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Activities

- Regular meetings of the entire Task Force were held from December 1994 through April 1996.

  a. Local expert consultants provided information and perspectives.

  b. Task Force members reviewed and discussed those insights.

- Subcommittees were formed to respond to each of the six charges (see Appendix item #).
  
  Subcommittee A: Charges 1, 2 and 6.

  Subcommittee B: Charges 3 and 5.

  Subcommittee C: Charge 4

- A comprehensive archive was collected of reports on the status of women at other North American universities. That archive is on reserve at Lockwood Library to serve as a community resource.

- A calendar was kept of all 1995 campus-wide activities of special interest to women.

- Two demonstration projects were organized:
  


Recommendations

Guiding principles:

- Consensus

- Practicality

- Specificity

- Benefits for UB
Overall recommendation

Extend the mandate of the Task Force on Women at UB until a permanent alternative is in place.

Specific recommendations

Charge #1: University policies and practices in hiring, advancing, and compensating women faculty, administrators, and staff.

- Regular updates should be made of data describing the distribution, representation and compensation of women at UB.
- Regular updates should be made of archives of extra-mural reports and other scholarly documents on the status of women in US academe.
- Archives/ data responsibility should be assigned to Task Force/ Office for Women.

Charge #2: Strategies for addressing any inequities.

- A plan should be made for timely rectification of persistent gender-based salary disparities.
- Specific plans, with targets, should be devised to increase representation of women in those worksites where they are significantly underrepresented.
- Significant representation of women should be required on all committees dealing with promotion, hiring, resource allocation, policy formulation, awards and honors, etc.
- Existing programs to address inequities should be strengthened and reinforced.
- Extra-mural practices should be monitored, to keep UB in close touch with rapidly changing US social /workplace patterns.

Charge #3: Improving the campus climate for women, with full consideration of the special needs of diverse groups.

- Adequate child care facilities should be provided as soon as possible to meet existing demands.
- Personnel policies should be formulated that are friendly to care-givers, including flexible work schedules, job sharing, tenure clock flexibility among others.
• National and/or extra-mural observances about women should be supported and celebrated on campus.

• Women's Studies should be strengthened and expanded.

• Athletics programs need more women head coaches and senior administrators.

• Positive images of women should be incorporated into publicity and other documents that represent UB to the community and to potential donors.

• A campus-wide survey should be conducted to assess the current 'climate' for women at UB.

**Charge #4: Methods for developing a campus environment that is free of sexual harassment.**

• A specific, detailed, practical program for dealing with complaints of sexual harassment should be an urgent priority in 1996-97. Essential elements in such a program include:
  a. Professionally conducted education/ awareness workshops.
  b. Efficient, timely procedures to review complaints.
  c. Adjudication processes free of all conflicts of interest.
  d. Emphasis on satisfactory informal resolution of complaints.
  e. Full protection of the rights of all parties to complaints.
  f. Significant sanctions for inappropriate behaviors.

**Charge #5: Methods for identifying, encouraging, and developing women leaders.**

• Significant representation of women should be mandated on all university committees, search processes, policy making bodies, awards and honors committees, etc.

• A consultant panel of senior women should be constituted to facilitate identification of qualified women for committee service.

• Career development workshops for women should be conducted at regular, frequent intervals.

• Specific initiatives should be supported to promote women's careers. Possibilities include intra- and extra-mural training courses, internships, seminars, financial awards for research and/or education.
Charge #6: Developing a process of accountability at all levels regarding the progress being made toward achieving equity for women.

- Strong, unwavering leadership decisions that facilitate, promote and reward efforts to achieve gender equity are key.
- Regular up-dates should be made of the data in this report, describing distribution, compensation and representation of women at UB.
- Specific timely plans should be formulated, with targets for achieving gender equity of compensation and/or representation by individual units.
- Regular assessment should be made of progress toward those targets, with rewards and incentives for success.
- Campus-wide surveys should be conducted to monitor changing community perceptions of the 'climate" for women at UB.
- Task Force findings should be widely disseminated to the UB community.
II. Comments from the Co-Chairs:

We accepted the responsibility of serving as Co-chairs of the Task Force on Women at UB with many trepidations. At first reading, the charges to the Task Force appeared dauntingly comprehensive. We knew that community expectations were high for a thorough, detailed but rapid response. We realized that investigations of many issues would be complicated by pre-formed opinions, cultural myths, and/or ignorance.

We came quickly to appreciate that American academic institutions are largely derived from centuries-old monastic models that excluded women entirely. Seen from that perspective, women are relatively recent interlopers in the academy. Although it is not really surprising that full gender equity remains elusive, we are appreciative that UB has undertaken a systematic analysis to accelerate the process of modifying deeply rooted social and institutional patterns.

To our very great fortune, a resourceful graduate student member of the Task Force retrieved a document that had been prepared by the late UB Professor Ann Scott and published in an early (May 14, 1970) issue of the Reporter. Dr. Scott's report, "The Half-Eaten Apple - a look at sex discrimination in the University [at Buffalo]" had accomplished many of the tasks assigned to us in 1995, including a detailed demographic analysis of conditions of UB, and an overview of women's status in other academic institutions, with general and specific recommendations for achieving gender equity at UB. The Half-Eaten Apple has been our inspiration and, to a large extent, our model and guide. It was extremely reassuring to realize that our task was do-able, as Dr. Scott had produced her report essentially alone, with much less institutional cooperation than has been provided to us. The "Half-Eaten Apple" served as a valuable reference that made it possible for us to compare the UB 'climate' for women 25 years ago with the present. None of the extra-mural reports we studied benefited from such precious historical information. In addition, the Scott report helped us to focus our energies and to define practical goals for Task Force activities over a limited time.

For each aspect of women's lives at UB that was reviewed, our aims were to describe existing conditions, to make comparisons with other similar institutions, to assess the concordances or discrepancies between actual circumstances at UB and the perception of them, and finally, to consider strategies that might alter those conditions that seemed in the most urgent need of improvement. We were also concerned to find ways to modify faulty perceptions and correct misunderstandings. In formulating recommendations, our main premise has been that the creation of a "woman-friendly" campus is absolutely essential for the academic and financial prosperity of UB.

We feel that this study of the status of women at UB is important for three reasons. First, the status of women in our society has changed dramatically over the last three decades. The reasons for this change are complex and require careful study and analysis at the societal level. If the university can be viewed as a microcosm of our society, this study may help us understand what has taken place and still is changing in the academy.
Second, as the University faculty ages and significant number of faculty members retire, a strategic plan must be developed to increase diversity in keeping with charges in American Society. Participation in the academy should reflect the ethnic, racial and gender composition of the American citizenry. Priority must be given to hire women in schools and departments where women are underutilized or essentially absent.

Third, UB is typical of many large public research universities that are undergoing change. In its sesquicentennial year, the University has an unprecedented opportunity to establish a model for the role of women in the academy.

There have been many rewarding aspects to this "Task". The opportunities afforded to us to meet and work with colleagues, especially women, across the whole university community has been educational and stimulating. We made many new friends whose opinions and perspectives we value and respect. We came to appreciate that women at UB are extraordinarily proud of their professional association with the university. They are accomplished, energetic, resourceful and ambitious. Women at UB recognize that their own personal career success is closely linked to the prosperity of the institution. They are anxious and willing to cooperate in all possible ways to promote that prosperity. This report is testimony to the positive force of women at UB.
IV. Methods: What the Task Force has done

- Task Force Charges and Composition

On February 1, 1994 President William R. Greiner announced the formation of a university-wide Task Force on Women at UB. "Workplace issues of hiring, advancement and equitable compensation [were to] be among the task force's primary concerns, as [well as] more general questions about the climate for women at UB." Members of the Task Force, with 2 co-chairs, were formally appointed in the late autumn of 1994. Selections were made by the President from nominations submitted by the Senior Vice President, Vice Presidents, Deans, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Professional Staff Senate Executive Committee, the labor unions representing U.B. employees, and the Undergraduate and Graduate Student Associations. At the request of the two co-chairs, two ex-officio members were added to the Task Force: Vice Provost for Faculty Development, Dr. William Fischer, and Assistant Vice President for Human Resources, Ms. Ellen McNamara. On the advice of the original members, the committee was also eventually expanded to include several more men and people of color.

