
Report of the School of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences

Reports of the Committees on the
Status of Women Faculty

March 2002

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Statement from the Dean of the School of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences

The Report of the Gender Equity Committee in the School of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences has provided an important service to the School and to the Institute as a whole. It has identified causes for optimism and causes for concern, and has put forth recommendations that will make this university a better place for all.

It should not be surprising that there are more women on the faculty of our School than in others at MIT, given the higher representation of women in the humanities, arts, and social sciences. This is not cause for complacency, however. Rather, it gives us a strong foundation for progress. And we have made significant progress in the past decade in the recruitment and retention of women faculty. In addition, the report indicates that in individual academic units there may be no significant difference in salaries for senior women and men. However, comparative salary data hardly tell the full story of the lives of senior women faculty in SHASS. In particular, a significant number of senior women have been made to feel marginalized in their academic units and in the wider school and Institute. This finding is consistent with the findings in other MIT schools, and it is deeply troubling.

To address the problem of marginalization and other concerns, the authors of this Report have produced some important recommendations that focus on increasing the number of women faculty at all ranks, improving the mentoring of all incoming faculty, monitoring faculty salaries at all levels, providing comprehensive information to all faculty about research funding and related opportunities within SHASS and the Institute, and creating the conditions by which more women faculty can achieve positions of leadership. The next step for SHASS is to begin to implement these recommendations and others.

An enormous effort went into the design, research and writing of the Report. Its findings and recommendations will certainly help to advance the quality of life for all SHASS faculty in the years ahead. I want to express my deep gratitude to all members of the SHASS Gender Equity Committee, and especially to its co-chairs, Professor Deborah Fitzgerald and Professor Jean Jackson, for their tremendous leadership. The committee has demonstrated its commitment to excellence in the widest definition of that term. The beneficiaries will be the entire faculty in the School of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences at MIT.

Philip S. Khoury
Dean
MIT School of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences
7 March 2002

**REPORT OF THE GENDER EQUITY COMMITTEE
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
MIT**

March 2002

Alan Brody
Deborah Fitzgerald, Co-Chair
Ellen Harris
Diana Henderson
Jean Jackson, Co-Chair
Paul Joskow
Anne McCants
Ruth Perry

Contents

Executive Summary	
1. Introduction and Background.....	1
2. Methodology.....	2
3. Findings.....	2
Salaries and Research Funds.....	2
Salaries.....	2
Internal research funds.....	3
Promotion and Tenure.....	4
Service on Committees.....	10
Institute Awards.....	10
Chairs Held by SHASS Faculty.....	10
Junior faculty chairs.....	11
Senior faculty chairs.....	11
Other Awards.....	11
Themes Emerging from Interviews.....	14
4. Discussion.....	17
Issues the Committee did not Investigate.....	17
Reflections on the MIT System.....	18
5. Recommendations.....	19
Appendices I, II, III, IV.....	22

**SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
GENDER EQUITY COMMITTEE REPORT
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

MIT's School of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences (SHASS) has the largest number of women faculty at the Institute: in 2000, 31% of all faculty in SHASS were women, 20% of them tenured. Unlike the other four schools at MIT, SHASS's major gender problems are not the number of women faculty (although the number of senior women is disappointingly low in Economics, Political Science, and the Music side of Music and Theater Arts); rather, they concern issues regarding salary, committee work, a weak communication and mentoring system, and a "male" atmosphere at times uncomfortable and difficult to work in. Due to MIT's dominant focus in science and engineering, most SHASS interviewees also report feeling marginalized and alienated, "second-class citizens" in the Institute's academic hierarchy.

The SHASS Committee on Gender Equity conducted lengthy interviews with all tenured women (30), as well as 15 tenured men who were named by the women as comparable in terms of career path. The Committee collected information on gender differences in salary, rates of promotion and tenure, access to research funds within the School and the Institute, rates of appointment to School and Institute chairs, degree of recognition by the School and Institute for exemplary scholarship and teaching, and service on Institute committees.

With respect to salary, the Committee found that although a wide variation in salaries by department characterizes the School, gender discrimination does not occur at present within any department. That is, the highest salaries in each department are as likely to belong to women faculty as to men. Looking at the School overall, however, the highest salaries by far go to male faculty, mainly due to their location in the more male-heavy social science departments—in particular Economics, which in 2000 had one tenured woman and nineteen tenured men. These findings support observations by others regarding a "feminization" process which operates in many areas of paid work, including academe: those disciplines with larger proportions of women, which tend to be humanistic in nature, command lower salaries and receive less prestige than male-heavy areas of scholarship. The Committee also found that in four humanities departments, salaries for both men and women are lower than that at peer institutions, a finding that cannot be explained by the feminization thesis.

With regard to rates of promotion and tenure, the Committee found that men and women are promoted and tenured at the same rate, and within a given department women are no more likely than men to be held back or denied tenure. However, we did notice that the only two senior women in Political Science were tenured in the 1980s. And promotion to full professor occurs more rapidly in Economics, where the faculty is nearly all male, than elsewhere in the school.

With respect to access to internal research funds, the Committee found a small gender difference in amount requested compared to amount granted.

The Committee found that women faculty in SHASS are disproportionately represented on Institute committees. First, women on Institute committees are far more likely to be from SHASS than from the other four schools (SHASS women constitute 25-60% of women serving on all committees but one). Second, SHASS representatives on

these committees are far more likely to be women than men (43% of Institute committee members from SHASS are women, and in AY2000 senior women made up 45-86% of the SHASS representation on six committees). Clearly, SHASS women have been doing considerably more than their share of Institute committee work.

Turning to endowed chairs held by SHASS women, the Committee found that the number of untenured women receiving chairs increased significantly in 1997, but declined to former levels by 2000. Between 1995-2000 the number of endowed chairs going to senior SHASS faculty increased, and the proportion awarded to women remained constant, roughly one in three.

The highest Institute award, the Institute Professorship, has never been given to a SHASS woman, and another highly prized award, the Killian Faculty Achievement Award, has gone to a SHASS woman only once. SHASS women have received other Institute awards with more frequency, but not in proportion to their numbers.

The most powerful findings on the status of SHASS women are contained in the interview transcripts. A substantial majority of women faculty feel that they have not been comprehensively mentored and advised by those senior colleagues in a position to help them understand what is required to succeed at MIT. They report receiving inadequate information on achieving promotion and tenure, obtaining salary increases, competing for external research funding, and applying for course releases or assistance with housing and the like. Many feel that decision-making in the departments is far from transparent, and they report feeling ignored and dismissed by colleagues and administrators alike. SHASS women report being reluctant to try to improve their situation at MIT by cultivating outside offers, to which the School and the Institute respond with increases in salary and other inducements to stay. Interviewees say that such deceptive “game-playing” would make them uncomfortable.

The Committee has compiled a substantial list of specific recommendations for improving the status of SHASS women, which can be summarized as follows:

- Adjust salaries for women and men to recognize, in addition to scholarship, pedagogical excellence, outstanding leadership, and exceptional Institute service
- Establish clear mentoring guidelines for department heads and senior faculty, and ensure that they advise junior and new faculty comprehensively and frequently about department, School, and Institute expectations
- Create mechanisms for informing all faculty about available opportunities, “rules of the game,” availability of special assistance, and general departmental and School operating procedures; overly hierarchical departments should democratize decision-making
- Create a permanent gender equity committee to monitor searches for new faculty, salaries, teaching loads, committee work, research assistance, and awards

Introduction and Background

In the wake of the highly visible and galvanizing Report on the Women Faculty in Science, in the summer of 1999 MIT Provost Robert Brown asked each of the Deans of the other four Schools to appoint committees to look into the status of their senior women faculty. Dean Philip Khoury appointed the Gender Equity Committee for the School of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences (SHASS) in October.

