates that despite the increased participation of women at the Ph.D. level within Canadian universities, the percentage of women faculty members has not increased accordingly. It would be expected that any marked change in the historical gender pattern of employment would over time be reflected in the overall percentage of women faculty. The slow rate of increase of women faculty from 13% in the mid-1970's to 17% in the late-1980's reflects a pattern of very low flow-through of women from doctoral to faculty level (COU, 1988). While the participation of women varies by discipline the phenomenon of a low flow-through of women is evident in all disciplines and at all levels and is particularly marked in the flow through from doctoral studies to faculty level (MacMillan, 1989).

2.1.2 Low Level of Integration of Women Faculty

The low level of integration of women faculty at universities is linked to their low representation. The barriers that have restricted entry also restrict integration. These barriers may stem from

- (i) gender stereotyping as reflected in the definition of particular types of studies and/or positions in terms of their assumed suitability for men or women;
- (ii) an academic milieu that fails to recognize teaching and scholarly work about and of concern to women;
- (iii) conditions of employment that neither take account of women's particular circumstances nor ensure that women are treated equitably, for example, the absence of adequate policies relating to employment equity, pay equity, parental leave, child care and sexual harassment (CAUT, 1986; OCUFA, 1989).

These barriers are not deliberately created but result from systemic discrimination (CAUT, 1986). Systemic discrimination is "indirect, impersonal and unintentional discrimination that is the result of inappropriate standards which have been built into the employment systems over the years" (Employment and Immigration Canada, 1985). In the Royal Commission Report on Equality in Employment it is argued that systemic discrimination requires systemic remedies:

...the systemic approach acknowledges that by and large the systems and practices that we customarily and often unwittingly adopt may have an unjustifiably negative effect on certain groups in society. The effect of the system on the individual or group, rather than its attitudinal sources, governs whether or not a remedy is justified.

Remedial measures of a systemic and systematic kind ... are meant to improve the situation for individuals who, by virtue of belonging to and being identified with a particular group, find themselves unfairly and adversely affected by certain systems or practices (Abella, 1984:9).

2.1.3 Apparent vs. Real Integration

Increasingly, commentaries on the status of women at universities point to the negative consequences of integration without increased representation. In the absence of increased employment of women in

faculty positions it is evident that attempts to create the appearance of integration of women into university administration will increasingly result in a disproportionate share of administrative work for the small percentage of female faculty. This is likely to be counter-productive in achieving true integration:

In fact, it can have the opposite effect from what is desirable. The over-extension and use of this small pool can make it appear that women's representation in the administrative structures has increased and that great strides toward affirmative action have been made. This can create a false sense of accomplishment and weaken the drive to more pro-active and substantive solutions (Briskin, 1990).

2.1.4 Negative Consequences

The low percentage of women faculty and the low level of integration of those represented have widespread negative implications, not only for faculty and students, both male and female, within universities but for the wider society. Numerous studies have identified the negative consequences for female students of the absence or relative scarcity of role models within universities. In addition it is important to recognize that the status of women and women's knowledge within universities is influential not only for university women. It also provides a frame of reference for men within universities and for men and women in the wider society:

What women learn about the subordination of women in the university, men also learn.... The university is a gate keeper for many of the decision making positions in our society; what the university teaches has a tremendous impact on our whole society. And the university teaches in more ways than the course syllabus (Fulton, 1989).

2.1.5 Solutions

Numerous solutions have been proposed to address these problems. These solutions involve not only specific policies relating to hiring and conditions of employment, such as employment and pay equity, parental leave, child care and sexual harassment but also involve attitudinal change. No set of policies will work without a focus on attitudinal change and the creation of an academic milieu that is as hospitable to women as to men (CAUT, 1986; COU, 1988; OCUFA, 1989).

2.2 WOMEN FACULTY MEMBERS AT MCMASTER

2.2.1 Distribution According to Faculty, Rank and Tenure Status (Full-time Faculty Members)

Note: Although the tables in this section present data for the Faculty of Health Sciences, this Faculty is not included in the totals and it is not considered in the commentary, for the reasons discussed in section 1.3.

The present distribution of women and men in the different ranks in each Faculty is shown in Table IA and the percentage of each rank composed of women is shown in Table IB. The overall gender composition of the Faculties varies from a low of 2% women in Engineering to a high of 24% in Humanities. In all cases, with the exception of the Faculty of Engineering which has only two women, women are more likely than men to hold junior rank.

2.2.2 Hiring Patterns

The number of women and men appointed and the percentage of appointments going to women at each rank in the Faculties for the five-year period from 1985/1986 to 1989/1990 are shown in Tables IIA

and IIB respectively. The numbers of woman hired to the Faculties (excluding Health Sciences) increased the overall proportion of women faculty members. However, their distribution in the different ranks has done nothing to correct existing disparities. While it might be expected that most would be hired as assistant professors, as was the case, it is notable that not one of the forty new full and associate professors is a woman. It might be argued that this can be accounted for by the larger number of appointments made in Business, Science and Engineering (total full and associate professors appointed = 36) than in Social Sciences and Humanities (total full and associate professors appointed = 4), and the fact that there are few senior women in the former fields. That is not a sufficient argument, however, because there are women of senior ranks in these fields.

TABLE IA WOMEN AND MEN IN THE FACULTIES: NUMBERS IN EACH RANK (1989/90)							
Faculty		Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Other	Total
Business	Women	0	0	4	2	0	6
	Men	14	13	13	4	0	44
Social Sciences	Women	2	9	17	3	1	32
	Men	47	44	18	7	0	116
Humanities	Women	4	10	17	5	0	36
	Men	44	41	23	3	1	112
Science	Women	3	1	7	0	0	11
	Men	110	36	26	3	0	175
Engineering	Women	1	0	1	0	0	2
	Men	50	17	15	2	0	84
Total Excluding Health Sciences	Women	10	20	46	10	1	87
	Men	265	151	95	19	1	531
Health Sciences*	Women	12	30	30	10	0	82
	Men	41	27	24	0	0	92

*Members of the Faculty of Health Sciences who derive any part of their incomes from clinical earnings are not included. Data supplied by the Office of Institutional Analysis, May 1990.

TABLE IB WOMEN IN THE FACULTIES: PERCENTAGE OF EACH RANK (1989/90)						
Faculty	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Other	Total
Business	0	0	24	33	0	12
Social Sciences	4	8	47	30	100	22
Humanities	8	20	43	62	0	24
Science	3	3	21	0	0	6
Engineering	2	0	6	0	0	2
Total Excluding Health Sciences	4	12	33	34	50	14
Health Sciences*	23	53	56	100	0	47

*Members of the Faculty of Health Sciences who derive any part of their incomes from clinical earnings are not included. Data supplied by the Office of Institutional Analysis, May 1990.

TABLE IIA WOMEN AND MEN IN THE FACULTIES: NUMBERS IN EACH RANK (1985/86 to 1989/90)							
Faculty		Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Other	Total
Business	Women	0	0	3	6	0	9
	Men	1	4	12	3	0	20
Social Sciences	Women	0	0	13	5	1	19
	Men	0	1	13	7	0	21
Humanities	Women	0	0	17	4	0	21
	Men	1	2	19	5	1	28
Science	Women	0	0	5	2	0	7
	Men	5	11	30	3	0	49
Engineering	Women	0	0	3	0	0	3
	Men	9	6	12	2	0	29
Total Excluding Health Sciences	Women	0	0	41	17	1	59
	Men	16	24	86	20	1	147
Health Sciences*	Women	0	10	13	9	0	32
	Men	5	2	14	0	0	21

Members of the Faculty of Health Sciences who derive any part of their incomes from clinical earnings are not included. Data supplied by the Office of Institutional Analysis, May 1990.

TABLE IIB WOMEN IN THE FACULTIES: PERCENTAGE OF APPOINTMENTS TO EACH RANK (1985/86 to 1989/90)						
Faculty	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Other	Total
Business	0	0	20	67	-	31
Social Sciences	-	0	50	42	100	48
Humanities	0	0	47	44	0	43
Science	0	0	14	40	-	12
Engineering	0	0	20	0	-	9
Total Excluding Health Sciences	0	0	32	46	50	29
Health Sciences*	0	83	48	100	-	60

*Members of the Faculty of Health Sciences who derive any part of their incomes from clinical earnings are not included. Data supplied by the Office of Institutional Analysis, May 1990.

An additional noteworthy point in Tables IIA and IIB is that at the entry-level ranks, women are hired disproportionately as lecturers. Looking just at assistant professors and lecturers, the all-Faculties totals show that 81% of the men were hired as assistant professors (86 vs. 20), while only 71% of the women were at that rank (41 vs. 17). Or, as the numbers appear in Table IIB, 46% of the lecturer positions went to women, whereas only 32% of the assistant professor positions went to them. Although this disproportionate hiring seems clear enough, we have investigated the nature of appointment types in more detail in the next section.