- Meeting Schedules and Topics

The Task Force held its first formal meeting on December 9, 1994. At that time, President Greiner presented six charges to the committee and shared his views on the function of the Task Force. The six charges were divided among three subcommittees. Subcommittee A was given responsibility for Charges 1, 2 and 6, Subcommittee B for Charges 3 and 5, and Subcommittee C for Charge 4.

Regular monthly meetings of the entire Task Force were held throughout the second semester, 1995, from January until May, and resumed in September. Guests were invited to many sessions to provide insight and information about the experiences of women at UB. With those experts, the Task Force reviewed University policies and practices on a variety of matters, including hiring, compensation, promotion, harassment, safety, and gender equity in athletics.

- Sources of Information: Extra- and Intramural

Considerable effort was placed, from the beginning, on collecting a comprehensive archive of reports on the status of women at other universities, and other relevant extramural documents. Those reports and articles, now on reserve in Lockwood Library, are freely available to the University community. The Task Force also acquired specific local information about women and women's concerns at UB from the Offices of Personnel, Institutional Studies, Affirmative Action, Public Safety, Student Life, President's Review Board, President's Panel to Review Search Procedure Reports, United University Professions, Civil Service Employees Association.

After lengthy discussion, the Task Force decided not to conduct a formal rigorous opinion survey at this time. Financial resources were limited; appropriate professional expertise was not available among Task Force members. However an informal questionnaire was written, from models provided by other institutions. That questionnaire appeared in UUP and
GSA newsletters; responses were voluntary and confidential. The Task Force felt strongly that all women should have the opportunity to communicate with the Task Force, adding personal comments and advice to the more formal input from invited experts. Furthermore, opinion surveys had been used widely at other universities to assess the prevailing climate for women. Those surveys were valuable in shaping policies and served as a solid basis for measuring improvements in the climate.

- **1995 Calendar of Activities of Special Interest to Women**

  During the past year, the Task Force has kept a record of the most important and/or representative activities on campus concerned with women's accomplishments, interests, and concerns. Those events were attended, whenever possible, by at least one Task Force member.

- **Projects to Promote Professional Development and a Sense of Community Among Women**

  Members of Subcommittee B chose to organize a career development workshop that would honor outstanding women at UB and provide a forum for those women to share information about the skills that led them to their success. That workshop was held March 7, 1996 during National Women's History Month.

  In addition, members of the Task Force organized local activities for National Take Your Daughter to Work Day, April 25, 1996. These two activities are viewed as "demonstration projects", examples of steps that can be taken to promote the interests of women and improve the campus climate for women.
V. Results

A. Subcommittee A: Charges #1, #2 and #6

1. Charge 1: University policies and practices in hiring, advancing, and compensating women faculty, administrators, and staff.

a. Demographic data from UB.

   (1) Introductory comments

   For a full appreciation of the following tables and graphs, several points need comment and explanation. The great majority of information about UB was provided by the Offices of Institutional Studies, Affirmative Action, and Personnel Services. The biannual report of the AAUP, published in Academe, March, 1993, was also an important reference for us (and for many extramural task force reports). A careful reader may notice, as we did, that data from different sources may not be identical. There are several reasons for discrepancies.

   - In the university community, employee and student turnover is a fact of life; data collected at different times in one academic year, or in different years, will reflect those population fluctuations.

   - The criteria for "counting" vary from office to office as do the categories for data analysis.

   - The information we have used for this report was the best available during our year (1995) of study, but it is imperfect. Some numbers are older than we might have wished; all sources did not employ similar standards of rigor in collecting information; inevitably much information was incomplete and/or not usefully available. For example it was not possible for us meaningfully to evaluate salary patterns in those clinical programs, such as Medicine and Dentistry, which derive much salary support from non-UB sources.

   - For those few instances in which apparent discrepancies required us to choose among data sets, we used the information provided by the Affirmative Action Office in official national reports.

   - Data describing demographics, hiring, promotion, compensation are available in much more detail for faculty than for students and staff. The response to Charge # 1 is, therefore, unbalanced in the emphasis on faculty experiences. From the available information about other women employees, the faculty figures seem at least representative, if not actually rosier than others.

   - Some typographical mistakes and errors of transcription will almost certainly have been missed despite careful scrutiny. We apologize for those in advance and would appreciate notification.
We view this aspect of the report as a model for further study and follow-up. Many interesting and important questions raised by this first look could not be examined in detail in the one-year period of this report. A few examples: Are there gender differences in the academic experiences of graduate students? How does the gender composition of our administration compare to other public research units? Are there gender differences in promotion rates for faculty or staff?

(2) Women in the Faculty
Tables A and B:

In 1994, at UB approximately 1/4 of the faculty, nearly 1/2 of the professional staff and well over 1/2 of the full-time support staff were female. In each category the proportion of women working part-time was substantially higher.

Table C:
Although women constituted 2670 of full-time faculty, their representation in tenured ranks, at 1770, was much lower. Only 1070 of all full professors were women. The high proportion of non-tenured women on tenure track may well reflect recent increased hiring of women (see Table M). It remains to be seen whether those women advance to tenure at the same rate as their
male colleagues. Interestingly, women predominated in non-tenure track assistant professor (55%) and lecturer (65%) positions.

Table D1, D2 and E:
Women have been much less successful than men in achieving the highest faculty rank. For the entire thirteen years from 1970-1983, during which they consistently constituted approximately 15% of the faculty, women were only 5% of the full professors. Since 1985, the proportion of women full professors has increased slowly (ca 0.5% per year). However, that increase was matched by the overall increase of women in the tenure track faculty (ca 0.5% per year). A woman’s relative opportunity to achieve full professorship at UB has not improved since 1970. UB is below average for AAU schools in the representation of women (1) in the faculty as a whole and, (2) at the rank of professor.

The data for minority women are even more disappointing, with very little improvement in representation since 1977. In 1977, minority women faculty at UB included 3 African Americans, 4 Asian Americans, but no Hispanic or Native Americans at all. The absolute number of minority women faculty has increased in proportion to the overall increase in women. The progress toward tenure for minority women has been highly disappointing. Although minority women have constituted more than 10% of the cohort of women faculty since 1985, by 1993 only 6% of tenured women were minorities. The relative opportunity for a minority woman to achieve tenure at UB has been substantially less than for her non-minority female colleagues.