SHASS has the largest concentration of tenured women at MIT (*senior* and *tenured* are interchangeable). In AY00 there were 28 tenured women (20% of SHASS faculty), and in AY02 there are 31 tenured women (21%). (See Table 1: Number and Percentage of SHASS Women and Men Faculty 1996-2000, which indicates the total number of faculty in the School). Despite the comparatively greater numbers of tenured women in this School, however, its tenured women felt that other issues related to gender inequity existed and should be investigated by the Committee.

TABLE 1: Number and Percentage of ALL SHASS Women and Men Faculty 1996-2000

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Women	39 (28%)	41 (29%)	44 (31%)	49 (33%)	47 (31%)
Men	101 (72%)	98 (71%)	98 (69%)	100 (67%)	104 (69%)
TOTAL	140	139	142	149	151

The disciplines represented by SHASS faculty are remarkably heterogeneous, and only four out of a total of ten SHASS units have PhD programs (Economics, Political Science, Linguistics and Philosophy, and the Program in Science, Technology and Society). The majority of SHASS women faculty are in humanities units without PhD programs. These two factors make comparisons across units difficult.

Once constituted, the Committee consulted with all the tenured women faculty in SHASS to develop a list of issues that needed further study, some of which were not within the Committee's mandate. All members agreed that several of these issues were related to the ones under investigation, and are briefly discussed at the end of the report:

- Status of lecturers
- Experience of the junior faculty
- Women graduate students and the "pipeline" issue
- Race and sexual orientation
- Recruitment policies

Methodology

The Committee conducted interviews with tenured women faculty and tenured male faculty who were named by some of the women interviewees as approximately “comparable” to them with respect to stage of career. The Committee also collected quantitative data on salaries, rates of promotion and tenure, access to School funds for research and travel, representation on School and Institute committees, and the frequency and type of recognition received by SHASS senior women faculty within the School and at the Institute as a whole.¹

The Committee drew up a list of questions (see Appendix I: Interview Questions) and ended up interviewing 30 women and 15 male “comparables.” Each faculty member was interviewed by a team of two Committee members, and team membership rotated among all members.

The substantive part of this report is divided into 5 sections, followed by Discussion and Recommendations. The sections are:

- Salaries and research funds
- Promotion and tenure
- Service on committees
- Institute awards
- Gender-related qualitative themes emerging from interviews

Findings

Salaries and Research Funds

A. Salaries

The salary subcommittee was permitted to examine salary data for one year only, AY01, which precluded any observations of comparable rates of salary increase over time. We inspected the range of salaries in each unit, broken down by rank, gender, and age.² Discovering whether salaries systematically vary due to gender proved difficult, first, because of the small amount of available data, second, because of the large differences in average salaries between units, third, the number of faculty per unit (department or

¹ The Committee would like to express its deep appreciation for all of the help provided by Marsha Orent, who also provided support to two subcommittees investigating salary and promotion, and Institute service. We would also like to thank Philip Khoury, Sue Mannett, Doug Pfeiffer, Marie DiMauro, and Gabriella Browne in the Dean’s Office, and Cherie Potts, the transcriber.

² At MIT, 6 of the departments in SHASS are referred to as “units,” because, in MIT parlance, they fall under Course 21, the Humanities Department. Thus History is called 21H, Anthropology is called 21A, and so forth. The 4 Ph.D-granting departments are known by a different number, except the Program in Science, Technology and Society, which is called STS.

section) involved is small, and fourth, the proportion of male to female varies widely among the units: some are 50-50, but others are extremely unbalanced.

We found no difference in salaries between men and women at the Assistant Professor rank after controlling for the unit making the appointment. Within a given unit men and women appear to start at the same base salary. Nor did we find systematic difference in salaries between senior men and senior women within a given unit. In some units men make the highest salary, in some the salary amount is equal or nearly so, and in some women earn the highest amounts.

Major salary differences occur between units, and so insofar as proportions of women to men vary from unit to unit, and insofar as those units with the smallest percentage of women are those units that pay the higher salaries, gender-correlated discrepancies do exist within SHASS. We feel that the pronounced differences between disciplines with respect to proportion of men and women and the salary differentials reflect a nation-wide gender bias in higher education, but does not reflect a systemic gender discrimination in salary peculiar to MIT. Researchers in higher education have long noticed that those fields characterized by a higher proportion of women in them reveal a decrease in prestige and in material benefits as the numbers of women increased over time. Scholars have termed this process of devaluation linked to increased numbers of women in certain disciplines “feminization.”

An additional factor producing the disparities in salaries between units is the pace of tenure and promotion. If we ignore field differences, men are clearly on average promoted more rapidly than women in SHASS. However, essentially all of this gender difference is due to inter-, rather than intra-unit variations in promotion trajectories because of the different proportions of men and women in the PhD granting units and the humanities and arts units and the difference in promotion and tenure scheduling.

In light of the difficulties of making inter-unit comparisons in SHASS, we consulted the National Faculty Salary Survey to compare salary levels in the humanities units of SHASS with salary levels at other peer institutions nationwide. We found that in four units of the School the mean faculty salary is significantly lower than the mean salary at these peer institutions. Accounting for this difference is not easy; it clearly does not result from gender bias, given the fact that these fields are feminized nationally (making for lower salaries). Despite the numerous publications, prestigious fellowships, recognition in national and international professional associations, prizes and other marks of distinction of the MIT faculty in these fields, they are still paid less than their colleagues at competing institutions.

B. Internal research funds

Several times a year, SHASS faculty are invited to apply for special funds to help defray costs of research and professional travel. Dean’s Fund awards, available to SHASS faculty, lecturers (with a 3-year contract or more), and senior lecturers, are limited to under \$2000 and are used typically to help defray conference expenses and travel related

to research projects.. Examining data from FY 1993 to FY2000, we did not distinguish any pronounced differences between men and women applicants to the Dean's Fund, in number of requests within the individual administrative units, or the number of awards granted. However, we did find that in 7 out of 10 years female faculty in all units received between 11%-36% less of the money requested than did men. And although we did find a difference between women and men in the amount of money requested, this second difference may be due to the fact that Economics puts in more requests, is the largest unit, is heavily male, and on average requests higher amounts (see Table 2: Dean's Fund Summary Statistics 1991-2000).

Nor did we discern any meaningful gender disparities in the biannual Provost Fund awards, ranging from \$3,000-\$20,000, and available to SHASS faculty, lecturers (with a 3-year contract or more), and senior lecturers (see Table 3: Provost's Fund Summary Statistics 1994-2000).

Promotion and Tenure

We examined promotion and tenure rates, and time of promotion to full professor, defined as number of years since receiving the PhD. The pace at which faculty are reviewed for promotion and tenure follows AAUP rules and is fairly consistent across the School, particularly with respect to younger faculty (see Table 4: Assistant or Associate Without Tenure Hired Between 1985-1994).