To assess how McMaster's hiring at the assistant professor level compares with that part of the available pool represented by doctoral students and recent graduates, the most recent Statistics Canada data for these groups have been sorted to reflect as well as possible the disciplinary composition of McMaster's Faculties. Table III shows the percentage of women in McMaster's appointments amongst Assistant Professors on a term (i.e. tenure-track) appointment for the 1985/86 to 1989/90 period, women as a percentage of doctoral students at Canadian Universities in 1986/87, and as a percentage of those receiving doctoral degrees from Canadian Universities in 1987. The selection of 1987 is supported by the fact that there was only a small increase in the proportion of doctorates awarded to women during the 1985 to 1989 period, and 1987 was the midpoint. (Statistics Canada, relevant years).

The validity of such comparisons is limited by the varying post-doctoral career patterns in different disciplines and the difficulty associated with this in selecting appropriate years for the comparisons. Nevertheless, some interesting tendencies can be identified with such data. For example, the lower percentage of women graduates than of students is consistent with observations made over the past 20 years that women overall are less likely than men to complete or take longer to complete the doctoral degree programmes in which they are enrolled (Statistics Canada, relevant years).

Table III provides two measures of hiring for assistant professor term appointments: the first includes only those hired to such a position directly (i.e. they had no previous academic appointment at McMaster); the second includes all term appointments at the assistant professor level (i.e. it includes newly appointed faculty plus those employed at McMaster before obtaining the status of Assistant Professor in a term appointment). For most Faculties, there is little difference in the proportion of women between the two numbers. The only ones to show a difference are Business and Health Sciences, where it appears that women often start at a lower rank or on a contractually limited appointment. There are potentially deleterious effects of starting on a contractually limited appointment, both on the person's career and in terms of personal stress. The issue of appointment type is discussed in the next section. Taking all term appointments at the Assistant Professor rank, the data show that all Faculties, except Science, have appointed women to junior positions in the past five years in proportions that are greater than or equal to their availability in the group of recent doctorates selected for comparison.

TABLE III WOMEN HIRED AS ASSISTANT PROFESSORS WITH TERM APPOINTMENTS IN THE FACULTIES 1985/86 to 1989/90 COMPARED WITH TWO INDICATORS OF AVAILABILITY Percentage of Women				
Faculty	New Appointments²	Total Appointments²	Doctorates Rec'd in Canada, 1987³	Doctoral Programs in Canada 1986/87^{3,4}
Business	8	29	19	33
Social Sciences	50	50	24	33
Humanities	44	44	43	48
Science	20	17	26	31
Engineering	12	11	5	7
Total Excluding Health Sciences	28	35	25	30
Health Sciences¹	0	56	-	-

¹Members of the Faculty of health Sciences who derive any part of their incomes from clinical earnings are not included.

²Note that previous tables include all appointments, not just tenure track.

³Statistics Canada data grouped as being equivalent to the McMaster Faculties:

FACULTY	DISCIPLINES INCLUDED FROM STATISTICS CANADA TABLES
Business	Business, Commerce, etc.
Social Sciences	Anthropology, Economics, Political Science, Religion/Theology, Sociology
Humanities	English, French, History, Other Modern Languages, Philosophy, Other
Science	Biochemistry, Biology, Botany, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geography, Geology, Mathematics, Physics, Psychology, Zoology
Engineering	Chemical, Civil, Electrical, Mechanical, Other

⁴Full-time and Part-time are included

Data on appointments from Office of Institutional Analysis, May 1990;

Data on Canadian doctoral students and graduates calculated from Statistics Canada, Universities: Enrolment and Degrees, 1986, 1987.

Competition for qualified women in Science and Engineering has become intense. A reflection of this is the high rate at which women declined offers of appointment to Departments in the Faculty of Science, 1982/83 to 1986/87. Six out of 10 offers to women in this Faculty were declined (60%), compared to 21 out of 56 offers to men (37.5%). In the other four Faculties combined the overall decline rate was 19% for women and 31% for men. (Employment Equity: A McMaster Perspective and Status Report, 1988).

Grouping individual disciplines into the equivalent of Faculties for purposes of comparison (Table III) masks very large variations within some of these groups. For example, within the disciplines equivalent to McMaster's Faculty of Science, the percentage of Canadian doctorates awarded to women in 1987 varied from 53% in Psychology to 5% in Physics. However, the numbers of new appointments at McMaster in the last five years does not allow meaningful comparisons to be made at the disciplinary level. Similarly, Faculty-level averages may mask vast differences among Departments. For example, while the overall hiring pattern of the Faculty of Social Sciences indicates that women were hired in the 1985-89 period at a level considerably higher than their representation in the pool, this figure obscures major differences among Departments.

Hiring practices reflected in the sex composition of senior ranks at McMaster are more difficult to assess, but the percentages of full professors and associate professors who are women (4% and 12% respectively, when Health Sciences numbers are excluded from those of the other Faculties) are appreciably lower than percentages of Canadian doctorates awarded to women some years ago e.g. 9% in 1970 and 23% in 1980 (Statistics Canada, relevant years).

2.2.3 Appointment Type

Analysis of type of appointment held in 1984 (including faculty members in Health Sciences without clinical earnings) showed women to be more likely than men to have contractually limited appointments (Employment Equity: A McMaster Perspective and Status Report, 1988).

Data on hiring during the 1985/6 to 1989/90 period indicates a continuation of this pattern in Business, Science, and Engineering. For the newly hired faculty at the Assistant Professor rank or lower the percentages of term and contract appointments to women are presented in Table IV. The Business faculty presents the most marked gender difference in term and contract hiring: 8% of the newly hired faculty in term appointments at the level of Assistant Professor or below in the 1985/90 period were women, compared to 67% of the contract faculty in these ranks in the same period. In Engineering 11% of the term appointments at these ranks went to women compared with 29% of the contract appointments. The corresponding figures for Science are 18% and 33%.

In order to better understand these data, we asked the Office of Institutional Analysis to do a further tally of those who had held contractually limited appointments during the academic years 1985-6 to 1989-90. Four categories were used, based on the highest degree held at the time of first appointment (Ph.D. or not), and the nature of the initial appointment (lecturer or assistant professor). Health Sciences has been excluded from consideration here, because of the large number of non-PhD appointments (14, compared to a total of 23 in the rest of the University). The numbers in the several categories are summarized in Table V.

Of those holding a PhD at the time of appointment, 19 men were hired as assistant professor and 8 were hired as lecturer; 13 women were hired as assistant professor and 2 were hired as lecturer. Of those hired at the assistant level, 7 men (37% of the 19) and 4 women (31% of the 13) were subsequently given term appointments. For the men, the average number of years in a contractual appointment before receiving a term appointment was 2.57; for the women it was 3.75. For the most part, however, these comparison figures for years to term appointment are based on women and men in different Faculties: 2 women in Social Sciences (at 3 and 5 years to term appointment); 3 men in Science (3, 2, and 2 years) and 1 in Engineering (2 years). This may affect the comparison. A direct comparison is possible only in Business (4 years for the man and 3 for the woman) and Humanities (2 and 3 years for the two men, and 4 years for the woman). It would appear that with the possible exception of time to a term appointment, the treatment of women and men in contractually limited assistant professor appointments is equitable.

TABLE IV APPOINTMENT STATUS OF ASSISTANT PROFESSORS AND LOWER RANKS 1985/86 to 1989/90					
Total Hired ¹			Women as % of Total		
Faculty	Term	Contract		Term	Contract
Business	12	12		8	67
Social Sciences	17	19		47	47
Humanities	21	24		48	42
Science	17	9		18	33
Engineering	9	7		11	29

¹Excludes Special Term Appointments, such as University Research Fellows funded by NSERC & SSHRC, so number do not match those in Table IIA. Includes tenure-track instructors, so numbers do not match those in Table III. Data supplied by Office of Institutional Analysis, Summer 1990.

TABLE V
TOTAL NUMBER OF CONTRACTUAL APPOINTMENTS, BY LEVEL OF
INITIAL APPOINTMENT 1985/86 to 1989/90 (All Faculties except
Health Sciences)

A. Those Holding PhD at Time of Appointment

	Assistant Professor	Lecturer
Women	13	2
Men	19	8

B. Those not holding PhD at time of appointment

	Assistant Professor	Lecturer
Women	2	13
Men	3	5

The discrepancy in the number of women in contractually limited positions seems to arise amongst those who do not hold a PhD at the time of appointment (Table V). It would appear, from the nature of the data, that most of these individuals are not in the final stages of obtaining one. Among the women, 2 were appointed as assistant professors, and 13 as lecturers. Among the men, there were 3 assistant professors and 5 lecturers. All 5 assistant professors in this category represent very short term appointments, in that they either were not reappointed at the end of their contract, or were hired in the final year studied.