Table F:
In all schools but Architecture and Planning, the proportion of women faculty was well below the proportion of qualified women in the US employment pool. The proportion of undergraduate women students at UB in each school was similar to the size of the available pool, and served to validate the estimate of that pool. The female graduate student population also reflected national trends, with a few notable exceptions. Women graduate students were underrepresented in Natural Sciences and Pharmacy. In Law and Education, women students were more numerous than might have been expected.
### Table D1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year*</th>
<th>Tenured/Tenure-Track Women Faculty (%)*</th>
<th>Women Full Professors (%)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data expressed as % women of total faculty (men and women)
Data from Affirmative Action Office, except 1970: from *Half-Eaten Apple*

### Table D2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year *</th>
<th>With Tenure Number (%) **</th>
<th>Tenure Track Number (%)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>3 (3.2)</td>
<td>4 (6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>3 (3.2)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>5 (4.6)</td>
<td>6 (8.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>3 (2.8)</td>
<td>5 (8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>3 (2.6)</td>
<td>9 (13.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>4 (3.4)</td>
<td>12 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>5 (4.2)</td>
<td>15 (16.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>9 (7.3)</td>
<td>10 (12.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>10 (6.1)</td>
<td>20 (16.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data expressed as % women of total faculty (men and women)
**Data expressed as % minority women of total women faculty (minority and nonminority women)
Data from Affirmative Action Office
### TABLE E

Representative Major Public Universities: Women Tenure-Track Faculty Compared to Women Full Professors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women Tenure-Track Faculty (%) ***</th>
<th>Women Full Professors (%) ***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers State University* N/A</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland* N/A</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California/L.A.*</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California/Berkeley*</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington*</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon*</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO*</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Hampshire</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AAU institution  
**AAUP data  
***Data expressed as % women of total faculty (men and women)

### TABLE F

UB Women Faculty & Students Compared to Women in National Availability Pool for Faculty Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Faculty</th>
<th>Tenure-Track Full-Time Faculty (%)</th>
<th>at UB Women in National Availability (%)</th>
<th>Pool Women Undergraduate Students at (%)</th>
<th>UB Women Graduate &amp; Professional Study (%) at UB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; Planning</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Letters</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Medicine</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Applied Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Related Professions</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine &amp; Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Professional or graduate programs only  
Data from Affirmative Action Office, 1994
The Task Force recognizes that estimates of the national availability pool in any particular discipline may not necessarily reflect a) the pool of women interested in working at UB and/or b) the pool from which expertise may be found for a specific work responsibility at UB. On the other hand, the proportion of women students in each program is a very real and important estimate of the need for women teachers, as mentors, role models and support systems for those students. In schools like Management, Pharmacy, Health Related Professions, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, women students may have a difficult time making effective contact with women faculty. Women faculty, in turn, may find themselves overburdened in an attempt to cover the gender deficit. The situation is especially acute for minority women who serve as role models for women and for all students of color. In many schools, minority women students will find no female minority faculty role models or mentors.

Table G:

As UB schools vary considerably in size, attempts were made to convert percentages in Table F to actual numbers (Table G). The column labeled "shortfall" indicates, for each school, the number of women to be added if the UB workforce were to reflect the national pool of women in each field. In Dentistry and Engineering, which have not yet attracted many women, the "shortfall" numbers were relatively small, as they were also for Social Work, Nursing and Library Studies, traditional "women's" professions. From an examination of Tables F and G, it became evident that women were especially deficient in the faculties of Health Related Professions, Pharmacy, Arts and Letters, Social Sciences, Management and Natural Sciences.

Table H:

Within individual schools, there were large variations among departments in the representation of women. In some, the "shortfall" was considerable. Deficiencies in English, Psychology,

\[^1\text{N.B. The comparisons made in Table G are based on "the total workforce" in each school, a number that encompasses tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty (see Table C) and is, therefore, different from and larger than the total tenure track faculty counted in Tables D, F, and H.}\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Faculty</th>
<th>Total Workforce (number)</th>
<th>A Women in Workforce (number)</th>
<th>B Women Expected from (number)</th>
<th>“Short Fall” B − A (number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; Planning</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Letters</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Medicine</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Applied Sciences</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Related Professions</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Library Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School—Basic</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School—Clinic</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This Utilization Analysis compares the number of women in the workforce of individual units at UB with the number that would be expected if the UB workforce reflected the national available pool. The column labeled “Shortfall” lists discrepancies between the number of women at UB and number in the national pool.

**Negative number reflects an excess of women compared to the available pool.

Data from Affirmative Action Office, 1994
## TABLE H

Individual Departments at UB: Utilization Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total Tenure-Track Faculty (number)</th>
<th>A Women Tenure-Track Faculty (number)</th>
<th>Women** in Available Pool (%)</th>
<th>B Women Expected from Available Pool (number)</th>
<th>Shortfall B – A (number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Lit.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Lang. &amp; Lit.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre &amp; Dance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Disorders &amp; Sci.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling &amp; Ed. Psych.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Org., Admin., &amp; Policy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine—Basic Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analysis limited to departments for which data were readily available. This Utilization Analysis compares the number of women in the workforce of individual units at UB with the number that would be expected if the UB workforce reflected the national available pool. The column labeled “Shortfall” lists discrepancies between the number of women at UB and the number in the national pool.

**Estimates of available pool size derived from National Research Council data

***Negative number reflects more women than expected from available pool
Biology, Comparative Literature, Microbiology, Counseling, Learning and Instruction were notable and disappointing, as those professions have attracted women scholars for many years. Most striking was the complete absence of women in Economics, Geology and Physics.

In this report, the analysis in Table H was limited to departments/fields for which data were readily available; with more time and effort it could be made more inclusive. The departments listed in Table H should be appreciated as representative examples from the Schools of Arts and Letters, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Social Sciences, Education and Medicine/Basic Science.

Table J:

From the data in Table J, it is possible to assess some of the impact of recent hiring practices on female representation in individual departments. In some units, recent recruitment of women junior faculty might eventually lead to a modest reduction in the existing gender imbalance. In others, the absence of women assistant professors suggested that gender disparities would persist for many years. For example, in Natural Sciences, the gender composition of the faculty in 1994 had remained essentially unchanged since 1970. Of the assistant professors, only 2 in Computer Science were women. When Computer Science data were removed from the analysis, the picture for women in Natural Sciences appeared even more disappointing (Table J-1).

In Basic Science programs of the Medical School, the number of female assistant professors was also very low, raising the serious concern that tenured women might well not be replaced from below as they retire. In Clinical Sciences, the cohort of assistant professors included many women, most notably in Pediatrics, where women constituted 2/3 of the junior faculty. The rate of success of those women should be monitored closely, as only 10% of the senior positions in Pediatrics have been awarded to women.

Tables K, L and M:

In the most recent seven-year cohort for which data were available, women remained in tenure-track positions with the same
### Table J

**Distribution by Gender & Rank of Tenure-Track Full-Time Faculty within Individual Departments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Am. Studies</td>
<td>M 5 F 0 M+F 0</td>
<td>2 0 2 0 1 0</td>
<td>2 0 2 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>8 4 12</td>
<td>33 6 2 1 1 1</td>
<td>2 1 2 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>10 4 14</td>
<td>28 4 0 6 2 0 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>4 3 7</td>
<td>43 2 1 2 1 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>7 2 9</td>
<td>29 3 0 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>8 0 8</td>
<td>0 3 0 3 0 2 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>35 18 53</td>
<td>34 25 5 10 9 0 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Study</td>
<td>4 1 5</td>
<td>20 2 1 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Lan. &amp; Lit.</td>
<td>19 12 31</td>
<td>39 10 3 4 5 5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>18 7 25</td>
<td>28 5 1 9 4 4 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre &amp; Dance</td>
<td>7 4 11</td>
<td>36 3 0 2 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125 55 180</td>
<td>26 65 13 43 26 17 16</td>
<td>13/78 =17% 26/69 =38% 16/31 =52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-Eaten Apple, 1970</td>
<td>12% 0% 11% 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from Institutional Studies, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>M 13 F 5 M+F 28</td>
<td>7 2 4 3 2 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>7 1 8</td>
<td>13 2 0 4 1 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. Disorders &amp; Sci.</td>
<td>6 8 14</td>
<td>57 4 1 1 3 1 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>14 0 14</td>
<td>0 7 0 3 0 4 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>12 2 14</td>
<td>14 7 0 5 1 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>19 5 24</td>
<td>21 11 0 6 2 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>5 3 8</td>
<td>38 2 1 3 1 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>13 3 16</td>
<td>23 7 0 5 2 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>15 2 17</td>
<td>12 6 0 3 0 6 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>24 11 35</td>
<td>31 13 4 9 4 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>8 2 10</td>
<td>20 3 0 4 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136 42 178</td>
<td>23 69 8 47 18 20 16</td>
<td>8/77 =10% 18/65 =28% 16/36 =39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-Eaten Apple, 1970</td>
<td>10% 4% 11% 17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from Institutional Studies, 1994
### Medicine—Basic Sciences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biophysical Sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Preventive Medicine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Department of Pathology, which has both basic science and clinical responsibilities, has not been included in this table nor in the Clinical Sciences table.*