Table 2
 SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
 Dean's Fund Summary Statistics 1991 - 2000

Award Chart 1

	FY 91		FY 92		FY 93		FY 94		FY 95		FY 96		FY 97		FY 98		FY 99		FY 00		
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Number of awards requested	29	8	4.4	16	2.5	14	2.7	13	3.1	14	2.8	14	3.1	33	1.5	2.0	11	17	9	2.4	10
Number of awards received	29	8	38	12	23	13	24	10	29	9	27	13	29	1.3	1.8	10	17	9	2.1	8	
Percentage of Total Awards Received	100%	100%	86%	75%	92%	93%	89%	77%	94%	64%	96%	93%	88%	87%	90%	91%	100%	100%	85%	80%	

Award Chart 2

	FY 91		FY 92		FY 93		FY 94		FY 95		FY 96		FY 97		FY 98		FY 99		FY 00	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Average Amount Requested	1,526	1,273	1,442	1,884	1,510	1,518	1,590	1,338	1,498	1,445	2,907	1,500	1,970	1,509	2,071	2,095	1,819	1,622	1,903	1,619
Average dollar award received	1,319	1,108	851	845	1,011	840	1,174	849	1,235	667	2,079	1,174	1,336	1,067	1,456	1,217	1,691	1,322	1,476	968
Percentage /yield	86%	87%	59%	45%	67%	55%	74%	63%	82%	46%	72%	78%	68%	71%	70%	58%	93%	82%	76%	60%

Award Chart 3

	FY 91		FY 92		FY 93		FY 94		FY 95		FY 96		FY 97		FY 98		FY 99		FY 00			
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F		
Percentage of Total Awards Requested	78%	(N=29)	73%	(N=44)	64%	(N=25)	67%	(N=14)	69%	(N=31)	67%	(N=28)	69%	(N=33)	65%	(N=20)	65%	(N=17)	65%	(N=24)	29%	(N=10)
Percentage of M/F in total SHASS Faculty (all ranks)	78%	(N=101)	78%	(N=101)	77%	(N=101)	76%	(N=87)	75%	(N=105)	72%	(N=101)	71%	(N=98)	69%	(N=98)	67%	(N=100)	67%	(N=104)	31%	(N=47)

Table 3
 SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
 Provost's Fund Summary Statistics 1994 - 2000

Award Chart 1

	FY 94		FY 95		FY 96		FY 97		FY 98		FY 99		FY 00	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Number of awards requested	8	3	7	0	7	2	6	2	9	2	5	3	7	6
Number of awards received	6	3	6	0	3	2	4	2	9	2	4	0	5	5
Percentage of Total Awards Received	75%	100%	86%	0%	43%	100%	67%	100%	100%	100%	80%	0%	71%	83%

Award Chart 2

	FY 94		FY 95		FY 96		FY 97		FY 98		FY 99		FY 00	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Average Amount Requested	18,689	16,227	18,259	0	18,004	9,524	13,633	15,436	13,727	19,168	14,740	17,881	17,275	15,549
Average dollar award received	11,775	10,567	11,472	0	5,671	10,800	7,850	12,950	10,550	7,500	14,633	0	7,857	10,000
Percentage yield	63%	65%	63%	0%	31%	113%	58%	84%	77%	39%	99%	0%	45%	64%

Award Chart 3

	FY 94		FY 95		FY 96		FY 97		FY 98		FY 99		FY 00	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Percentage of Total Awards Requested	72% (N=8)	27% (N=3)	100% (N=7)	0% (N=0)	78% (N=7)	22% (N=2)	75% (N=6)	25% (N=2)	82% (N=9)	18% (N=2)	63% (N=5)	37% (N=3)	54% (N=7)	46% (N=6)
Percentage of M/F in total SHASS Faculty (all ranks)	76% (N=97)	24% (N=30)	75% (N=105)	25% (N=35)	72% (N=101)	28% (N=39)	71% (N=98)	29% (N=41)	69% (N=98)	31% (N=44)	67% (N=100)	33% (N=49)	69% (N=104)	31% (N=47)

Table 4: Assistant or Associate Without Tenure Hired Between 1985-1994

Department	No. of Hires (M/F)	No. Tenured (M/F)	Tenure Rate
History	7 (3,4)	2 (0,2)	28.60%
Anthropology	3 (1,2)	2 (1,1)	66.70%
FL & L	2 (2,0)	0	0%
Pol. Sci.	12 (11,1)	4 (4,0)	33.30%
Writing	1 (0,1)	0	0%
Literature	9 (6,3)	5 (3,2)	55.50%
STS	3 (0,3)	2 (0,2)	66.60%
Music & TA	4 (3,1)	3 (2,1)	75%
Ling/Phil	5 (4, 1)	2 (1,1)	40%
Economics	15 (12,3)	7 (5,2)	47%

When we looked at the distribution of tenured women in the units, we found that two units had hired and tenured women and men in equal numbers. In certain other units the one or two senior women who had been awarded tenure in the 1980s or earlier continued to have only senior male colleagues.

We did find that relatively more men were promoted to full professor earlier in their careers than women, but concluded that most of this discrepancy is due to differences between fields with respect to mean year of promotion as measured from year PhD was received. Specifically, Economics promotes to full after fewer than ten years far more frequently than other disciplines represented in the School, which skews gender figures because Economics has such a low proportion of tenured women (see Table 5: Promotion Rates including Economics and Table 6: Promotion Rates excluding Economics).

Table 5: Promotion Rates including Economics³

	No. w/tenure	No. full	No. hired full	10 yrs. or less	11—15 yrs.	More than 15 yrs.
M	72	65	14	23	19	9
F	30	20	6	4	5	5

Table 6: Promotion Rates excluding Economics⁴

	No. w/tenure	No. full	No. hired full	10 yrs. or less	11—15 yrs.	More than 15 yrs.
M	53	46	12	9	17	8
F	28	19	6	4	5	5

Table 6A presents the number of SHASS women and men faculty by rank and department for FY 2000.

³ The abbreviations refer to the following:

“# w/ten” = number of faculty in the School with tenure as of July 2001

“# full” = number of current tenured faculty who are at the Full Professor rank

“# hired full” = number of current Full Professors who were hired at that level from another institution

“10 yrs or <” = number of current Full Professors, excluding those hired at that level, who were promoted to the rank of Full Professor within ten years or less of receiving their Ph.D

“11-15 yrs” = number of current Full Professors, excluding those hired at that level, who were promoted to the rank of Full Professor 11 to 15 years (inclusive) of receiving their Ph.D

“> 15 yrs” = number of current Full Professors, excluding those hired at that level, who were promoted to the rank of Full Professor more than 15 years after receiving their Ph.D

⁴ These numbers exclude faculty in the Department of Economics.

TABLE 6A: Number of Women and Men Faculty in SHASS by Department and Rank
FY2000

Department/ Program	Graduate Program	Gender	Assistant	Associate w/oTenure	Associate w/Tenure	Full	Total
Economics	M.A.1937 Ph.D.1941	Men	4	2	1	19	26
		Women	2	2	0	1	5
Total Econ.			6	4	1	20	31
Anthropology	No	Men	0	1	0	2	3
		Women	1	0	0	2	3
Total Anthro.			1	1	0	4	6
Foreign Lang. and Literature	No	Men	0	2	0	2	4
		Women	1	0	1	3	5
Total FL&L			1	2	1	5	9
History	No	Men	0	1	1	4	6
		Women	2	1	2	2	7
Total History			2	2	3	6	13
Literature	(CMS) M.A. 1998	Men	1	1	1	6	9
		Women	1	0	2	1	4
Total Literature			2	1	3	7	13
Music and Theatre Arts	No	Men	3	0	0	6	9
		Women	0	1	1	2	4
Total Music & TA			3	1	1	8	13
Writing & Humanistic St.	No	Men	0	0	0	4	4
		Women	2	1	0	3	6
Total W&HS			2	1	0	7	10
Linguistics	Ph.D. 1961	Men	1	2	0	5	8
		Women	1	0	1	1	3
Total Ling.			2	2	1	6	11
Philosophy	Ph.D. 1963	Men	2	2	1	4	9
		Women	0	0	1	1	2
Total Phil.			2	2	2	5	11
Political Sci.	Ph.D. 1958	Men	4	2	3	7	16
		Women	2	1	0	2	5
Total Pol. Sci.			6	3	3	9	21
STS	(HSSST) Ph.D 1988	Men	2	0	0	5	7
		Women	1	0	2	2	5
Total STS			3	0	2	7	12
TOTAL			30	19	17	84	150