The discrepancy, then, comes down to those without PhDs hired as lecturers (outside the Faculty of Health Sciences): 13 women and 5 men. By Faculty, there are 5 women and 3 men in Business; 2 women and 1 man in each of Humanities and Social Science; and 4 women and no men in Science. One of the women in Science subsequently received a term appointment at the assistant professor level, after she received her PhD. Among the other 17 individuals, the highest degree shown on their employment records were Master's degrees (14) or Bachelor's degrees (3). It is not obvious why there is a disproportionate representation of women in this category of employment. As well, it is not obvious that this represents negative employment practices, nor that it should require any action to change these numbers.

This investigation does point out, however, that in looking at future hiring statistics, it will be important to distinguish between those holding PhDs and those holding only a Master's degree. This factor would seem to explain most of the 67% for women hired on contract in Business (mentioned above in the discussion of Table IV), in that 5 of the 8 women had only a Master's degree (as did 3 of the 4 males hired on contractually limited positions). Nonetheless there remains some discrepancy, in that 3

women with PhDs were hired on contract, while only 1 man was. The fact that all 4 were subsequently converted to term appointments only serves to emphasize the discrepancy in the original hiring.

Faculty members who hold regular part-time appointments (12 women, 7 men) are not concentrated in any particular Faculty, but tend to be in junior ranks (1 woman associate professor and 2 men full professors are the exceptions). This number may increase if policies on part-time tenure status and job-sharing are more fully implemented.

2.2.4 Tenure

The number of women with tenure (Table VI A) and without tenure (Table VI B), and the percentage they represent of each rank in the Faculties (Table VI C) do not indicate major differences between women and men in tenured status above the Assistant Professor rank, except in Science, where the 10 male untenured Associate Professors were in all likelihood new hires. (There is, of course, only one female Associate Professor in that Faculty.) The gender difference in tenure status at the Assistant Professor level in both Humanities and Social Science might be partially accounted for by the length of time in rank. The lower percentage of tenured women than men in all Faculties, and most noticeably in the Faculty of Business, is presumably related to the fact that the majority of women are in junior ranks.

Table VII provides information on the tenure status of the faculty hired in term appointments at the Assistant Professor level in the 1979/80 to 1984/5 period. Note that this is an earlier period than was used in the previous discussion. It was selected such that six years have already elapsed, so that the tenure decision would have been made already for almost all of these individuals. The year 1979 was used to start the period both to provide a long enough interval to obtain useful numbers, and because September 1979 was the date of the report prepared by Dr. Tihanyi outlining salary differentials between male and female academic staff, indicating a beginning of efforts to improve recruitment conditions for women. Because of the small numbers of women involved the percentage differences have to be interpreted with caution. Despite this there are some noteworthy patterns.

The percentage of women receiving tenure is consistently lower than that of men. While 68% of males hired in this period had received tenure by August 1990, only 45% of females had done so. The differences are even more dramatic when the directly hired faculty are considered: 65% of males compared to 20% of females. The size of the difference in percent tenured varies considerably by Faculty (when the difference can be measured). Business tenured neither of the two women hired in this period. This contrasts with tenure for 53% of the males (9 of 17). A similar picture holds in Science: neither of the two females were tenured compared to 50% of the males (6 of the 12). Social Sciences tenured 80% (8 of 10) of the males compared to 60% (3 of 5) of the females. No comparison is possible for Engineering or Humanities since neither hired women in this period.

Table VII also shows that females took less time to receive tenure (3.0 compared to 3.7 years), but this would appear to reflect the fact that they were more likely to be at McMaster in some position prior to their Assistant Professor term appointment. For those directly hired into these positions there is little difference in time to tenure between males and females (4.6 compared to 4.3 years).

The consistent picture from the data on hiring and tenure is that there is under-representation of women in both hiring and the granting of tenure in Business and Science.

2.2.5 Salaries

Regression analysis of the salaries of all full-time faculty members in 1974/75, 1980/81 and 1986/87 indicated that women's salaries are, on average, somewhat lower than men's, even after allowing for differences in other characteristics (Report on Regression Analysis to Investigate the Possible Influence of Sex Bias in the Determination of Faculty Salaries. F.T. Denton and C.H. Feaver, 1989). This problem is presently being addressed by the Joint Committee.

2.2.6 Promotion

There is little difference in the time taken by women and men to move from rank to rank, with the exception of the Faculty of Health Sciences. In this Faculty, men are promoted faster than in other Faculties, whereas women's rate of promotion is similar to that in the rest of the University (Employment Equity: A McMaster Perspective and Status Report, 1988).

TABLE VIA WOMEN AND MEN IN THE FACULTIES: NUMBERS WITH TENURE AT EACH RANK (1989/90)							
Faculty		Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Other	Total
Business	Women	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Men	14	12	2	0	0	28
Social Sciences	Women	2	9	3	0	0	14
	Men	47	42	5	1	0	95
Humanities	Women	4	10	2	0	0	16
	Men	44	40	7	0	0	91
Science	Women	3	1	1	0	0	5
	Men	108	26	3	0	0	137
Engineering	Women	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Men	48	14	4	0	0	66
Total Excluding Health Sciences	Women	10	20	7	0	0	37
	Men	261	134	21	1	0	417
Health Sciences*	Women	10	17	4	0	0	31
	Men	32	10	2	0	0	44

*Members of the Faculty of Health Sciences who derive any part of their incomes from clinical earnings are not included. Data supplied by the Office of Institutional Analysis, May 1990.

TABLE VIB WOMEN AND MEN IN THE FACULTIES: NUMBERS WITHOUT TENURE AT EACH RANK (1989/90)							
Faculty		Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Other	Total
Business	Women	0	0	3	2	0	5
	Men	0	1	11	4	0	16
Social Sciences	Women	0	0	14	3	1	18
	Men	0	2	13	6	0	21
Humanities	Women	0	0	15	5	0	20
	Men	0	1	16	3	1	21
Science	Women	0	0	6	0	0	6
	Men	2	10	23	3	0	38
Engineering	Women	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Men	2	3	11	2	0	18
Total Excluding Health Sciences	Women	0	0	39	10	1	50
	Men	4	17	74	18	1	114
Health Sciences*	Women	2	13	26	10	0	51
	Men	9	17	22	0	0	48

*Members of the Faculty of Health Sciences who derive any part of their incomes from clinical earnings are not included. Data supplied by the Office of Institutional Analysis, May 1990.

TABLE VIC WOMEN AND MEN IN THE FACULTIES: PERCENTAGE TENURED AT EACH RANK (1989/90)							
Faculty		Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Other	Total
Business	Women	-	-	25	0	-	17
	Men	100	92	15	0	-	64
Social Sciences	Women	100	100	18	0	0	44
	Men	100	95	28	14	-	82
Humanities	Women	100	100	12	0	-	44
	Men	100	98	30	0	0	81
Science	Women	100	100	-	-	-	45
	Men	98	72	0	0	-	78
Engineering	Women	100	-	-	0	0	50
	Men	96	82	0	0	0	79
Total Excluding Health Sciences	Women	100	100	15	0	0	43
	Men	98	89	22	5	0	79
Health Sciences*	Women	87	57	13	0	-	38
	Men	78	37	8	-	-	48

*Members of the Faculty of Health Sciences who derive any part of their incomes from clinical earnings are not included. Data supplied by the Office of Institutional Analysis, May 1990.

TABLE VII									
ASSISTANT PROFESSORS HIRED 1979/80 TO 1984/85:									
SUCCESS IN RECEIVING TENURE									
Faculty		Number Hired		Number Tenured by 1990**		% Receiving Tenure		Average Years to Tenure	
		X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
Business	Women	2	2	0	0	0	0	-	-
	Men	13	17	7	9	54	53	5.3	4.6
Social Sciences	Women	1	5	1	3	100	60	3.0	3.3
	Men	4	10	4	8	100	80	4.8	4.1
Humanities	Women	0	2	-	2	-	100	-	1.5
	Men	2	6	2	6	100	100	3.0	2.0
Science	Women	2	2	0	0	0	0	-	-
	Men	6	12	3	6	50	50	4.0	3.7
Engineering	Women	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-
	Men	9	17	6	13	67	76	4.5	3.6
Total Excluding Health Sciences	Women	5	11	1	5	20	45	4.3	3.0
	Men	34	62	22	42	65	68	4.6	3.7
Health Sciences*	Women	4	13	2	9	50	69	5.0	3.2
	Men	3	3	1	1	33	33	5.0	5.0

X = New appointments to McMaster

Y = New appointments plus faculty continuing service at McMaster University

*Members of the Faculty of Health Sciences who derive any part of their incomes from clinical earnings are not included. Data supplied by the Office of Institutional Analysis, May 1990.