**Data from Institutional Studies, 1994**

### Health Related Professions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Lab. Sci.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Behavioral Sci.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data from Institutional Studies, 1994**
### Distribution by Gender & Rank of Tenure-Track Full-Time Faculty within Individual Departments

#### Medicine—Clinical Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MF M + FF MF M F</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF M F M F M F</td>
<td>6/82</td>
<td>=7%</td>
<td>11/89</td>
<td>=12%</td>
<td>47/156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data from Institutional Studies, 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Natural Sciences & Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MF M + FF MF M F</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF M F M F M F</td>
<td>47/156</td>
<td>=30%</td>
<td>3/47</td>
<td>=6%</td>
<td>2/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data from Institutional Studies, 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE J cont’d

#### Distribution by Gender & Rank of Tenure-Track Full-Time Faculty within Individual Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M+F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling &amp; Ed. Psych.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Org., Admin., &amp; Policy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/28</td>
<td>=11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/24</td>
<td>=38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/14</td>
<td>=57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from Institutional Studies, 1994

### Other Schools/Faculties*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Faculty</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M+F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; Planning</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Medicine</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; App. Sci.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Library Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*With small numbers of women and/or few departments

Data from Institutional Studies, 1994

### TABLE J1

#### Natural Sciences (minus Computer Science)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M+F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from Institutional Studies, 1994
### TABLE K

**Retention of New Tenure-Track Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1988 to 1994</th>
<th>Women (number)</th>
<th>Men (number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hired in 1988</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained to 1994</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention (%)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from Affirmative Action Office

### TABLE L

**Changes in Faculty Composition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>900 (82)</td>
<td>781 (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>197 (18)</td>
<td>242 (24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from Affirmative Action Office

### TABLE M

**Newly Hired Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Men Tenured</th>
<th>Nontenured Tenure Track</th>
<th>Women Tenured</th>
<th>Nontenured Tenure Track</th>
<th>Women Hired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from Affirmative Action Office
success as men. The proportion of women in faculty jobs increased since 1988; comparison with Table D showed the increase (3%) was as great in 1993-1994 alone as it had been during the entire period 1988-1993 (3%). No pattern was detected in the rate of hiring of women from 1979-1993. Recent high points in the proportion of women among new faculty (ca 45%) in 1991 and 1993 were counterbalanced by the very lowest percentages (ca 20%) of women hired in 1989 and 1987. The historical data in Table M provided more evidence that women have been significantly less successful than men in academic careers at UB. From 1979 to 1985, women represented approximately 30% of all newly hired faculty, yet, even in 1994, they were still only 21% of the total faculty. Of the 296 men hired from 1979 to 1993, 55 (19%) were hired with tenure. In contrast only 5% (7/142) of the women hired in the same period were hired at senior ranks. Stated in another way, of 440 appointments (’79 - ’93), 12.5% were awarded at the tenurial level to men and only 1.6% at the tenurial level to women.

(3) Women in the Student Body

Tables N and O:

Women have been, and remain, significantly less than 1/2 (45%) of the student body at UB. In contrast, at many sister institutions, and in US higher education overall, women have predominated for some time. The discrepancy (between UB and others) could not be attributed readily to imbalanced enrollment traditional "male" fields at UB. For example, a recent large drop undergraduate engineering students did not alter the gender composition of the student body as a whole.

(4) Women in Administration

Table P:

In a recent (1994) intensive evaluation of the Graduate School, the team of outside reviewers were "struck by the overwhelming predominance of white males in positions of leadership at UB." They felt that "is imperative for a modern research university with diverse faculty and student populations to have women and people of color in key decision-making roles..." and urged that "attention ... be given to [diversity] considerations in the hiring of all
future academic deans, vice provosts and vice presidents." Since the submission of that report, several important administrative appointments have been made, including the Provost, Vice Provost for Faculty Development, Deans of the Graduate School, Millard Fillmore College and Health Related Professions, and interim deans of Engineering, Social Sciences, and Pharmacy (Table P). Disappointingly, all of those positions were awarded to white males. Of the 17 deans, 6 (35%) have been quite recently appointed. Only three of those appointments resulted from systematic, committee-run nationwide searches for the most suitable candidate. Interim appointees were chosen by processes which were not well-defined and/or widely publicized, exactly the mechanism by which qualified women are overlooked or ignored.

At the decanal level, only Nursing, an overwhelmingly female profession, has a woman dean. The appointment of a minority woman, Dr. Muriel A. Moore, as Vice President for Public Service and Urban Affairs was an encouraging step in the right direction, that position is now held by a white man as well. However, Dr. Moore's office represented a new administrative initiative for UB. The need remains for women to be appointed to high leadership positions within the traditional academic hierarchy.

At present, approximately 10% of all Department Chairs (8/78) are women. Three of those women serve in the School of Medicine, and nearly all (7/8) were appointed within the last five years.

Open, well-publicized searches, conducted by appropriately representative search committees provide the best opportunity for qualified women to be identified. This is especially important in the present fiscal climate, which is likely to limit the practical choices to internal candidates.

(5) Women in Professional and Support Staff Positions

Figure 1 illustrates the distribution of women among the ranks of professional staff at UB. Gender imbalance is readily apparent. In Management Confidential (MP) ranks, women are represented by only a few individuals in positions of high rank (MP1,2), although women constitute the vast majority of the work force at the lowest level (MP5). Women are similarly significantly underrepresented in higher SL (Salary Level) ranks (SL4, 5, 6) of employment as well.

Figure 2 illustrates the distribution of women in classified service positions. A similar pattern can be discerned. However, it is important to note that the higher level classified service positions tend to be in predominately male fields (e.g., mechanics, electricians, public safety) and recruitment is often a result of competitive examinations.

b. Salary Data from UB

(1) Introductory remarks
### TABLE N

#### UB Women Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Women Freshmen (%)</th>
<th>Women Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from Institutional Studies

### TABLE O

#### Women Freshmen at Representative AAU Institutions (1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Women Freshmen (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California/Berkley</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Tech</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>William R. Greiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Thomas E. Headrick effective 5/3/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Vice President</td>
<td>Robert J. Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Presidents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Dale M. Landi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Robert L. Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement &amp; Development</td>
<td>Ronald H. Stein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service &amp; Urban Affairs</td>
<td>John B. Sheffer II (Acting) effective 4/24/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Affairs</td>
<td>John P. Naughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Bruno B. Freschi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Medicine</td>
<td>Louis J. Goldberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Applied Sciences</td>
<td>Mark H. Karwan effective 7/1/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Related Professions</td>
<td>Barry S. Eckert effective 2/26/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Library Studies</td>
<td>George S. Bobinski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Barry B. Boyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Frederick W. Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Mecca S. Cranley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Wayne K. Anderson (Interim) effective 11/15/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Fredrick W. Seidl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Hugh G. Petrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Letters</td>
<td>Kerry S. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>Joseph J. Tufariello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Mark B. Kristal (Interim) effective 6/1/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>David J. Triggle effective 11/13/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine &amp; Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>John P. Naughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millard Fillmore College</td>
<td>George J. Lopos effective 7/1/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Provosts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Education</td>
<td>David J. Triggle effective 11/13/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>Nicolas D. Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education</td>
<td>Stephen C. Dunnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td>William C. Fischer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 1
Professional Staff: Percentage Women
Management Confidential (MP)

FIGURE 2
Classified Service Positions: Percentage Women (Full-Time)
The Task Force on Women at UB found itself at a considerable advantage, compared to peer institutions, with respect to the evaluation of possible gender bias in salaries. In their 1985-88 collective agreement, New York State and United University Professions established a labor-management Disparity Committee to review salaries state-wide for disparities related to gender, race and/or ethnicity. The report of the committee, submitted in January 1993, was based on a highly sophisticated methodological analysis of the most comprehensive and accurate data that could be obtained. Among the variables for which the Disparity Committee controlled were rank, discipline, education, years at SUNY, years in rank, etc. On the basis of the findings of the Disparity Committee, a one-time salary increase was granted to women and minorities (professionals and faculty) where salary disparity was identified. No further systematic adjustments have been made since then.