Service on Committees

In the interviews conducted with senior women faculty, again and again women commented on the fact that they felt they were doing more Institute work, or what some call “water carrying,” than their male colleagues. The Committee reviewed the membership of the largest and/or most important Institute committees from 1990-2000, and found that this perception is correct. We examined the number of individual women and the number of individual men who have served on these committees, and found that SHASS women are disproportionately represented on all but one Institute committee in two different ways. First, SHASS women faculty represent between 25% and 60% of all women on every committee except the Committee on Discipline. Second, although in 1999-2000 senior women constituted 20% of SHASS faculty, from 1990-2000, they represented a mean of 43% of Institute committee membership from SHASS, and on six out of fifteen committees, SHASS women constituted 45% to 86% of the members from SHASS. Clearly, women in SHASS are doing a lot more committee work than some of their male counterparts (see Appendix II: SHASS Representation on Institute Committees).

In addition to confirming the perception that SHASS women carry an extra burden by serving on committees in disproportionate numbers, these data suggest several other conclusions. On the one hand, because so few women from Science, Engineering, Sloan, and Architecture serve on these committees, they are in some ways invisible at the Institute as a whole, and they have relatively less experience in how the Institute works. This encourages the perception, not only among male faculty members but also among the administrators and students who serve on these committees, that those fields are male pursuits. Concomitantly, the high number of women from SHASS who appear on these committees encourages a perception that the fields they represent are unusually “feminine,” despite the fact that male faculty outnumber female faculty in these fields, both at MIT and at the most prestigious universities.

One possible contributing factor to this overrepresentation of women on committees is a “kill 2 birds with one stone” attitude at play during the nomination process. Striving to constitute representative committees, perhaps a disproportionate number of SHASS women are nominated because in this way both a SHASS faculty member and a woman are serving on a given committee.

Institute Awards

A. Chairs held by SHASS faculty

Faculty chairs, designated for junior or senior faculty, come from a variety of sources. Some chairs are quite constrained as to criteria, and others are awarded more or less at the discretion of the department, School, or Institute.

When funds for a chair are given to MIT, one of the following occurs 1) the funds are given to a particular department; 2) the funds are given to the Institute, which assigns the

chair to a particular department; 3) the funds are given to a School and the dean designates a recipient. All chair awards must be approved by the provost (see Appendix III: SHASS Chair Statistical Breakdown by Unit and Year).

Junior faculty chairs: All junior faculty chairs, usually controlled by the Provost's Office, are designated Career Development chairs and are occupied for a period of 3 years. Overall, the number of CD chairs awarded to junior faculty in SHASS has increased (see Appendix III).

Examining faculty chair awards for AY96-AY00, we found that the percentage of chairs held by women increased significantly in the Assistant Professor rank, producing a statistical hump which began in 1997. This hump moved through the junior faculty ranks (from assistant to associate) in 1998 and 1999, and disappeared in 2000, illustrating that, despite such welcome increases in the percentage of chairs, they do not carry over into the senior ranks.

Senior faculty chairs: Chairs going to senior faculty are renewable at 5-year intervals, and are usually renewed. Institute professorships are held until retirement. In AY00 23% of SHASS senior women held chairs, as compared to 32% men (see Table 7: Tabular Representation of Chair Holder by Chair and Unit).

B. Other Awards

Several important MIT awards recognize faculty scholarship and teaching. Within the School, the largest award is the Levitan Prize, an annual competition for a \$20,000 prize awarded to the faculty member with the best proposal for an important and innovative research project. The Committee found no gender bias in Levitan Prize awards (see Appendix IV: Levitan Award).

Six major Institute-wide awards are given out: Institute Professorships, the MacVicar Prize in Recognition of Teaching Excellence, the Wade Award (for research), the Class of 1960 Endowment for Innovation in Education Fund, the Killian Faculty Achievement Award, and the Edgerton Award (for both research and teaching). The most dismal showing is Institute Professorships; of the 52 awarded so far, none has gone to a woman in SHASS, and only two have gone to women in other Schools. Similarly, only one Killian Award has gone to a woman in SHASS, and only one to a woman outside SHASS. The Wade, Class of 1960, Edgerton, and MacVicar awards present a more felicitous record with respect to women.⁵ All of these awards and the Institute Professorships are based on faculty committee recommendations (see Table 8: Other Awards).

⁵ MacVicar: 35 men, 5 women; Class of 1960 Fellows: 12 men, 4 women; Edgerton: 13 men, 7 women; Wade: 12 men, 7 women.

Table 7

SHASS Tabular Representation of Chair Holder by Chair and Unit

CHAIR		FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	SPVR
Economics								
32290	Killian	Fischer	Fischer	Joskow	Joskow	Joskow	Joskow	Provost
32292	Class of '41	Blanchard	Blanchard	Blanchard	Blanchard	Blanchard	Blanchard	Provost
32341	Ford	Dornbusch	Dornbusch	Dornbusch	Dornbusch	Dornbusch	Dornbusch	Dept.
32342	Ford	Ekaus	Ekaus	Krugman	Krugman	Krugman	Krugman	Dept.
32355	Gray	Temin	Temin	Temin	Temin	Temin	Temin	Provost
32412	MacDonald	Hausman	Hausman	Hausman	Hausman	Hausman	Hausman	Provost
32422	Mitsui	Joskow	Joskow	Poterba	Poterba	Poterba	Poterba	Provost
32468	Skinner	Piore	Piore	Piore	Piore	Piore	Piore	Provost
32475	Castle Krob CD	Gruber	Gruber	Gruber	Athey	Athey	Athey	Dept.
32498	Kouri CD	Kremer	Kremer	Kremer	Acemoglu	Acemoglu	Ventura	Dept.
32516	Samuelson	Diamond	Diamond	Diamond	Holmstrom	Holmstrom	Holmstrom	Dean
32373	Ford CD	Ellison	Ellison	Ellison	Costa	Costa	Costa	Dean
32262	Carlton					1st	Fisher	Dept.
Linguistics & Philosophy								
32443	Rockefeller	Thompson	Thompson	Stalnaker	Stalnaker	Stalnaker	Stalnaker	Provost
32570	Ward	Hale	Hale	Hale	Hale	Hale	Pesetsky	Dept.
32298	Class of 47 CD					Byrne	Byrne	Provost
32291	Class of 42 CD				Von Fintel	Von Fintel	Von Fintel	Provost
Political Science								
32346	Ford	Samuels	Samuels	Samuels	Samuels	Samuels	Samuels	Dept.
32500	Sloan		Cohen	Cohen	Cohen	Cohen	Cohen	Dept.
32322	Starbuck	1st	Berger	Berger	Berger	Berger	Berger	Provost
32299	Class of '57 CD					White		Provost
32391	Greene CD				Nobles	Nobles	Nobles	Provost
History								
32407	Kenan	Maier	Maier	Maier	Maier	Maier	Maier	Provost
32267	Conner	1st	Ritvo	Ritvo	Ritvo	Ritvo	Ritvo	Provost
32299	Class of '57 CD		Mccants	Mccants	Mccants			Provost
32266	Morison		1st	Dower	Dower	Dower	Dower	Provost
FL&L								
32297	Class of 58 CD	Widdig	Widdig	Widdig				Provost
32467	Kochi	1st	Miyagawa	Miyagawa	Miyagawa	Miyagawa	Miyagawa	Dean
32289	Class of '54 CD						Wey-Gomez	Provost
32439	Mitsui CD			Aikawa	Aikawa	Aikawa		Provost
32351	S. C. Fang							Dean
Literature								
32298	Class of 56 CD			Buzard	Buzard	Buzard		Provost
32349	Friedlaender	Donaldson	Donaldson	Donaldson	Donaldson	Jenkins	Jenkins	Dean
32291	Class of 42 CD	Jenkins	Jenkins	Jenkins				Provost
32299	Class of '57 CD						Raman	Provost
Music & TA								
32295	Class of '49			Harris	Harris	Harris	Harris	Provost
31085	Taylor	Thompson	Thompson	Thompson	Thompson	Thompson	Thompson	Provost
32288	Class of 48 CD					Makubuya	Makubuya	Provost
Anthropology								
32572	McMillan			1st	Slyomovics	Slyomovics	Slyomovics	Dean
STS								
32318	Dibner	Buchwald	Buchwald	Buchwald	Buchwald	Buchwald	Buchwald	Provost
32539	Dibner CD			Mindell	Mindell	Mindell	Mindell	Provost
32431	Mellon	Keniston	Keniston	Keniston	Keniston	Keniston	Keniston	Dept.
32275	Cutten	Smith	Smith	Smith	Smith	Smith	Smith	Provost
32319	Leo Marx CD					Riskin	Riskin	Provost
32298	Class of 47 CD		Hammonds	Hammonds	Hammonds			Provost
32298	Class of 56 CD	Fitzgerald						Provost
32426	Mauze						Turkle	Provost
Writing								
32281	Class of '22	Wolff	Wolff	Wolff	Wolff	Wolff	Wolff	Provost
32425	Meloy	Manning	Manning	Manning	Manning	Manning	Manning	Provost
32471	Metcalfe	Williams	Williams	Williams	Williams	Williams	Williams	Dean
32263	Burchard	1st	Lightman	Lightman	Lightman	Lightman	Lightman	Provost
Dean of SHSS								
32343	Ford	Berger						Dean
32344	Ford	Weiner	Weiner					Dean