**None of those who were denied tenure by 1990 is at McMaster. Two men and one woman among those hired and who received tenure are no longer at McMaster.

2.2.7 Summary

The data suggest that while numbers of women faculty members are low, recent hiring with the exception of Science (and Business depending on which type of hiring is considered (Table III)) has to a large extent reflected the available pool. Other disparities shown by comparisons of men and women (e.g. overall percentage with tenure) may be explained by the recent increases in numbers of women

appointed, most of them to junior ranks. Again the experience in Science and Business is at variance with other faculties. As well, women are more likely to be hired into contract positions rather than term appointments in Business, Engineering, and Science. In addition, for the time period studied, women were less likely to be granted tenure than men. If the observed patterns are maintained it will be a considerable period of time before the sex distribution in senior ranks is altered.

The data also suggest that to increase numbers appreciably in some disciplines it would be necessary to increase both the enrolment of women in doctoral programmes and their interest in academic careers.

2.3 ATTITUDES AND ENVIRONMENT

To this point, discussion of the nature of the problem for women faculty has been largely a numerical one, focussing on those aspects of the problem that can be clearly documented. The numbers have pointed up some problem areas, but the overall problem is not one that lends itself to quantification. The broader issues of attitudes toward women, of the working environment, and of their perceptions of integration (or the absence thereof) need also to be addressed. The IFFM Report presented as clear a picture of these as can be obtained without a massive additional effort. It is unfortunate that the relatively small numbers in that survey do not permit further analysis. It would have been useful to know whether the larger proportion of women who were recently hired, and therefore the larger proportion who lack tenure, may be responsible for some of the sex differences noted. It would be reasonable for those who are untenured, of both sexes, to feel less secure in their positions. But additional factors may be operating: repeated small injustices may have a profound cumulative effect; women may have inaccurate impressions of some aspects of the actual situation of women at McMaster; and the climate of the University may be less hospitable to women than to men. If any or all of these explanations are valid, a broad approach to the problem will be needed to dispel women's sense of being outsiders.

The items we have addressed in this section can be seen as both setting and reflecting the general attitudes on campus. The numbers show that women are more likely to receive contractual appointments than are men in several faculties, and that they are less likely to receive tenure. A separate study showed that senior women have experienced salary differentials. To the extent that new women faculty are aware of these problems, they become a part of the climate at McMaster that reduces the satisfaction these women feel for their work here.

More importantly, however, these problems may well be a reflection of attitudes that need to be changed. In what follows, we do not offer any recommendations to change attitudes, because it is not at all obvious how one can accomplish that. Nonetheless, we recognize that legislated changes may remain only superficial. Only when attitudes change can there be true integration of women within the University. The current attitude of many appears to be that "all is well already; what's the fuss about". We sensed this in replies we received from Chairs. Perhaps one indication of this attitude is the difficulty we had in obtaining relevant information for the Tables included earlier: not that people were not willing to provide it, but that the data were not being stored in a way to facilitate answering these questions.

The IFFM Report showed that there is a problem, in that women faculty do not believe themselves to be fully a part of the functioning of this institution. Our own analysis here has documented a number of

reasons for these perceptions. Perhaps the most important attitudinal change needed is for there to be a recognition that there is a problem. Once that has occurred, implementation of the recommendations that follow can have a real impact on working conditions for women at McMaster.

3. PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The IFFM Report showed that many female members of the university's professoriate consider that they are isolated from their male colleagues and from the centres of power and prestige in the institution. The study showed that women believe that their scholarly work is not valued to the same extent as that of their male colleagues. Finally, the study showed that they also believe -- along with many of their male colleagues -- that many decisions affecting their scholarly lives and their remuneration are taken according to rules that are shrouded. (A scant majority of the respondents to the IFFM study agreed with the statement that the criteria used for tenure and promotion recommendations are clearly articulated (52% of women and 55% of men, Table 3.4.6B, p. 62).) The fact that these findings are relevant to male faculty as well is consistent with previous studies that have found that correcting practices that militate against members of a specific group will generally benefit all members of a community.

The recommendations that are made by this Task Force are intended to rectify the situations that give rise to these beliefs. While we recognise that no set of rules will achieve perfect integration, all regulations and procedures bearing on relations among faculty and between faculty members and administrators at McMaster University should embody general principles that will foster collegiality and provide a milieu in which good scholarship and good teaching are recognised and rewarded. Further, the principles should be enshrined in such a way that any procedures currently in violation of them, whether of the Senate of the University, the various Faculties, or their constituent Departments, would require reconsideration and amendment.

The general principles that we feel should be embedded in the University's decision making are: (1) inclusion; (2) visibility of procedures; (3) equitable treatment; and (4) the creation of a climate of support.

INCLUSION: For those instances in which members of faculty are identified for positions of power, trust, and prestige, policy should be formulated so as to include all eligible candidates. Persons should be excluded from such consideration only for cause. By this we mean that formal non-discriminatory criteria should be established by which all faculty become eligible for such positions in the University. For some positions, e.g., Chairs of doctoral defenses, this would simply mean that all those who met the formal criteria would have their names added to the rota unless they chose to exclude themselves. For elective tasks, where the numbers of persons who may serve are necessarily limited, inclusion would mean ensuring that all qualified persons are alerted to the open positions and asked if they wish to be considered.

VISIBILITY OF PROCEDURES: By visibility of procedures, we mean that all faculty must have access to information about the making of decisions that affect their lives as members of the academic community. They must know the rules of procedure and the persons who are charged with implementing those rules. The Task Force has been astonished not only at the extremely wide variance in the way that different Faculties and Departments apportion merit increments and assign teaching duties, (to cite two striking examples) but with the fact that many faculty perhaps most, including

members of this task force are ignorant of the way that things are done. This is a clear case in which it is not enough that justice be done. Justice must be seen to be done.

EQUITABLE TREATMENT: Under the category of equitable treatment, there are four concerns. First, care should be taken to ensure that there is equitable distribution of both those tasks that may be onerous or unpopular (summer/evening teaching; working committees at various levels) and those that may be prestigious or pleasant (being included when distinguished guests are entertained, for example). Second, all members of faculty must have equal access to information respecting formal policy and real practice at all levels of the university. Third, information about the work and research interests of all faculty should be made generally available to the scholarly community. Fourth, no assumptions based on gender stereotypes should be made about the interests and suitability of people for certain positions.

CLIMATE OF SUPPORT: It is vital to the success of the University that all faculty members believe that they function in a setting that by its openness, fairness, and supportiveness provides them the opportunity to carry out all aspects of their work to their full potential. It is particularly important that women faculty members, whose lives and careers have been played out against a historical pattern of systemic discrimination and exclusion, be assured that at McMaster University exclusion has been replaced by inclusion and that they are valued and welcomed as scholars and colleagues. In addition to the principles of inclusion, openness and equity outlined above, therefore, we feel that a climate of support must be created. Such a climate can only exist when the demands of family life which may affect the careers of men and women in different ways are recognised as legitimate. It can only exist when those in authority (especially Chairs of Departments) take it as their responsibility to provide supportive career guidance and advice to their junior colleagues and when all faculty (and particularly women) are made to feel secure from harassment of all kinds and have means of redress if that security is breached.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations contained in this section of the report are grouped according to the principles just identified. Consequently they do not appear in order of importance.

Despite having identified and agreed upon these principles, development of the actual recommendations was difficult. We often found ourselves caught on the horns of a dilemma. On the one extreme, we could put forward recommendations that forced the inclusion of women, but that could become simply token participation. Women would be included not for what they had to contribute, but because the rules required a woman. At the other extreme, the problem of integration can be seen as one of attitudes, yet a recommendation to change attitudes is not very effective. The problem is a complex one, involving ultimately change in society, of which the University is only a part, and relying much more on a re-orientation of attitudes than on rules. In the meantime, however, rules must suffice, for attitudes will change only slowly. The dilemma is to make sure that the rules do not reinforce the old attitudes, thereby hindering long-term change while giving the appearance of immediate change.

One of the things that can create a negative attitude on the part of faculty is the sense that it doesn't matter what policy or procedure gets passed, because implementation is still up to the individual. There seems to be a sense in which the notion of "academic freedom" is carried over to administrative

matters, with the result that there can be in some respects administrative anarchy. Yet it seems more likely that academic freedom requires administrative accountability, or strictness. Our first recommendation has to do with the supervision of implementation of this report. Since that recommendation does not fall easily under one of the other headings, it appears here.