(2) Faculty Salaries Tables Q and R

The data from 1996 presented here in Tables Q and R represent a modest up-date of the 1993 Disparity Committee report. The Task Force was limited in its ability to conduct a review as complete and sophisticated as the SUNY-wide report. In many cases, for example, statistically significant analysis of salary data was precluded by the small numbers of women working in individual employment units. In addition, the Task Force had neither the human resources nor the detailed information to include a comprehensive review of all the important employment variables analyzed in the state-wide report.
TABLE Q1
Salary Comparisons by Gender
(Full-Time Faculty on Ten-Month Appointments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/School</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Average Years/Service</th>
<th>Average Years/Title</th>
<th>Number Incumbents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; Planning</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Letters</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38,109</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Medicine</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Education</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42,909</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42,252</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Applied Sciences</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51,819</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52,414</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Related Professions</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44,507</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Library Studies</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40,058</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law (Assistant Professor)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>59,422</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50,987</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine &amp; Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>45,367</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44,253</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45,693</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47,584</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39,514</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39,561</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>45,609</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42,936</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>44,320</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Shaded areas represent data suppressed (fewer than three incumbents)
Prepared by Personnel Services, April 1996
## TABLE Q2
### Salary Comparisons by Gender
(Full-Time Faculty on Ten-Month Appointments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/School</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Average Years/Service</th>
<th>Average Years /Title</th>
<th>Number Incumbents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; Planning</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>58,831</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52,459</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Letters</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>53,839</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50,862</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Medicine</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Education</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>57,777</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52,099</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Applied Sciences</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>59,486</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Related Professions</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54,384</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Library Studies</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law (Assistant Professor)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>73,056</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>74,438</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>71,677</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine &amp; Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54,940</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>53,588</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>58,760</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>56,162</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52,499</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>62,243</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>57,927</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>56,171</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>56,824</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Shaded areas represent data suppressed (fewer than three incumbents)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/School</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Average Years/Service</th>
<th>Average Years/Title</th>
<th>Number Incumbents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; Planning</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>76,180</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Letters</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>70,871</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>62,140</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Medicine</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Education</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>76,426</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>70,686</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Applied Sciences</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>84,172</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Related Professions</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Library Studies</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>61,644</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law (Assistant Professor)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>94,088</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>86,175</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100,932</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine &amp; Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>86,145</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>76,461</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>74,304</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>78,345</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>70,752</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>79,056</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>70,556</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>78,040</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Shaded areas represent data suppressed (fewer than three incumbents)
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To prepare Tables Q1-Q3, average salaries were calculated for all faculty holding tenured/tenure track titles of assistant, associate or full professor. For schools in which the number of incumbents in any category was less than three, the data have been suppressed for reasons of confidentiality. Suppressed data are reflected in the total salaries, years of service, etc. It was encouraging to see that entry-level salaries for assistant professors show little, if any, gender bias. Salaries of associate professors seem also to be free of gender-based disparity, especially when average years of service are included in the assessment. In many schools, however, women full professors receive substantially less salary compensation than their male colleagues, probably a reflection of hiring practices at UB twenty years ago, when those full professors began their academic employment. The most flagrant disparities were noted in Arts and Letters, Graduate School of Education, Law and Social Sciences. Those salary discrepancies affect a relatively small number of women, and could, therefore, be readily erased.

For several reasons, the Task Force was not able to do a useful comprehensive review of the salaries of full-time faculty on twelvemonth appointments. In many of the schools in which faculty serve for twelve months, the number of women is very small, and the data were suppressed. Furthermore, in many of those schools (e.g. Medicine, Dentistry) faculty salaries are substantially increased by clinical funds, with state contributions constituting a minor component of annual income. The only salary data for which a review was practicable were those from basic science departments of the School of Medicine. Those data confirm that women full professors are substantially underpaid compared to male colleagues. Again, the number of affected individuals is small; that salary disparity should be relatively easy to eliminate rapidly.

In a 1994-95 survey by the AAUP, UB ranked among the large research universities with the largest difference in salary between men and women full professors. On average, for all large research universities, women full professors earned 90% of the salary of men. At UB, women full professors on average earned only 85% of the average salary for men. Most AAU schools had much smaller salary gender gaps than UB. Within the SUNY system, Stony Brook, at 84% was a bit worse, and Binghamton, at 86%, a little better. The data provided to the Task Force for 1996 show a slow decrease in the gender-based salary gap, with women full professors at UB now earning 89% of the average salary for men.

(3) Staff Salaries

Within the individual Salary Level (SL) grades of state employment no evidence of gender bias is apparent (Table S1). However, as can be seen in both Table S1 and in Figure 1, women are disproportionately represented in lower salary grades and conspicuously missing from the higher ones. Women employed as professional staff in Management Confidential grades MP3A and MP3B (Table S2) receive significantly lower compensation than their male counterparts, despite very similar average years of service and title. The analysis of salaries in classified service positions also did not disclose any apparent gender
bias within individual salary grades (Table S3). However, as with other staff jobs, male employees are mostly clustered in higher pay categories, reflecting the relative values our society, in general, and New York State in particular, places on men’s and women’s work.

c. Summary and conclusions

- Women employees at UB are underrepresented at all but the lowest ranks of faculty and staff.
- Notable gender-linked disparities in salary (for comparable rank/years of service) are evident among women full professors and women in the higher ranks of professional staff.

With respect to the distribution of women at high ranks and to compensation, UB compared relatively unfavorably with peer institutions, and was, for most comparisons, rated below average. A thick glass ceiling seems to be in place at UB. From the persistent, pervasive and systematic exclusion of women from the high-paying, policy forming ranks of faculty and administration, it seems clear that responsibility cannot be assigned to one office, unit, or process within the university. No single action is, therefore, likely to serve to improve the situation. The record shows conscientious and successful efforts by some units to achieve gender equity. Unfortunately, improvements overall have been achieved much too slowly. At the present rate, appropriate representation of women at UB is unlikely to be achieved until the third decade of the 21st century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Full Professors</th>
<th>Female Average Salary</th>
<th>Number Incumbents</th>
<th>Number Incumbents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>53,296</td>
<td>65,024</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>70,773</td>
<td>65,024</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>87,416</td>
<td>77,604</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor and Chairperson</td>
<td>129,315</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Basic Sciences includes Anatomical Science, Biochemistry, Biophysics, Microbiology, Physiology, Pharmacy and Toxicology, and Social and Preventive Medicine
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### TABLE S1

**Professional Staff Positions:**
**Average Salaries by Salary Grade & Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Average Years/Service</th>
<th>Average Years/Title</th>
<th>Number Incumbents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>77,284</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 47,615</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>76,639</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 85,903</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>77,155</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>59,482</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 38,858</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58,114</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 72,668</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>59,012</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44,305</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 32,291</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>44,358</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 68,287</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>44,326</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36,257</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 27,912</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35,216</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 54,501</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>35,642</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28,670</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 24,629</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27,902</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 48,013</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>28,216</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28,351</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 21,345</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23,973</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 41,524</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>26,600</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE S2