Red=Women Chair holders

Table 8: Other Awards**Institute Professors (52)**

	Men	Women	
Total	50	2	4% Women
SHASS	6	0	0% SHASS women
		0%	

1960 Fellows (16)

	M	W	
Total	12	4	25%
SHASS	3	1	25%
		25%	

Edgerton Professor (20)

	M	W	
Total	13	7	35%
SHASS	3	2	40%
		28%	

Killian (29)

	M	W	
Total	27	2	7%
SHASS	5	1	16%
		50%	

Wade (19)

	M	W	
Total	12	7	37%
SHASS	6	2	25%
		28%	

McVicar (40)

	M	W	
Total	36	4	10%
SHASS	4	2	33%
		50%	

Themes Emerging from Interviews

This section presents our findings from interviews with women faculty and male “comparables.” These men and women reported their experiences and opinions, which can diverge from reality, and are always only one side of a story. Other parties often have rather different stories to tell, especially in cases involving conflict. Of the themes that emerged in our interviews some were directly gender-related, and some concerned issues only indirectly linked to gender (for example, having to do with the position of the humanities, arts and social science fields at MIT). The interviews contain an extremely wide range of opinions.

We found that a significant number of both female and male SHASS faculty interviewed feel marginalized and unappreciated within the science and engineering culture of MIT. Clearly a process of feminization partly accounts for the overall devalued status of SHASS, the School containing the largest number of women at the Institute, and containing the disciplines with the highest proportions of women nation-wide. A male “comparable” made this point bluntly and ironically: “We’re all women in the sense that we are all second-class citizens in the larger scheme of MIT.”

One of the most frequent comments in the interviews with women was a complaint about receiving insufficient professional support and advice from colleagues, in particular a tremendous lack of **mentoring**. An overall weak mentoring system was mentioned, as well as a scarcity of potential women mentors.

Most of the women who felt they had received adequate mentoring had male mentors, often men occupying high standing in the School hierarchy. The lack of women on School Council before 1984 was seen as unfortunate, as well as the continuing lack of women faculty in line positions on Academic Council. The scarcity of senior women in those positions results in very few role models for women coming up through the ranks, and an absence of women in administrative positions able to nurture and groom younger colleagues for leadership positions.

The issue of mentoring is linked closely to the pervasive reports regarding the **inadequate amounts of information** about navigating both the School and Institute. Interviewees reported instances of poor communication of important information to junior SHASS faculty, and many also felt that such information was distributed unequally. Both the gender roles acquired during socialization and the aspects of MIT culture encouraging entrepreneurial efforts were seen to result in male faculty being able to find and make use of these resources more easily. We heard of frustration and exasperation over difficulty in getting information about such important matters as how to get raises, promotions, chairs, leaves, research funds, course releases, housing assistance, and so forth. Some faculty reported hearing about deals negotiated with a department head, and felt that such opportunities should be clearly available to all. Most faculty who asked for additional assistance at the time of hiring and when considering outside offers were accommodated in some way, often with a compromise package, and felt they had been treated fairly in this regard.

Inadequate information was tied to a number of complaints about **decision-making** being overly hierarchical and “behind the scenes” in several units, in particular with respect to awarding of endowed chairs. Insufficiently democratic decision-making affects women disproportionately if they are excluded more than men, and a substantial number of interviewees indicated that this was the case. Complaints about favoritism and patron-client relationships also emerged in this regard. Within one unit, we were told, junior male peers were protected, given much more comprehensive information, assigned the more senior secretaries, and allowed to cut more deals for course release.

It is commonly known that one way, and at times the only way, to boost one’s salary and prestige at MIT is to present the administration with an **outside offer** from another university at or above the caliber of MIT. Yet although many SHASS faculty women have received “nibbles” from other universities, very few have pursued them to the point of receiving an official offer of a position. Unless they’re seriously considering moving, they say, obtaining such offers strikes them as “hustling,” if not dishonest. We wonder whether the Institute perceives women faculty as less desirable, notwithstanding their scholarly and pedagogical accomplishments, if it rewards faculty who bring in outside offers more than it rewards those who are content to stay at MIT, and if male faculty hustle such offers more than female faculty (which is by no means established).

Both male and female faculty commented on the **unpleasant atmosphere** within which women faculty must work. Many interviewees felt that MIT still retains a “locker-room feeling,” in which men welcome each other but are suspicious of, and at times hostile to, women, producing feelings of marginalization and alienation. This shows up in subtle but painful ways; for example, several women reported feeling that they were taken much less seriously than male counterparts, at department, School and Institute meetings. Complaints about the expectation that, as a woman, one is expected to defuse tense situations and smooth the way in a gracious manner also emerged, and several described feeling like a token, or invisible at Institute committee meetings.

Of course what produces such feelings are numerous: gender socialization, both male and female, is one important source. Women commented about feeling that they had had to be “good girls” if they were going to get the support of powerful senior men; others said they had to “pull rank”—assert their position in some fashion to receive appropriate responses from students or staff, which made them uncomfortable. Several women complained about being the target of sexual harassment or having seen it occur to a colleague. And several women spoke of the price they had to pay in their units because their concentration on their research resulted in their male colleagues not receiving the “milk and cookies” they expected from a woman.