***Recommendation 1.* The Provost should report annually to Senate on the progress made on the various recommendations in this report, and on the integration of female faculty at McMaster. The Provost's report will include elements that Chairs include in their annual reports to Deans, and Deans in their report to the Provost. The Provost's report to the Senate with respect to these matters should be published in the Courier or otherwise be given wide circulation.**

One other recommendation also does not fall easily under any of the principles, so is treated here. The Faculty of Health Sciences deserves, indeed requires, separate study.

***Recommendation 2.* The Vice-President, Health Sciences, should ensure that a group be set up within the Faculty of Health Sciences to consider the extent to which the findings in the IFFM Report apply to that Faculty, to undertake a study of the integration of female faculty in Health Sciences, and to recommend ways to implement changes in that Faculty that will further the integration of women within it.**

Additional questions not included in the IFFM survey would be appropriate in a Health Sciences Survey. These include questions about whether there is a difference in the number of women appointed to "hard" or "soft" funded positions, or in the proportion of income required to be generated from clinical earnings. Undoubtedly other questions will be developed by those responsible for undertaking the survey.

The remaining recommendations follow the order of the principles just presented.

4.1 THE PRINCIPLE OF INCLUSION

4.1.1. PhD Examination Committees

The IFFM study found that males were more likely than females to be asked by Graduate Deans to chair or participate in the examination of doctoral theses. The committee discussed this recommendation and was in agreement with the IFFM Report that these positions are seen to be honorific and bring visibility to professors outside their own particular School or Faculty. One of the concerns identified was that procedures followed in selecting potential candidates for such positions did not appear to include all those who might be eligible. At the same time, the committee recognized that specific criteria must be met to be eligible to Chair PhD defenses.

***Recommendation 3.* The Dean of Graduate Studies should ensure that the criteria for eligibility for chairing or participating in the examination of doctoral theses are clearly documented for the information of all faculty.**

***Recommendation 4.* The Dean of Graduate Studies should extend to all who meet the formal criteria the opportunity to chair or participate in the examination of doctoral theses. The School of Graduate Studies should include all such individuals in an appropriate rota unless they choose to exclude themselves.**

4.1.2 Senior Administrative Positions

Recommendation 4 of the IFFM Report called for instituting procedures whereby all senior academic administrative positions are advertised and candidates are encouraged to apply for these positions, recognizing that such procedures need not preclude nominations as well. The IFFM Report discussion of administrative positions included "Chairs or Associate Chairs ..., Directors of Schools or Programs, Deans or Associate Deans", and the President and Vice-Presidents. The Task Force believes that the presence of women at the senior administrative levels is important in achieving full integration of women within the university. At the same time, women occupying such positions act as role models, both for students and for junior women faculty. The question we faced was how to ensure that qualified women are given, and are seen to be given, full consideration for these positions.

As in other areas, procedures for selecting candidates for senior administrative positions other than Department Chair often appeared to be unfamiliar to many faculty members. The existence of a search committee does not allay the concerns. The selection of such search committee members was often perceived to be arbitrary. Since it is the Senate Appointments Committee that nominates or approves people for these search committees, and since we ourselves have no idea how they identify members for these committees, we turn the problem over to them, with some suggestions of our own.

Recommendation 5. The Senate Appointments Committee should consider ways to ensure that their nominations to search committees follow the principle of inclusion, and should report to Senate on the procedures they have adopted to accomplish this goal.

Ideas that have occurred to us include sending a letter to all eligible members of faculty asking for expressions of interest, and reasons for that interest. This need not be a separate letter for every committee, of course. A general list could be sent out each year identifying all of the search committees needed in the coming year. In addition, it would be valuable if the members of the Senate Appointments Committee could clearly identify in the letter soliciting members the procedures that will be used for selecting those members.

There seems also to be a widespread belief that members of search committees usually identify potential candidates whom they will consider and tend to value less highly those candidates who apply to the search committee for the position. We find this a strange and unfortunate way to proceed, and would like to see procedures clarified such that potential applicants know how they will be judged, and can decide whether or not to apply. If direct application is not desired (as for example on the much-mentioned grounds that anyone foolish enough to want this job is not a person we want in the position), then that should be made explicit in the statement of criteria.

Recommendation 6. For all available academic administrative positions within the University, the chair of the search committee (who would be the President, one of the Vice-Presidents, or a Dean) make known to all relevant members of faculty information about the availability of the position, the requirements of the position, the criteria by which candidates for the position will be judged and the fact that all members of faculty who meet the criteria have equal opportunity to apply for and be considered for the position.

4.1.3 Committees

Although the IFFM study found that men and women were equally likely to have served on Departmental committees and that 75% of men and women served on such committees in the 1987-1988 academic year, significantly fewer women than men felt that they had been members of important decision making committees in their Department, or that they had served on the type of Faculty-level committees that they were interested in.

The data did not demonstrate significant differences in the percentages of men and women who chaired Departmental Tenure and Promotion or Hiring committees, but in this category the numbers were very small. The IFFM Report did recommend that "particular attention should be paid to ensuring that female faculty members with equivalent qualifications have equal opportunity to chair Departmental Tenure and Promotion and Hiring committees".

The Task Force discussed the issue of mandatory representation on these important committees at length. There was agreement that the importance and status of certain committees is greater than that of others. Of particular importance in Departments and Faculties are Tenure and Promotion committees and Hiring/Search committees. The principle of inclusion rather than exclusion is of particular significance in considering appointments to these committees. The greater visibility of women in such positions as well as the incorporation of women's perspectives into the deliberations of such committees is essential to improve the integration of women faculty throughout the university and to combat systemic discrimination.

Concerns, however, were expressed about the effect of legislating mandatory membership of women on such committees. Among these concerns was the fact that in those Faculties in which there are small numbers of women, these women risk being overburdened and having their career progress adversely affected if they are required to sit on too many committees. Furthermore, women do not wish to be seen as being selected for committees merely because they are women rather than because they meet the criteria for the position. Such a perception risks devaluing women faculty and the contribution that women may make to committee deliberations, and may ultimately be counter-productive to women. Mandatory membership regulations may also be seen by some Departments or Faculties as a disincentive for developing other strategies to combat systemic discrimination. The Task Force also recognized that there are differences between various Departments and Faculties with respect to the visibility and involvement of women at the senior administrative level.

The Task Force believes that the resolution of this dilemma lies in recognition that there are many qualified women who meet the necessary criteria for membership in such important decision-making committees, and it is the involvement of these qualified women in these important committees that is critical. Such involvement is not tokenism and will be of immense benefit to our academic community. The Task Force recognizes that no one woman can represent the perspective of all women, but by virtue of the different life experience of women, they bring to committee deliberations a different perspective than do men. Furthermore, many women in our society have been affected to a greater or lesser degree by systemic discrimination. It is the awareness of, and commitment to combat, this systemic discrimination at all levels of our University that the Task Force feels is most important.

Recommendation 7. Department Chairs and Faculty Deans should ensure that mechanisms are in place to identify qualified women for participation in important decision making committees and to

encourage the participation of such women in these committees. Widespread discussion should take place within Departments/Faculties to develop ways of increasing the participation of qualified women and other under-represented groups at all levels of Faculty governance. Such discussion must take into account the real risk of over-burdening small numbers of women in some Departments and address ways of dealing with this problem.

Recommendation 8. The annual reports submitted by Chairs and Deans to the President should include a list of members of important decision making committees, particularly Promotion and Tenure committees and Hiring/Search committees. Such a report should also include information about the process by which members of these committees were selected.

4.1.4 Perceptions of Inclusion

Networks, informal contact and the opportunities for meeting academics in one's own and other disciplines constitute an extremely important component of the overall university environment and are significant contributors to the perception of inclusion and integration.

Recommendation 9. The Provost and the Vice-President, Health Sciences, should ensure that orientation and workshops for both Chairs and new faculty address the need to consider all faculty members for inclusion in informal networks and in invitation lists to meetings and informal gatherings with visiting academics.

The committee heard women faculty express the belief that their concerns are often not well understood, that feminist scholarship is often undervalued and that women's success may not be appropriately acknowledged. Linda Briskin of York University has written that "university administrations and faculty associations must take pro-active and public measures which emphasize that the under-representation of women, sexism and anti-feminism are totally unacceptable, reflect on the character of the university as a whole, and are a collective responsibility" (1990).

Recommendation 10. Chairs should ensure that the scholarly and professional achievements of all faculty members be publicly acknowledged and widely publicized in their Departments.