**Professional Staff Positions (Management Confidential):**
**Average Salaries by Salary Grade & Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Average Years/Service</th>
<th>Average Years/Title</th>
<th>Number Incumbents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>153,567</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 68,993</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>148,772</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 117,342</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>120,654</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 57,494</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>120,393</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 109,731</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP3A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>97,781</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 47,200</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>83,308</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 97,411</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>94,939</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP3B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>81,613</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 47,200</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 97,411</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>79,960</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>53,764</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 38,232</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58,207</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 73,263</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>55,541</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35,734</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 27,050</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35,734</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 54,865</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>34,300</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Shaded areas represent data suppressed (fewer than three incumbents)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Grade</th>
<th>Average Gender</th>
<th>Number Incumbents</th>
<th>Incumbents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>43,200</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39,607</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>42,668</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38,879</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>38,781</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>37,428</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>37,556</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39,900</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34,243</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>37,185</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33,707</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34,052</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>33,815</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33,269</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31,290</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>32,032</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31,075</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31,482</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>31,117</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28,425</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29,319</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>29,239</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27,170</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25,256</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>26,022</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25,899</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26,783</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>26,445</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25,516</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25,673</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>25,571</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24,057</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24,044</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>24,050</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21,880</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22,162</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>22,124</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20,545</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20,570</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>20,556</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21,339</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21,271</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>21,271</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Shaded areas represent data suppressed (fewer than three incumbents)
Prepared by Personnel Services, April 1996
Fiscal constraints are almost certain to reduce the present rate of employment of women.

The Task Force was especially surprised to realize that the proportion of women in undergraduate student ranks is also below average. It would appear that an important part of the student "market" is presently lost to us.

From discussions with consultants, members of the UB community, and each other, it is evident to the Task Force that most men and women have not fully appreciated the magnitude and penetration of gender-linked disparities in rank and/or salary. Most people expressed a desire to see those disparities eliminated.

Finally, it should be noted that compilation of these data required many hours of work by many Task Force members. The information was not located in a central file, but was divided among a variety of offices, each with a different focus of interest and responsibility, none specifically charged and/or provided with adequate staff to produce the detailed analyses and comparisons in this report.

2. Charge 2: Strategies for addressing any inequities.
   a. Existing strategies

   At present, UB has two major institutional strategies for "addressing any inequities". The first strategy, which has been in place since 1973, is a rigorous affirmative action search and hiring process. The President's Panel to Review Search Procedure Reports checks the documentation for each appointment before final approval, to ensure that appropriate efforts were made to identify qualified candidates from underrepresented populations, including women. The requirement for thorough documentation and review of search procedures and the commitment to affirmative action at hiring are reassuring policies which should continue to receive strong support.

   Unfortunately, the data collected as part of Charge #1 reveal that this approach has had relatively little impact on the overall gender imbalance. Systematic under-representation of women is a persistent phenomenon: UB is below average among peers in many categories for which comparative data were available. In faculty ranks, women have long represented a substantial fraction of the newly hired. In general, the more troublesome aspects of gender imbalance are manifested at higher, rather than entry level ranks, reflecting difficulties women experience with retention and/or promotion after they have been hired. It is also evident that, despite the mandate for rigorous affirmative action searches, many units continue to choose only men. That behavior is especially disappointing in the face of considerable evidence (including our own graduate student body composition) that women scholars are not at all rare in the vast majority of fields. For many of the recalcitrant hiring units, the approach to affirmative action searches has become cynical, with close attention paid to the form, but not the substance, of identifying qualified members of underrepresented groups. There would seem to be considerable room for tougher administrative enforcement of affirmative action.
hiring policies, especially for departments/schools/units in which women have been most dramatically and persistently excluded.

A second UB approach to improving the gender imbalance, aimed at improving career success rates of all faculty, has been the very recent (1994) establishment of the office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Development. A major function of that office has been education, with the goal of increasing gender and racial diversity in hiring and strengthening those cultural and institutional mechanisms that contribute to career success. The efforts of the Vice Provost are absolutely necessary and should receive the broadest and strongest possible support. Many members of the UB community, like their peers in other institutions, have not yet come fully to appreciate the importance of equitable, balanced representation for the financial and academic prosperity of public universities.

**b. Recommended strategies**

Reviewing the strategies in place at, or proposed for, peer institutions, the Task Force recommends the following new policies:

1. **Setting Targets**

   - Specific short- and long-term goals should be set for individual hiring units to increase representation of women. An emphasis should be placed on increasing representation of women of color. Special attention should be paid to those units in which the gender imbalance is greatest and/or most inappropriate.

   - Short- and long-term goals should be set to eradicate persisting race and gender disparities in salary. A substantial portion of all discretionary pay increases should be committed to achieving full pay equity for women at UB in as short a time as possible, with more immediate attention paid to those units in which disparities have been greatest.

   - A program of rewards and/or incentives should be established for units that succeed in meeting targets for equitable representation and for equitable pay.

   - Special attention should be paid to hiring women at the top, to those senior faculty and administration ranks in which women, at present, are so conspicuously absent.

   - Systematic "exit interviews" should be conducted to determine why women applicants refuse jobs at UB and why women faculty and staff leave to take other jobs.
(2) Mandate significant, not token, representation of women on important committees, including:

- Search committees for hiring at any and all levels.
- Promotions committees at all levels
- Resource allocation committees, executive steering committees, etc.
- Committees to bestow honors and awards.

In many units, past hiring and promotions practices have resulted in serious shortages of women to serve on policymaking committees. As a consequence, gender imbalances in those units are inevitably perpetuated. Women's needs, points of view, and accomplishments remain poorly appreciated. To compensate, until those demographic deficiencies are corrected, the Task Force proposes that qualified women might be "borrowed" from other departments or schools. For example, Natural Sciences and Mathematics might turn to the faculties of Medicine, Dentistry, Health Related Professions for experienced women scientists to supplement the sparse ranks of women in Biology and Chemistry. To increase the participation of women as expert consultants in Federal programs, lists of qualified, willing women have been compiled at many agencies in Washington. That approach has been quite successful at the national level and should be easy to implement in our relatively small community.

(2) Conduct open, well-publicized, committee-run searches for all administrative positions, including chairs, associate deans, deans, vice presidents, etc., especially when interim and/or internal appointments are contemplated.

3. Charge # 6: Developing a process of accountability at all levels regarding the progress being made toward achieving equity for women.

a. General comments

At this time, the Task Force would rather not be overly prescriptive in recommendations to ensure accountability. We believe that the community needs to review the contents of this report, and become familiar with present circumstances, as described here, before comprehensive institutional responses are formulated. A few general remarks and suggestions do seem appropriate now.

Leadership-based accountability with vigorous enforcement of guidelines, is essential for accomplishing change. Gender imbalances and disparities at UB have been so pervasive, so systematic and so widely experienced that responsibility cannot be assigned to particular individuals, offices, departments, schools, etc. Major changes in the culture of academe, in general, and UB in particular, are required for gender equity in institutions that have traditionally been, and remain, centered around men. For that reason, the attitudes of local leaders, especially the President and the Provost, are the most potent forces to direct change. Publicly disseminated position papers, such as the recent affirmative action policy
statement of President Greiner, are laudatory measures. Actions are even more important than words in communicating leadership commitment to gender equity. Unwavering enforcement of the strategies recommended above (see Charge #2), for example, could improve significantly the opportunities for women at UB in a relatively short time. In the absence of definitive action by our highest leaders, virtuous professions of intent will be perceived as hollow statements. Many university workplaces will remain as cynical, half-hearted, and insincere about achieving gender equity as they have been in the past.

b. Specific recommendations

A few specific actions are proposed to facilitate leadership-based accountability.