Unconscious sexism is undoubtedly responsible for some of the treatment female faculty resent. Many commented that they were accorded less authority and respect, and treated dismissively by colleagues and administrators on a regular basis. Several complained that males with fewer credentials were treated better. A very articulate male interviewee spoke of all the ways male privilege continues in the academy: he could wear what he

wanted, he does not have to be considerate of others' feelings, rudeness in his male peers is more tolerated, he doesn't have to second-guess his colleagues when important decisions are being made (graduate admissions, hiring) nor worry about causing offense, he doesn't have to spend an extra 15% of his time looking out for his female peers. Finally, women are expected to be more involved in the "advocacy" aspects of his field, but this work is less valued.

Unfortunately, another source of difficulty for some women was an apprehension that their accomplishments were resented because of plain old envy, reporting that recognition seemed to elicit ambivalent feelings and indifferent behavior, or, worse, a punitive response. Would they be seen as threatening, as a reproach, and risking being labeled a "difficult older woman" if they complained about anything?

"Ghetto" was used more than once to describe how faculty in the arts and humanities side of the school feel about their place at MIT. "MIT culture" was the phrase sometimes employed. "There's one style, the hustling style, and if that is not your style, you are made to feel inferior." Insofar as these attitudes and behaviors are more acceptable and prevalent among men than women, SHASS women will feel more uncomfortable, more compromised, more isolated; both male and female interviewees made statements to this effect. Several feminist scholars complained about their research interests being dismissed by colleagues and administrators. Overall, interviewees indicated that the nation-wide feminization of their fields was heightened at a place like MIT. Language like "hard" and "soft" (for example, economics being hard and literature being soft) was gendered, pointed out one interviewee. A woman speculated that even if Academic Council had 50% women, perhaps not much would change because the mindset is so powerful.

Finally, attempts to right gender wrongs have, paradoxically but expectably, produced resentment. One male interviewee who had served as department head said that female associate professors were used too much by an administration concerned with visibility and diversity.

One interesting finding was that many women faculty in the doctoral programs seemed more dissatisfied than those in units teaching only undergraduate subjects. This dissatisfaction, if indeed greater, may be due to these departments being less "feminized" (we're all second-class citizens here), making the gender disparities more apparent. Also, being in prestigious departments may have led to higher expectations, and while they are aware that they have received more than their female colleagues in undergraduate-only units, perhaps they are more likely to perceive the disparity between what they are receiving and what their male peers are receiving.

We want to stress that most senior women felt that when they asked for material assistance, the School generally provided it and facilitated their research in other ways. Most women commented that they loved their work (although several also reported feeling isolated, bereft of colleagues with whom they could have stimulating and helpful discussions). That is, most women felt that on the one hand, the School made it possible

for them to conduct research and accomplish their scholarly goals; on the other hand, however, these same women bemoaned a lack of **community** both within the School and at the Institute overall. At times the stress was on the “SHASS ghetto” feature and at times their gender position took front stage.

When asked what they felt was the best thing about being at MIT, the vast majority of women interviewees mentioned either their students or their colleagues. Men gave these reasons as well, but several also mentioned freedom and the Institute’s support for new ideas and new projects.

Discussion

Issues the Committee did not investigate, but which need further investigation

Three SHASS units (Music and Theater Arts, Foreign Languages and Literatures, and Writing and Humanistic Studies) depend heavily upon outside lecturers to teach their basic, required undergraduate subjects. Other units hire lecturers on a less frequent basis. Lecturers are clearly an important part of the MIT pedagogical enterprise, yet many part-time and junior lecturers’ salaries do not reflect this importance. Nor do they have job security. The Committee feels that the status of lecturers needs serious investigation, particularly with respect to possible gender discrimination (for instance, are the part-time lecturer ranks more heavily female than the senior lecturer ranks?).

The Committee feels that understanding junior faculty experiences, especially women’s, will help us place our findings concerning senior women’s experiences into context. The differences between junior and senior women faculty experiences in the School of Science uncovered by that School’s gender equity committee argue strongly for such investigations within SHASS.

A disjuncture exists between the number of women enrolled in the doctoral programs and the number of tenured women in the two largest departments with doctoral programs—Political Science and Economics. For example, in recent years roughly 25% of the PhD students in Economics have been women, while no more than 15% of the faculty have been women. Although not part of the Committee’s charge, we recommend below that such “leakage in the pipeline” be investigated further.

The Committee was not able to compare the experiences of women minority faculty with other faculty in the School due to the small number of such tenured minority women (one). It is clear, however, that minority faculty face additional sets of problems that can have discriminatory effects in the School and at the Institute. Most notably, the extraordinary service demands placed on minority faculty and the instances of subtle racial discrimination they experience may not be fully recognized or understood by faculty and administrators.

Finally, the effectiveness of MIT’s “Target of Opportunity” program for attracting senior women to the faculty needs to be fully evaluated. Especially for the departments with

PhD programs and few women faculty, there is a widespread view that the program is not well-matched to the way departments search for senior faculty or the financial realities that they face. Searches are typically field specific, while top women faculty are not equally distributed across fields. The requirement that all faculty slots be “full” to obtain financial support under the program is a further barrier. If MIT is really serious about attracting more senior women to these departments, a commitment about which several faculty interviewees expressed considerable doubt, simply making a specific number of fully financed slots available for appointments of senior or advanced junior women faculty to these departments, without all of the current contingencies and strings attached, would have a much higher probability of achieving results.

Reflections on the MIT system

Significantly affecting the figures on salaries is what Dean Khoury has informally referred to as the “star” system; an assumption that certain senior faculty members hold a “star” status granted to them by most, if not all, of their peers. As we understand the term, “stars” are more visibly marketable than their peers and as a result they are more likely to earn a higher salary, hold an endowed chair, have received significant outside recognition, and are regularly courted by other prestigious universities. We were informed by Dean Khoury that most of the top star salaries are earned by faculty who were hired as seniors, or, if they came up through the ranks, have negotiated higher salaries for themselves. That is, in both cases, the star MIT salaries have typically been generated through negotiating (either an offer to come to MIT or a response from an outside offer). However, having examined salary data from only one year this remains only an impression. In addition to the more numerous men, several senior women appear to be marketable in this sense; if this is so, their presence will significantly affect the aggregate salary figures for women in those units.

The finding that the salaries of the most senior women are not generally incommensurate with those of their male peers should not be surprising, given that they are so few in number. As many of the most prominent senior women in the School were hired into MIT as full professors, their salaries are quite high, just as they are for men who have advanced in similar ways. Being so few, these women’s experiences are unlikely to be predictive of the experience of women who advance through the ranks. Hence, while comparable “star” men have very similar profiles, the overall picture for men is less deeply affected because of the greater numbers of male faculty in all SHASS units.

In the perception of the Committee, therefore, and of many of the interviewees, the acquisition of salary increases, chairs, research support, etc., partly depends on obtaining outside offers from other universities, and such outside offers have become increasingly important drivers at MIT over the last decade. To the extent that women are less willing to entertain outside offers, or are less mobile than their male counterparts for personal or family reasons, this trend must inevitably lead to gender discrimination in salaries and working conditions. Accordingly, we believe that it is important for MIT to expand the objective criteria upon which it evaluates faculty members for the purposes of determining salaries, chairs, and other benefits.

We noticed three different tenure patterns in SHASS. In some units, men and women have been tenured at more or less the same rate. Certain other originally male-heavy units have succeeded in increasing the number of senior women colleagues. When we looked at the interviews, what seemed to matter most in the units which have significantly changed the gender ratio in senior faculty was the presence of a senior female faculty member who worked to ensure that her younger female colleagues were supported in every way possible in their career trajectory, and therefore had the best chance at being awarded tenure. These same units also contain male senior faculty committed to creating equitable conditions in the shortest amount of time possible. Other male-heavy units have tenured one or two senior women, but the gender ratio remains lopsided. These units continue to hire junior women at a disappointingly low rate.