Recommendation 11. Those responsible for organizing University-level lectureships should seek to include speakers who will emphasize gender issues and the new developments in feminist scholarship.

4.2 VISIBILITY OF PROCEDURES

All of us concur with the general principle that confidentiality must prevail in some aspects of university life, for individuals must feel free to assess information and make judgements with respect to tenure, promotions, and the like. Nevertheless, in our deliberations we have been struck by the fact that many of our colleagues, not all of whom are either women or junior in rank, are in ignorance of the procedures by which the decisions that affect their scholarly lives and careers are made. In addressing term of reference (c), to "reduce dissatisfaction of faculty with the University", this obscurity of procedures seemed to us to be quite important. The evidence from the IFFM Report documenting this was quoted in Section 3.

Our discussions were also based on the information received from the Departments and Areas listed earlier (in Section 1.4). Obviously, there are limitations in drawing conclusions from this partial list of Departments. The problems may be much greater, or much less, than these responses lead us to

believe. On the one hand, the Departments that replied may be the best ones, in terms of their handling of the merit pay issue. If that is the case, then the situation is much worse than the replies would suggest. On the other hand, it is possible that those who did not reply experience no problems with this issue, hence saw nothing to write about. Even if there is a problem only in those Departments that did reply, there is still a very real problem, needing remedy. Hence even given this low response rate, several conclusions are possible from the replies that were received.

With regard to determination of the merit pay increment, the most striking results are the lack of consistency across campus in the importance of the several criteria, or even what they mean; the lack of clarity or openness in a number of the replies; and the extent to which the new 'par' merit scheme seems not to have been implemented.

For merit pay determination, most Departments identified the same three major criteria -- teaching, research, and service. (Medicine included a fourth, clinical activity. At least one Business Area included a fourth for community service.) In Humanities, the three categories receive equal weight. In Science, and in Economics (which may be representative of Social Sciences), the weighting is reported as 2, 2, and 1 for teaching, research, and service respectively. In Mechanical Engineering the weighting is 9, 9, and 7, and this is said to be the same for all of Engineering. Opinion varied on where some things lay: graduate supervision for example was sometimes included under teaching and sometimes under research. While not wishing to promote consistency for its own sake, some of the disparities make little sense to us. It is certainly reasonable for Medicine to have its fourth criterion, but we fail to see why service should be of different importance in the several Faculties.

Among the replies received, several were excellent, and made a number of useful points about procedure. Others were not very informative. We were simply told that the Chair rates each faculty member on the criteria and reports the results to the Dean. If we received the same information as did members of the Departments (and in one instance we received a copy of the letter sent them), we can understand why there is dissatisfaction with the process. Two of the interesting variations we received are as follows (quoted without attribution).

I do attempt to make some allowances in terms of expectations of younger faculty, by giving them lighter loads (to accelerate their research initiatives), and by compensating for their lack of classroom experience.

In our Department, we are all above average teachers so, by definition, upon comparison within the Department, we are all average in teaching component. We all do what we are asked to do in committee work (although some do it better than others) and so, for the most part we are similar in terms of our administrative component. The variance in recommendation for merit in our Department is eaten up largely by research.

Our greatest concern arising from these replies was the apparent failure to implement, at the Department level, the new career progress/merit scheme described to all faculty in a document from the Joint Committee (Faculty Career Progress/Merit Plan, March 13, 1989). That scheme is premised on the notion of par merit, "a concept quite distinct from average", and defined in the glossary as "competent performance of the duties normally associated with an academic appointment at McMaster. It follows that par is a descriptive and not an arithmetic or statistical term." Yet one Faculty uses a form that describes satisfactory teaching, meaningful service, and an on-going research program

as meriting 0.75 par increments. A Chair in another Faculty informed us that it was required in that Faculty to have the ratings for each criterion average 50% of the available rating scale. Not only has the concept of average merit not given way to the notion of par performance, but in many cases the Chair wrote of doing this alone, despite the fact that the 1989 document clearly says it is a task to be done in consultation with senior colleagues.

There are Departments that seem to have attempted to work under the spirit of the new procedures, and they have found difficulties. One writes,

The definition of competence is unclear. Faculty members may perform their duties competently but may also be relatively unproductive. If all members of a Department are viewed as competent, it is difficult to justify something less than a par increment. This in turn makes it difficult to reward the members of the Department who are very productive....

Dr. Heidebrecht, on February 1, 1990, sent a memo to faculty colleagues on behalf of the Joint Committee, regarding the career progress/merit plan, in which he suggested individuals contact their Chair if they have any questions about the plan. Although none of us on the Task Force felt moved to act on the basis of that memo, now that we have received these replies, we are less sanguine about the level of our understanding, and indeed the level of implementation of the new procedures.

If McMaster faculty were merely ignorant of procedures that were demonstrably fair and equitable, an easy solution would offer itself. That is not the case, though. We found that in many cases the Departmental procedures are given to ad hoc implementation, or, worse, are applied in such a way as to flagrantly violate both the spirit and the letter of agreements that have been forged.

Though perhaps not restricted to the procedures by which assessments about career progress and merit are made, the information we obtained makes clear the fact that there are definitely problems in this area. Procedures must be brought into line with broad University policy, and they must be visible. The principles of equitable treatment and inclusive procedures can only be assured if the measures taken to protect them are visible. The following recommendations are offered as ways to bring this about.

Item 3 in the March 13, 1989, description of procedures for merit increment determination calls upon the Chair to "make clear to all faculty members" the basis of the recommendations. This has apparently not happened. If faculty members had clearly understood these procedures, the failure to implement the new scheme universally would have been visible by now. Hence the next recommendation is not for any change, but for implementation of procedures that should already have been in place.

Recommendation 12. The Chair of each Department and School in the University should be responsible for developing a written statement indicating the way in which merit recommendations are derived.

The Chair's statement should specify the weighting that is given to the various criteria. The statement must obviously be consistent with the spirit of the new CP/M agreement, must be shown to have the support of the members of the Department concerned, and must be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty for approval before being implemented. The statement should be distributed to all those in the Department who participate in the CP/M scheme.

Recommendation 13. The Chair of a Department should apprise each member in writing of the merit determination made in his or her case. A person rated below par should also be informed of what must be done to alter future ratings.

The distribution of salary information has been done on an irregular basis in the past. Merit increment distributions are at least as important. Insofar as it can be provided while being consistent with confidentiality requirements, such information would be a contribution towards greater visibility of procedures.

Recommendation 14. The Provost's office should make available to all faculty information about the distribution of merit awards by Faculty, by rank, and by gender.

The terms of reference for Department Chairs give the Chair responsibility for determining which faculty members will teach which courses. Teaching assignments, graduate supervision, and committee service should all be decided according to procedures that are open and equitable. Faculty members must be able to feel that they have a hand in deciding the shape of their Departments and that their contributions to it and their rewards from it are appropriate.

Recommendation 15. Departmental Chairs should make clear to all members of faculty how duties are allocated.

4.3 PRINCIPLES OF EQUITABLE TREATMENT

Compliance with the recommendations listed under the principles of inclusion and visibility of procedures can do much to ensure that all faculty members are, and trust that they are, treated fairly. In addition, recognition and elimination of sexual stereotyping, which has the potential to affect members of both sexes, should be a goal. Since women in general are considered to have more nurturing skills than men, it can happen that women are assigned to, and men deprived of, work which involves these skills, whether or not they wish to undertake it. Judgements may be made that married women present risks as employees because they may leave if their husbands are relocated, or that women with children are too likely to be distracted to be serious about their careers a concern never raised about fathers. Decisions based on such generalizations and unsubstantiated judgements are intrinsically unfair.

While differences in interests and abilities will always properly result in distinctive patterns of involvement of faculty members in the working of the University, objective assessments of all qualified individuals' ability to undertake any task are essential features of equitable treatment.

All tasks, of course, are not equally popular. Their timing, demands and perceived prestige contribute to determining whether they will be welcomed. The distribution of tasks, therefore, conveys powerful messages about faculty members' value and acceptability. This may be particularly true of teaching assignments, which are the most public of a faculty member's duties.

Recommendation 16. Chairs and Directors should allocate all teaching and in particular that done in evenings or in the summer or that is particularly onerous, according to equitable criteria. These criteria should be understood by and acceptable to members of their Department or School.

Responses to the Integration of Female Faculty survey indicated that there is a strong perception among women that their opinions and their research are taken less seriously by their male peers than those of

men. This concern was reinforced for the Task Force members by direct reporting of lack of recognition of the accomplishments of women. One of the several consequences of this situation is the possibility that potential graduate students may not be aware of the research interests of women faculty members.