- Maintenance of a database similar to that presented in this report. Responsibility for recording/keeping analysis should be assigned to those with a vested interest in those records. A continuing Task Force on Women at UB (or an Office for Women's Affairs) would be an ideal body for this responsibility. Task Force members have a record of commitment to gender equity and are now extremely knowledgeable about local conditions. Furthermore, the Task Force is a committee of volunteers whose efforts have been available without additional costs to UB.

- Monitoring on a regular, perhaps biannual basis of the responses of individual units to targets (see Charge #2). The Annual Reports of departments and schools might be a convenient mechanism for collecting this information.

Disclosure of findings to the UB community at large. One potentially effective way to change our male-oriented culture is to make everyone aware of the nature and magnitude of gender inequities. Many UB employees, administrators, students, etc. would be much more cooperative and energetic in efforts to eradicate existing imbalances if they were fully informed about the pervasiveness and magnitude of the problems.

B. Subcommittee B: Charges #3 and #5

1. Charge 3: Improving the campus climate for women, with full consideration of the special needs of diverse groups.

   a. Insights from other institutions: Factors that may limit full participation of women in the life of educational communities.

      (1) Introductory comments

      The UB Women's Task Force was successful in collecting sixteen recent reports prepared at other academic institutions. All were studied carefully, but special attention was paid to those from schools most similar to UB and those concerned with issues relevant to the charges for our own task force. Among the most valuable reports were those from Stanford, Purdue, Northwestern, and the Universities of Michigan, Delaware and Maine.
A variety of methods had been used to assess the climate for women. For a majority of reports, systematic written surveys had been conducted. Panel discussions, focus groups and open forums had also been used at some schools to sample the attitudes and opinions of women and men in the community. Campus publications, activities, events and organizations were reviewed and analyzed. Despite substantial heterogeneity of the institutions from which reports were available and the methods used to evaluate the climate for women at those institutions, patterns were readily detected. In the sections that follow, the main consensus views have been summarized.

(2) A "chilly" climate prevails.

All reports were in agreement that women faculty, students and staff in academic institutions function in an environment that is often cool and, sometimes, hostile. Women frequently experience more isolation, marginalization and powerlessness than men, no matter how enlightened parts of their respective university communities might be.

(3) Underrepresentation: A generic problem.

It is the consensus view that both improvements in the quality of working life for women in academic institutions and the future competitiveness and prestige of academic programs within those institutions will depend on the achievement of full representation of women at all ranks of staff, faculty, administration. For women students, the paucity of senior women faculty and administrators delivers an explicit message that they also will be highly unlikely to attain positions of stature in their chosen fields. For junior women employees, the deficiency of women at high ranks significantly limits introduction to the "culture" of success in their profession.

Senior administrators establish, foster and maintain the values of an institution. Most extramural task force reports revealed that women administrators remain clustered, and barely visible, in middle-level posts, with little or no opportunity to formulate and/or influence important policies.

Underrepresentation of women is pervasive in US academe. As a consequence, American educational institutions respond poorly, if at all, to women's aspirations, potentials, needs and accomplishments. A vicious circle exists: The absence of women in strategic, influential positions prevents and discourages women from aiming for and achieving those positions.

(4) Low priority of women's concerns

An important corollary to the systematic underrepresentation of women is the relatively low priority assigned to issues deemed "women's problems". Safety, child care, salary disparities, spousal accommodation at hiring, maternity leave, family leave, nepotism rules, are matters affecting the quality of personal and family life for all men and women employed
by universities. Marginalized as "women's" rather than "people's" problems, those issues have, for too long, been superficially discussed, if not entirely overlooked, and incompletely resolved. Most extra-mural task force reports acknowledged that, as our society becomes more egalitarian, with family responsibilities well-divided among both parents, successful recruitment and retention of the best students, faculty and staff will depend increasingly on gender-free workplace accommodations.

(5) Critical mass, not token representation

According to many reports, past responses to the problem of underrepresentation have resulted in appointment and/or promotion of small numbers of women in various units. It has been a universal experience that such "token" appointments do not contribute significantly to promoting women's concerns or to filling the leadership gap for women. When women constitute a small minority in a group discussion, their voices go unheard, their interests remain unrepresented. Many observers noted that outspoken and assertive women often suffered marginalization and negative career consequences.

b. Brief Reports on Special Topics

(1) Child Care Facilities

The expression of a need for increased child care facilities at UB was more widespread, and considerably more vehement, than had been anticipated by many Task Force members. Campus child care was identified as an essential element in improving the climate for women at UB. Expert consultants to the Task Force from Personnel, Student Life, UUP, CSEA, testified to the urgent need for campus-based child care among all female constituencies: graduate and undergraduate students, professional and classified staff and faculty. In the informal written surveys conducted by the Task Force, child care issues emerged consistently as one of the pressing needs shared by many women at UB.

In the present economy, the great majority of parents find it necessary to work. In so-called "traditional" two-parent families, it is the rule, rather than the exception, for both parents to work outside the home; "non-traditional" families, in which either the male or female parent may be raising children alone, are increasingly common. Changing social circumstances make the university of the 1990's a very different place from the academic institutions of the '50's and '60's in which many of the senior faculty and administrators at UB were "raised". Increasingly, competition for the successful recruitment of high quality female students, faculty and staff will require the provision of amenities, such as child care, that could make UB a uniquely attractive environment for women to study and work. Adequate child care facilities could be an important factor in a woman's decision to join the UB community. The provision of child care should be appreciated as a "marketplace" issue, an essential element in the healthy financial future of a competitive university. Child care arrangements must be seen, not as a luxury to be deferred until some convenient future time,
but as a necessity for acquiring and retaining the best possible students, faculty and staff, men as well as women.

Since 1985, UB has had an excellent facility on the South Campus. There is, however, universal agreement that the existing facility is much too small for the needs of the community and that the South Campus is prohibitively inconvenient for the vast majority of potential users working on the North Campus.

The Task Force was delighted to learn that an outstanding, comprehensive and detailed report of child care needs had been prepared by a blue ribbon panel in 1994. That study could rapidly be updated; implementation is long overdue.

The Task Force recognizes that many constraints (fiscal, regulatory, technical, etc.) may influence the plans for a child care facility and hinder their realization. It is our observation, however, that the UB community includes many enthusiastic, energetic, and needy young parents, who would be more than willing to develop innovative, low cost solutions to difficulties that may have seemed insurmountable in the past. We recommend that the "child care problem" be placed primarily in the hands of those with a vested interested in a successful outcome, including, but perhaps not limited to these in the previous Child Care Advisory Committee (see Appendix).

(2) Athletics

There appears to be considerable agreement that women's athletic programs at UB have not received either the resources or the attention accorded to programs for men. The recent association of UB with the NCAA Division I has brought a new focus on the opportunities and facilities provided to women. The standards for gender equity imposed by the NCAA promise to have a long-term sanguine influence on local policies. As with many University practices, however, change can be slow, and resistance to change considerable. In the past, the budget for women's athletics has been only about three-quarters of the expenditures for men when all football costs are removed from the calculation. Future budgets have been planned to be more equitable, but close monitoring for compliance is recommended in this period of fiscal austerity.

The local (UB) NCAA Commitment to Equity Subcommittee, chaired by Dr. Mary Ann Sharrow, has made several strong recommendations for improving the situation for women athletes at UB. First, they suggested that more sports programs be developed for women's participation, and second, they urged the hiring of more women in head coaching and senior administrative staff positions. They also urged regular monitoring of the perception of women students about equity issues in Athletics.