These findings support our wish to emphasize that while hiring and promoting more women is an important goal, perhaps equally important is the commitment on the part of all senior faculty to treat their younger female colleagues, junior and senior, with the same enthusiasm as they do their younger male colleagues. A senior faculty member who speaks out forcefully when unconscious sexism appears (and we received ample testimony in the interviews that such sexism continues to thrive) during informal conversations and department meetings (and at School Council and Academic Council) can accomplish wonders.

Our final reflection concerns the finding that women from SHASS are bearing much more than their fair share of MIT committee assignments. These burdens are especially inequitable in light of the relatively low salaries, relatively low promotion rates, and relatively high teaching loads of the SHASS units with the largest number of women. MIT must adopt policies which either spread these burdens out or provide compensation—released time from teaching—for excessive administrative/Institute service burdens, for in the present situation doing this disproportionate amount of service is not working to women's advantage, given the rewards system.

Recommendations

The Committee has collected data on senior SHASS faculty with respect to compensation and research funding, promotion and tenure, service to the School and Institute, and recognition by the School and Institute of scholarship, teaching and service in the form of awards. The School of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences has recruited, recognized, and rewarded women faculty more than certain other MIT Schools. We found no discernible inequities in several of the areas we examined; in particular junior women faculty appear to be entering MIT on an equal footing with their male peers. However, much remains to be done to improve both the continuing structural inequities and, equally important, the overall climate in which SHASS men and women faculty interact and carry out their research and pedagogical activities. In this spirit we offer the following recommendations.

- Establish a permanent SHASS Gender Equity Committee with rotating membership and representative with respect to gender and field (i.e., humanities, arts and social sciences). This Committee will establish a School-wide policy and monitor adherence to it.
- Continue, or, better yet, increase the efforts to recruit outstanding women faculty at every rank. Given the gender proportions in many SHASS fields nation-wide, an overall percentage of 21% SHASS senior women faculty in AY02 can be improved. In particular Political Science and Economics should continue to be very proactive in this regard.
- Establish clear mentoring guidelines and require unit heads to assign mentors to all incoming faculty members. Provide mentors with training and ongoing advice about assisting their mentees in an appropriate and productive manner. The permanent Gender Equity Committee should continue discussions with regard to the two roles mentors play: intellectual (here the mentor works in the same field as the mentee) and administrative (this kind of mentor, an administrator, usually the department head, must be knowledgeable about MIT and SHASS policies and procedures with respect to promotion, leaves, funding, etc.). Mentors will be expected to meet with their mentees a specified number of times per year.
- Monitor faculty salaries to ensure equity between genders within units, adjusting for other support packages. Given that many studies⁶ including those of other schools at MIT, have discerned systematic gender discrepancies in salary, in a given field or a given department, we recommend that extra vigilance be paid to this issue at every administrative level to ensure that no hidden discrimination is operating and that any discrepancies that appear are the result of acceptable differences (i.e., quality of scholarship, teaching excellence, etc.).
- Communicate to faculty the “rules of the game,” especially surrounding issues of promotion and tenure. Ensure that *all* faculty, not just administrators and mentors, are able to communicate accurate information about School standards and expectations, and that they understand the seriousness of this responsibility.
- Communicate to all faculty in an open, clear, and comprehensive manner, any opportunities for research support, and encourage them to apply. Faculty applicants should indicate any other funding they have secured, and the Dean should take into consideration the available sources of outside funding.

⁶ In “Gender differences in salary and promotion for faculty in the humanities, 1977-95” (*Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta Working Papers*, 2001, 07, 69 pp.), Donna K. Ginther and Kathy Hayes conclude that gender discrimination in humanities salaries tends to operate through substantial differences in promotion rates, even after controlling for productivity and demographic characteristics.

- Apprise all faculty of every opportunity for forms of assistance in areas other than research, for example with housing, child care, and other kinds of assistance when special circumstances warrant.
- Create a reward structure within the units and School to encourage faculty who serve the School and the Institute on committees, and recognize them when they do.
- Ensure that distinguished female faculty in SHASS are nominated for Institute awards and chairs as well as prestigious awards beyond MIT.
- Create a visible and workable strategy for preparing senior women faculty to assume responsible leadership positions within the School and elsewhere in the Institute.
- Encourage department heads through the dean to exchange information about personnel practices.
- Remind senior faculty through the dean and department heads that fostering equity and community is the responsibility of *all* senior faculty.
- Collect and permanently retain comprehensive records on teaching loads, committee (including ad-hoc committee) assignments, advisee loads and other administrative responsibilities in both the department office and the Dean's Office.
- Keep more comprehensive records of Provost's Fund awards.
- Collect quantitative data on current junior faculty women and their male comparables as a means of understanding changes taking place over time within SHASS, and to keep an eye on pipeline issues.
- Sensitize faculty and administrators to the particularly difficult issues facing minority faculty.
- Provide more funding for recruiting senior and advanced junior women, without regard to field representation, to departments that have very low numbers of women.
- Collect quantitative and interview data on the status of women lecturers in SHASS.

Appendix I: Interview Questions

What were the circumstances of your coming to MIT?

- What stage of career
- How related to your personal situation
- Kind of negotiating with your department head or the dean
- Success at getting what you asked for or were promised

Have you received any special considerations from your department head or the dean (e.g., time off, course release, funding for travel, research, supplies/computers, housing, child-related expenses, etc)?

Have you been fairly treated, or overlooked with regard to departmental honors, opportunities, etc.?

Have department chores (e.g., advising, administration, hosting guests, sitting on committees) been equitably assigned, or have you been unduly burdened?

What has been the most difficult thing about being at MIT? Examples?

What has been the most positive thing? Examples?

How are decisions made in your department about

- Faculty hires
- Graduate admissions
- Curricular changes
- Invited speakers and colloquium
- Special initiatives/fundraising

Do you sense a gender or rank dimension to these decisions?

Are there ways in which men and women fare differently in your department overall, and if so, what are they?

Have you ever received an outside offer, and, if so, how was it handled by your department chair or the dean?

Have you seriously considered leaving MIT, and if so, why?

APPENDIX II.

SHASS REPRESENTATION ON INSTITUTE COMMITTEES

Faculty 10 year History: 1990 - 2000

I. Committee on Academic Performance

	Male	Female	
SHASS	3	3	6
Other Schools	23	2	25
N =	26	5	31

Note: 50% of SHASS members were female.

60% of women on the committee were from SHASS.

II. Committee on Corporate Relations

	Male	Female	
SHASS	3	1	4
Other Schools	22	1	23
N =	25	2	27

Note: 25% of SHASS members were female.

50% of women on the committee were from SHASS.

III. Committee on Curricula

	Male	Female	
SHASS	4	2	6
Other Schools	26	4	30
N =	30	6	36

Note: 33 1/3% of SHASS members were female.
33 1/3% of women on the committee were from SHASS.

IV. Committee on Discipline

	Male	Female	
SHASS	3	1	4
Other Schools	16	5	21
N =	19	6	25

Note: 25% of SHASS members were female.
17% of women on the committee were from SHASS.

V. Faculty Policy Committee

	Male	Female	
SHASS	1	6	7
Other Schools	31	7	38
N =	32	13	45

Note: 86% of SHASS members were female.
46% of women on the committee were from SHASS.

VI. Committee on Faculty Administration

	Male	Female	
SHASS	3	2	5
Other Schools	23	4	27
N =	26	6	32

Note: 40% of SHASS members were female.
33 1/3% of women on the committee were from SHASS.