***Recommendation 17.* Chairs and Directors should ensure, either directly or by way of the Chair of their Graduate Committee, that graduate teaching is distributed according to their faculty members' qualifications and that information about all qualified faculty members' research interests is made known to potential graduate students and student advisors.**

Any scholar whose research interests diverge from the mainstream or challenge conventional positions may be at risk in the peer-review process. Women scholars may be particularly vulnerable if they are involved in new areas of feminist research or are approaching more traditional areas with novel insights and interests. Journals that publish such work may be too new to have acquired the recognition brought by long establishment. The peer-review system must accommodate the open and fair assessment of the merit of scholarship, irrespective of its theme. The University's Policy and Regulations for tenure and promotion already require that in assessing the quality of the candidate's research or other professional activities, the Departmental Committees shall also, as far as practical, solicit the judgements of his or her colleagues within or without the Department. Consultations with referees outside of the University is necessary in considering promotion to the rank of Professor. Thus the practice of seeking expertise outside the Department is well established and could be extended to all assessments of professional functions.

***Recommendation 18.* The chairs and members of committees, and any other individuals charged with the evaluation of scholarship, whether this evaluation is episodic or ongoing, should systematically consult with experts in the relevant field. If such experts are not available within the University, they should be sought outside. In this case, the conditions of the consultation should be as specified in McMaster University Revised Policy and Regulations with respect to Academic Appointment, Tenure and Promotion (1977, 1980). The chairs of such committees or groups or the individual responsible should be held accountable by their Deans for ensuring that the opinion of appropriate experts has been sought.**

4.4 CLIMATE OF SUPPORT

Although our emphasis in this section remains on the integration of female faculty, our recommendations can improve conditions for all faculty. In the next ten years McMaster will be in competition with much of the English-speaking world for qualified faculty. In the face of such competition an environment that supports and nurtures all our people could provide a vital edge. Such an environment must be a value of the University as a whole, permeating the Faculties and impressed upon the Departments. Since it will involve changes in long-ingrained attitudes it will not develop overnight but will emerge from a process of education about equity and active encouragement of its growth.

The climate of an institution is set from the top: improvements will succeed only to the extent that they are encouraged by senior administrators who should take immediate and positive steps to improve the present climate. For example, the 1981 terms of reference for Chairs already include the nurturing of faculty and staff as a responsibility but without encouragement from above this will often be neglected.

Recommendation 19. Each Faculty Dean should be held responsible for ensuring that the Faculty provides an environment that supports and nurtures all its members - and especially new faculty. Deans should hold their Chairs accountable for Departments' roles in the provision of such a supportive climate.

To a large extent, the Department is the locale of a professor's activity since involvement in Faculty, University and professional activities often stems from departmental recommendations and references. Thus the Department dominates the climate of support and the importance of this role is recognized in the terms of reference for Chairs and Directors in which the responsibility for career progress of faculty members is given a high place - second of fifteen components. Whatever rules are in place, much also depends on the 'mood' in a Department. Just as it is no longer acceptable to derogate people because of their race so it must become unacceptable to demean people because of their sex. Chairs who tolerate situations where colleagues are arbitrarily excluded from full participation betray their trust and harm their Departments and the University as a whole.

Recommendation 20. Senate should ensure that procedures for the selection of Chairs of Departments and Directors of Schools and Programmes are amended so that the formally constituted Selection Committees interview potential Chairs with particular regard to style of departmental governance and sensitivity to the problems of integration of female and junior faculty.

Recommendation 21. The Provost should ensure that new Departmental Chairs attend a workshop on the topics of this report. Special attention should be paid to the sources of gender discrimination and their corrosive effect on the collegial spirit McMaster works to foster. This workshop should be distinct from any training in the administrative practices of the University. (See also Recommendation 9.)

A Chair's responsibility for the careers of the Department's members has two components. On the one hand, the annual recommendations of merit salary increases require an assessment of past performance. On the other hand, the fostering of career progress looks to the future. Whilst they are inter-related, these two facets should be kept separate. In addition, young faculty usually need introduction to the networks of relationships that span the University and those that span the discipline concerned. Senior faculty can, and should, take an active role in advising and encouraging their newer colleagues.

Recommendation 22. Each chair should meet annually with every member of the Department to review career progress. This meeting should look forward and go beyond any discussion of past performance involved in explaining the latest merit award.

Recommendation 23. Each chair should review annually for tenure all untenured faculty in the Department and review all assistant and associate professors for promotion. (That is, the Chairs should take the initiative and not require their faculty to put themselves forward.)

A multitude of studies here and elsewhere demonstrates the need for effective measures to combat sexual and gender harassment. A report on this subject was received by Senate last June, and will be acted on by the Senate Executive Committee. We strongly endorse the adoption of effective measures to combat this problem. We offer no recommendation regarding such measures because the topic is currently being dealt with.

McMaster's rules regarding tenure contain a time limit. The years in which a young professor is expected to establish the body of work on which the vital tenure decision will be based are also the years in which a family is often established. In our society, the woman is usually expected to carry the major responsibility for child-rearing. It is the University's duty to reduce the effect on women faculty of the conflict between the two demands. Indeed, this issue is of interest to a growing proportion of the male professoriate. The most prevalent solution to this conflict at other universities is based on schemes that allow a faculty member to be absent for a period and also extends the time limit by a proportionate amount. These are usually termed 'stop-the-clock' schemes. One such model could involve complete absence from duties for, say, one year with an extension of the time limit for the tenure decision also of one year. As another example, the professor might be working for 80% of the normal time for two years with an extension of 40% of a year.

Whilst there is a range of circumstances under which such plans might be useful, two periods are of most concern: firstly the period surrounding the actual time of birth and, secondly, the remaining period before the child(ren) attends full-time schooling.

The first situation is tackled by the current parental leave policy. This provides for leave for up to 26 weeks. Further, it allows the faculty member the option of deferring, for up to one year, academic decisions relating to the individual's career development. Hence McMaster already has in place one form of a 'stop-the-clock' scheme, which recognizes the fact that the presence of a very young child in a household is quite disruptive and that productivity may be reduced. Whilst some of the details of the scheme are designed to encourage a timing of the leave that has little effect on the teaching loads in the Department, it will often be necessary to make some ad hoc arrangement, perhaps by a contract or part-time appointment in a small Department.

For the period after parental leave there are two schools of thought. Many parents are willing to entrust their children to some delegate for at least part of the day and for this case there are recommendations re day-care below. This situation allows for the completion of those duties that require the professor's presence on campus during normal working hours. However, much work is done outside those hours - few minds are switched off when the body leaves the campus. We need to recognize that there will be some reduction in productivity whilst children are small.

An alternative view holds that in the early years a consistent upbringing is best achieved by the full-time presence of a parent. The lengthy absence that this implies is harder to handle but there is a precedent in the leave given for participation in political office. One problem is the need for replacement teachers and the temptation to form a ghetto of part-time and contract appointees. However, this problem occurs when faculty are allowed to 'buy-out' of teaching and acceptable solutions exist. A more serious problem is the loss of up-to-date knowledge of the appropriate field. Whilst this can be alleviated to some extent by reading and, with cooperation from the Department, by attendance at some seminars there will undoubtedly be a need to catch-up on return to duties. This must be allowed for as it is for people appointed to major administrative posts. Another serious problem is that of job security: it is unlikely that an absence of several years with a guarantee of a position on return can be available to untenured faculty.

A compromise position would allow a professor to transfer to some level of part-time status, with a proportional extension in the time allowed to reach tenure, etc. Any such scheme must be designed with care so that the 'ghetto' effect is avoided. In particular, part-time in this context must not imply a

full teaching load with no allowance for research. None of the current or proposed schemes will be of any use in a Department whose Chair believes that anything less than 80 hours per week implies a lack of serious interest in a career.

The need to avoid unfairness to any replacement will make the task of managing the long-term effects complicated but not impossible. A Department sensitive to the issue would make some effort to keep in touch with faculty who are temporarily absent, for example through invitations to any annual end-of-term event, or consultation about the times of seminars in the appropriate area.

Recommendation 24. The Joint Committee should develop amendments to the time-dependent rules in the Tenure and Promotion documents to allow a modest variety of 'stop-the-clock' choices.

The term 'part-time' is applied in two distinct situations. In one case, the holder of some outside post is employed so that our students may benefit from expertise not available otherwise. Such appointments are typically for quite small contributions. In the second case, the appointee has the normal attributes of a professor but, by mutual agreement, is employed for only some fraction of the normal working time, for example, only on three days of the week or only through September to May. A genuine part-time appointment would reduce all duties (teaching, research, administration) in the same proportion at least over the long-term.

Recommendation 25. Senate should modify the terms of permanent, tenured, part-time appointments to allow a variety of schemes. In all cases the assigned duties should have normal proportions of research, teaching, and administration. When a full-time appointee arranges to be on part-time status, the right to return to full-time status should be preserved. Time-dependent deadlines should be extended proportionately.

For many working parents, access to reliable day care is vital. Many employers are finding its provision to be cost-effective. We are aware that the McMaster Child Care Centre has recently been expanded. That is a step in the right direction, but the waiting list remains excessively long for a new parent. In practice, many faculty can find and afford adequate care of some kind for the 'normal' working day but have severe problems when there is some unforeseen occurrence. Many day care facilities are unable to accommodate children with even minor illness. The usual caregiver may be unexpectedly absent due to illness. Furthermore, parents may be obliged to participate in evening or weekend seminars. While our mandate is to address problems of women faculty members, we do not wish to suggest that the child care problems of other employees and students be handled differently. Hence this recommendation is addressed to the Board of Governors.

Recommendation 26. The Board of Governors should establish a working group to look into possible solutions to a number of issues related to child care for faculty with young children. Three issues that have surfaced in our discussions are the quantity of day care available on campus, the provision of 'after hours' care (e.g. for faculty teaching evening courses, or with lab work that carries on beyond the 8 to 6 time frame in which child care is normally available), and the provision of care for slightly sick children during the normal child care hours.

4.5 HIRING MORE FEMALE FACULTY

The hiring process followed at McMaster University should demonstrate adherence to the principle of employment equity, which has as its objective the elimination of systemic discrimination. Employment

equity, as defined by Abella (1984, 254), is a "strategy designed to obliterate the present and residual effects of discrimination and to open equitably the competition for employment opportunities to those arbitrarily excluded. It requires a 'special blend of what is necessary, what is fair, and what is workable' [Lemon v Kurtzman, 411 US 192, 201 (1973)]."

McMaster University has committed itself to these principles in its Employment Equity Statement, which "reflects the objective of creating and maintaining a workforce that is representative of the demographic mix in the available Canadian workforce".

In section 2.1, we discussed the issue of systemic discrimination. Systemic discrimination in the hiring process may have been or may still be operating in our University in a number of ways. These include judging potential faculty members on the basis of the number of their publications since graduation, without acknowledgement of the effect on this number of child-bearing or child-rearing responsibilities, other family-related care-taking obligations, or an increased commitment to teaching as opposed to research. There may be reluctance to hire women because it is anticipated that women's conflicting demands or spouses' careers will interfere with their faculty responsibilities to a greater extent than for men.

The Task Force believes that it is of particular importance to avoid forcing women to make choices between career development and having a family. While many of these concerns are of importance to men as well, in reality in our society, women are still expected to be disproportionately responsible for family caring. Furthermore, true equity cannot exist if we do not recognize biological reality.

Table III shows that, except in the Faculty of Science, the proportion of women hired as assistant professors with term appointments has in recent years exceeded the proportion of women amongst those receiving doctorates. These recent advances are to be commended. It must be remembered, however, that these are global figures and thus mask significant variations among different Departments in each Faculty. However, even with increased hiring at junior levels, it will be many years before there is a substantial change in the overall representation of women in the faculty.

So long as women remain a small proportion of the total faculty complement, it will be difficult to achieve full integration. Hence all members of the Task Force are in favour of efforts to hire more women at all ranks for faculty positions at McMaster. We debated long on how best to express that goal in a recommendation. We are convinced that a commitment to equitable hiring is entirely compatible with and indeed essential for hiring the best possible candidate. Hence we are against quotas, and against preferential hiring of women to any particular specified number of vacancies. Nonetheless, we are persuaded that McMaster can do more than it has done in the past to encourage the hiring of women. We are strongly of the opinion that the advances already made in some Departments must be defended and that great efforts should be made to improve the hiring of women in those Faculties and Departments that are lagging.

Recommendation 27. The University Appointments Committee (which for any particular vacancy outside of Health Sciences consists of the Provost, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean of the Faculty involved, and the Chair of the Department concerned) should review the treatment and evaluation of all applications, and should require the Department to explain the reasons for their choice when a strong woman candidate is rejected in favour of a male candidate.

While the foregoing recommendation contains the "teeth" for this section, there are other things that can also be done to assist in the hiring of more women faculty members. The first is simply one of information, and of publicity for that information. Simply making numbers known, such as those in Table III, on an annual basis, will help to emphasize the importance of seeking and recruiting women candidates.

Recommendation 28. The Provost should include in the annual report to Senate (Recommendation 1) a review of the percentage of women being hired, by Faculty (and areas within the Faculty where feasible), by type of appointment, and by rank, to ensure that the hiring of women to tenure-track positions does not fall below their proportion in the available pool.

The second area for improvement concerns the procedures used during the advertising of vacancies and the screening of candidates. The fact that no women were appointed at the level of Associate or full Professor during the period 1985/6 to 1989/90, while forty men were hired to such positions (Table IIA) suggests strongly that much of the hiring at this level really does operate through an "old boys" network. If this practice is not changed, it will take much longer than otherwise to begin to bring about a more equitable distribution of women and men at the senior levels.

Recommendation 29. Faculty Deans and Department Chairs should ensure that when appointments are to be made at senior levels of the Faculty, every effort is made to find qualified women and to encourage them to apply.

Even before a candidate is brought to campus for an interview, the candidate is evaluated through the c.v. and reference letters. There are subtle, and unconscious, ways in which these are evaluated differently for women than for men. Those involved in hiring decisions at all levels should become aware of these unconscious tendencies. At the interview, there are other considerations, not the least of which is the set of limitations placed by the Ontario Human Rights Code upon questions that can be asked.

Recommendation 30. Faculty Deans should ensure that all members of hiring committees are familiar with the information on interviewing in the publication "Human Rights: employment application forms and interviews", (Ontario Human Rights Commission, 1989), and with material on prejudicial perceptions of female candidates.

One excellent source of the latter information is the booklet by Geis et al. (1976).

The final issue regarding hiring deals with recruitment procedures, as distinct from selection procedures. Hiring is not a one-sided matter. McMaster must be able to persuade the candidate whom we have selected that she (or he) should select McMaster. Many institutions will be seeking the same highly qualified candidates that we seek. Indeed, this is already the case, as evidenced by the fact that 60% of offers to female candidates in Science were declined, as were 37.5% of the offers to men. McMaster needs to be able to demonstrate that there is a very positive climate of support for new faculty here, and especially for new female faculty.

Recommendation 31. Faculty Deans and Department Chairs should bring to the attention of candidates for faculty positions the implementation of the other recommendations in this report, as an indication of the type of support available at McMaster for all faculty members.

Substantial progress towards the full integration of female faculty will require a commitment to this objective and a concerted effort by the University community. It will also require a significant increase in the proportion of women taking up post-graduate studies and in the rate of completion. Although these are outside our terms of reference, we observe that those steps that improve life for women faculty will also improve the image of that life in the undergraduate body and make undertaking graduate studies more often a seriously considered career move for women students.

REFERENCES

- Abella, R. Silberman, 1984. *Report of the Commission on Equality in Employment*, Ottawa: Ministry of Supply & Services.
- Briskin, L., 1990. "The Pressure to Create Representative Structures within Universities is Taking a Toll on Women", *OCUFA Forum*, Vol. 6, (20):3.
- CAUT, 1986. *Policy Statement on Positive Action to Improve the Status of Women in Canadian Universities*.
- COU, 1988. *Employment Equity for Women: A University Handbook*, Toronto.
- Employment and Immigration Canada, 1985. *Affirmative Action: What is it All About?*
- Fulton, K.L., 1989. "Opening Address: Taking Action Women and the University", *Proceedings from the Symposium on the Status of Women at the University of Manitoba*, October 12-13, 1989.
- Geis, F.L., M.R. Carter, and D.J. Butler, 1976. "Seeing and Evaluating People" (Office of Women's Affairs, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware).
- MacMillan, B., 1989. "The Flow-Through Hypothesis: A Review of the Data", pp. 1-2 in *Proceedings of a Conference on Women in Graduate Studies in Ontario*, (ed.: C. Filteau), Ontario Council on Graduate Studies.
- OCUFA, 1989. *Resource Materials on the Hiring and Retention of Female Faculty*, August 1989.
- Ontario Human Rights Commission, 1989. "Human Rights: employment application forms and interviews".
- Statistics Canada; Education Division, Student Information Section. 1970-1971. *Fall enrolment in universities and colleges*. Ottawa, Ontario: Information Canada.
- Statistics Canada; Education, Culture and Tourism Division, Postsecondary Education Section. 1980, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988. *Universities: Enrolment and degrees*. Ottawa, Ontario.