VII. Committee on Graduate School Programs

	Male	Female	
SHASS	18	6	24
Other Schools	64	5	69
N =	83	11	94

Note: 25% of SHASS members were female.
55% of women on the committee were from SHASS.

VIII. Committee on the Library System

	Male	Female	
SHASS	5	3	8
Other Schools	18	2	20
N =	23	5	28

Note: 36% of SHASS members were female.
60% of women on the committee were from SHASS

IX. Committee on Nominations

	Male	Female	
SHASS	2	5	7
Other Schools	24	4	28
N =	26	9	35

Note: 71% of SHASS members were female.
56% of women on the committee were from SHASS.

X. Committee on Outside Professional Activities

	Male	Female	
SHASS	3	1	4
Other Schools	26	2	28
N =	29	3	32

Note: 25% of SHASS members were female.
33 1/3% of women on the committee were from SHASS.

XI. Committee on Student Affairs

	Male	Female	
SHASS	2	2	4
Other Schools	23	2	25
N =	25	4	29

Note: 50% of SHASS members were female.
50% of women on the committee were from SHASS.

XII. Committee on the Undergraduate Program

	Male	Female	
SHASS	4	4	8
Other Schools	35	6	41
N =	39	10	49

Notes: 50% of SHASS members were female.
40% of women on the committee were from SHASS.

XIII. Committee on Undergraduate Admissions & Financial Aid

	Male	Female	
SHASS	4	1	5
Other Schools	19	3	22
N =	23	4	27

Notes: 20% of SHASS members were female.
25% of women on the committee were from SHASS.

XIV. Killian Award Selection Committee

	Male	Female	
SHASS	6	5	11
Other Schools	27	5	32
N =	33	10	43

Notes: 45% of SHASS members were female.
50% of women on the committee were from SHASS.

XV. Edgerton Award Selection Committee

	Male	Female	
SHASS	3	5	8
Other Schools	22	5	27
N =	25	10	35

Notes: 63% of SHASS members were female.

50% of women on the committee were from SHASS.

Appendix III

SHASS Chair Statistical Breakdown by Unit and Year

SHASS CHAIRS FY'96	ASSISTANT		ASSOCIATE WITHOUT TENURE		ASSOCIATE WITH TENURE		FULL		ALL RANKS	
	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
ECONOMICS	1	-	2	-	-	-	9	-	12	-
ANTHROPOLOGY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FL&L	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	-
HISTORY	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	3
LITERATURE	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	-
MUSIC & THEATER	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
LING. & PHILOS.	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1
STS	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	1
POLITICAL SCIENCE	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	2	1
WRITING	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	2
ALL DEPARTMENTS	1	1	3	1	1	-	20	6	25	8

Appendix III

SHASS Chair Statistical Breakdown by Unit and Year

SHASS CHAIRS FY97	ASSISTANT		ASSOCIATE WITHOUT TENURE		ASSOCIATE WITH TENURE		FULL		ALL RANKS	
	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
ECONOMICS	-	-	3	-	-	-	9	-	12	-
ANTHROPOLOGY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FL&L	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	1
HISTORY	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	1	3
LITERATURE	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	3	-
MUSIC & THEATER	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1
LING. & PHILOS.	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	2	1
STS	1	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	4	1
POLITICAL SCIENCE	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	2	1
WRITING	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	2
ALL DEPARTMENTS	1	2	5	1	1	-	22	7	29	10

Appendix III

SHASS Chair Statistical Breakdown by Unit and Year

SHASS CHAIRS FY98	ASSISTANT		ASSOCIATE WITHOUT TENURE		ASSOCIATE WITH TENURE		FULL		ALL RANKS	
	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
ECONOMICS	-	1	1	1	-	-	9	-	10	2
ANTHROPOLOGY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
FL&L	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
HISTORY	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	1	3
LITERATURE	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	-
MUSIC & THEATER	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1
LING. & PHILOS.	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	3	-
STS	1	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	4	1
POLITICAL SCIENCE	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	2	2
WRITING	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	2
ALL DEPARTMENTS	2	4	2	2	-	-	22	7	26	13

Appendix III

SHASS Chair Statistical Breakdown by Unit and Year

SHASS CHAIRS FY99	ASSISTANT		ASSOCIATE WITHOUT TENURE		ASSOCIATE WITH TENURE		FULL		ALL RANKS	
	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
ECONOMICS	-	1	1	1	-	-	9	-	10	2
ANTHROPOLOGY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
FL&L	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
HISTORY	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	2
LITERATURE	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	-
MUSIC & THEATER	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	1
LING. & PHILOS.	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	4	-
STS	1	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	4	1
POLITICAL SCIENCE	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	3	2
WRITING	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	2
ALL DEPARTMENTS	4	4	2	1	1	-	22	7	29	12

Appendix III

SHASS Chair Statistical Breakdown by Unit and Year

SHASS CHAIRS FY00	ASSISTANT		ASSOCIATE WITHOUT TENURE		ASSOCIATE WITH TENURE		FULL		ALL RANKS	
	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
ECONOMICS	1	-	1	1	-	-	10	-	12	1
ANTHROPOLOGY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
FL&L	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	-
HISTORY	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	2
LITERATURE	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	-
MUSIC & THEATER	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	1
LING. & PHILOS.	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	4	-
STS	1	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	4	1
WRITING							2	2	2	2
POLITICAL SCIENCE	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	3	1
ALL DEPARTMENTS	5	1	4	1	-	-	23	7	32	9

Appendix IV

Levitan Prize Statistical Breakdown by Unit and Year

Levitan Prize	Assistant	Associate Without Tenure		Associate With Tenure		Full	All Ranks	
		M	W	M	W		M	W
FY96								
ECONOMICS								
Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANTHROPOLOGY								
Requests	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FL&L								
Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HISTORY								
Requests	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Awards	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Mean award amount	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
LITERATURE								
Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MUSIC & THEATER								
Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LITERATURE								
Requests	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-
Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LING. & PHILOS.								
Requests	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
POLITICAL SCIENCE								
Requests	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
STS								
Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WRITING								
Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALL DEPARTMENTS								
REQUESTS	1	1	-	-	-	4	1	5
AWARDS	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
MEAN AWARD	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	20,000

Appendix IV

Levitan Prize Statistical Breakdown by Unit and Year

Levitan Prize FY99		ASSISTANT		ASSOCIATE WITHOUT TENURE		ASSOCIATE WITH TENURE		FULL	ALL RANKS	
		M	W	M	W	M	W		M	W
ECONOMICS	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANTHROPOLOGY	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FL&L	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HISTORY	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	20,000
LITERATURE	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MUSIC & THEATER	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LITERATURE	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LING. & PHILOS.	Requests	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
POLITICAL SCIENCE	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
STS	Requests	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WRITING	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALL DEPARTMENTS	Requests	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
	MEAN AWARD	-	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	20,000

Appendix IV

Levitan Prize Statistical Breakdown by Unit and Year

Levitan Prize FY'00		ASSISTANT		ASSOCIATE WITHOUT TENURE		ASSOCIATE WITH TENURE		FULL	ALL RANKS	
		M	W	M	W	M	W		M	W
ECONOMICS	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANTHROPOLOGY	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FL&L	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HISTORY	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LITERATURE	Requests	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	20,000	-
MUSIC & THEATER	Requests	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LITERATURE	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LING. & PHILOS.	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
POLITICAL SCIENCE	Requests	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
STS	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WRITING	Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Awards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean award amount	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALL DEPARTMENTS REQUESTS AWARDS	Requests	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	3
	Awards	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1
	MEAN AWARD	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	20,000	-