The Task Force felt that the "chilly" climate in Athletics could be considerably, and rapidly, improved by concerted University-wide efforts enthusiastically to honor women athletes, attend women's games, and publicize women's events. The outstanding annual February celebration for National Girls and Women in Sports Day was initiated by students
themselves, and remains to this day, largely a student undertaking. A University-wide Office for Women's Affairs could play an important proactive role in promoting appreciation of and participation in women's sports. Publicity, fund-raising, ticket distribution, award ceremonies, etc., are among the kinds of support that could be centrally coordinated to enhance the efforts of the Division of Athletics on behalf of women. It is our conviction such centralized, visible encouragement of women's sports could also have a very positive influence on successful recruitment of women coaches and women student athletes.

(3) Women's Studies

In reviewing the status of women, many academic institutions have come to appreciate a strong correlation between the overall climate for women students, faculty and staff and the institutional commitment to academic programs on women and gender. The University of Michigan's "Agenda for Women", issued by their president in 1994, speaks clearly to this point. It is the University of Michigan's vision to "become the leader among American universities in promoting the success of women of diverse backgrounds, as faculty, students and staff". In the Agenda, 5 goals are cited as "necessary to achieve this vision". One of those 5 goals is to make the University of Michigan "the leading [US] institution for the study of women and gender issues".

As an academic discipline, Women's Studies has produced a significant body of scholarship that has influenced and changed the direction and substance of scholarly activities in many fields. Gender has gained recognition as a significant, often essential category of analysis in many disciplines.

Women's Studies at UB has a long and distinguished history. Our program is widely recognized as a national pioneer in the field. Courses in Women's Studies were first offered in the late 1960's, spurred by the late Professors Ann Scott (English), and Daphne Hare (Medicine), and the late Ms. Bernice Poss, of the administrative staff. By the mid-1990's, Women's Studies at UB has developed as a center for research and teaching about women and gender. To overcome increasing impediments to program development imposed by financial constraints, Women's Studies helped to found the Graduate Group in Feminist Studies, which has fostered highly productive, collegiate, scholarly interdisciplinary interactions among faculty and students in many departments and schools.

UB Women's Studies faculty have contributed importantly to the development of the National Women's Studies Association and have made scholarly contributions to feminist pedagogy. The faculty serving Women's Studies at UB over the years includes individuals such as Ellen DuBois, Endesha Mae Holland, Masani Alexis DeVeaux, Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy, Hester Eisenstein and Lillian Robinson, all highly regarded nationally for their scholarly and/or creative output.
To consolidate declining resources and to compensate for the recent departure of Professor Eisenstein, Women's Studies has spent the last year (1995-96) devising a realistic academic and research plan for the immediate future that could protect the extraordinary resources and reputation accumulated during the last twenty-five years and permit UB to retain its national visibility and stature.

The 1996 "Proposal for the Future of Women's Studies" reflects the collective efforts and collaborative commitments of more than thirty faculty from the Schools of Law, Arts and Letters, Social Sciences, Education, Medicine and Dentistry. Interdisciplinary programs of lectures, workshops and internships on issues of women and gender are planned to facilitate scholarly and pedagogical interactions among departments, schools and campuses at UB. The month-long Women's History celebration in March, 1996 (see Appendix) provides an exciting example of the potential of Women's Studies to enhance intellectual life on campus and in the Buffalo community, to honor women and focus attention on their accomplishments, to integrate activities on women and gender among different academic units, and to maximize the use of limited financial resources.

Despite these accomplishments, Women's Studies has been persistently undervalued and inadequately appreciated by faculty colleagues and the university administration. In that respect, the low status of Women's Studies in the academic hierarchy at UB may be viewed as paradigmatic for all women at UB. Any plan to improve the climate for women and develop women leaders must include a commitment to the stability of existing Women's Studies activities in teaching, research and service and a plan for strengthening and enhancing those activities in the near future.

(4) Family needs (other than child care)

UB has been slower than many academic institutions to adopt policies that address the needs either of two-career families or single parents. Other universities and colleges, as well as other businesses, have come to realize family responsibilities are no longer clearly divided on gender lines. Mechanisms have been developed to accommodate family needs without imposing severe limitations on the opportunities for individual professional development within the institution. Policies and practices that are gaining widespread acceptance include spousal accommodation at hiring, abolition of nepotism rules, maternity leave, caregivers leave, flexible working hours and job sharing. Institutional sensitivity to the special needs of families is increasingly recognized to be a distinct advantage for hiring and retaining high-quality faculty and staff. Working conditions that facilitate necessary caregiving without jeopardizing career development are attractive incentives for choosing a place of employment and for choosing to remain there.

Some steps in the right direction have been taken at UB. In the last few years, spousal accommodation at hiring has been encouraged, supported and rewarded by the administration. It remains, however, to formulate and promulgate an official University-wide policy on this
practice. In addition, the recent policy statement from the Provost on conditions for stopping the tenure clock is a heartening, positive attempt to deal realistically with family responsibilities that could disrupt an academic career.

There are at UB a large number of individuals in the faculty and staff who have coped with child-rearing and other forms of care-giving while also working productively and successfully at their jobs. Most, but by no means all, are women; many have spouses who are also UB employees. [The Task Force on Women at UB includes many such women and men.] Practical, fair and successful strategies to integrate responsibilities of modern family life into University employment should rely heavily on the experiences and advice of those faculty and staff. In the past, proposals for "family-need policies" have been reviewed and evaluated by governance bodies (Senates, Councils of Deans, Vice Presidents, etc.) in which men predominate and the proportion of major family caregivers is low.

In keeping with US federal guidelines, personal resumes and curriculum vitae nearly always omit details of past or present family responsibilities. That policy is designed to protect employees and job applicants from prejudicial use of the information in personnel decisions. Such omissions are extremely unfortunate, especially when they might explain a period of lower productivity or absence from the workforce. In addition, and much more important, such "personal" information is often very revealing of an individual's managerial and organizational skills, dedication to a profession, commitment to a career, effective performance under stress, sense of responsibility and physical stamina. With guarantees of suitable protection by managers, employees might be encouraged to disclose evidence, from care-giving histories, of attributes and experiences that could have a positive impact on the job. Documentation might go a long way towards dispelling the myths that family responsibilities can only have detrimental effects on careers and that caregivers are a liability as employees.
c. **Summary and conclusions**

In reviewing campus climate issues at UB, and making comparisons to similar academic institutions, Subcommittee B concluded that administrative leadership was urgently needed in several areas that affect women in all University constituencies.

- A Child Care Center on the North Campus should be arranged without further delay.

- Flexible work time and job sharing policies should be developed, encouraged and promoted, to permit effective integration of work and family responsibilities for both men and women at UB.

- A group of experienced caregivers, with senior positions in University faculty and administration, should serve as the main counsel for future strategies and policies to facilitate and promote careers for those with important family responsibilities.

- Women's Studies programs should be given strong academic and administrative support to continue the highly visible and widely respected contributions made by UB scholars.

- Athletics programs for women should be strengthened with more equitable distribution of resources, appointment of women coaches and administrators, and investment in efforts to promote local enthusiasm for women's athletic events.

A rigorous survey should be conducted to assess the current climate for women at UB as accurately as possible. The survey would provide a baseline for monitoring changes. It would also help to sort out those climate issues that are real problems from misconceptions, myths and/or misunderstandings.

2. **Charge 5: Methods for identifying, encouraging, and developing women leaders**

   a. **Demonstration Projects**

   At the strong recommendation of Subcommittee B, the Task Force responded to Charge #5 by undertaking two major demonstration projects, aimed at developing women leaders and promoting positive "network" interaction among all women in the UB community. The first was a career development workshop open to all women at UB; the second was a campus-wide program for National Take Our Daughters to Work Day.

   **Career Development Workshop**
A career development workshop, was held on March 7, 1996, entitled "Women's Voices: Insights for a Successful Career". The workshop had three specific goals: to identify women leaders at UB, to encourage leadership among women and to provide practical advice about career development. To accomplish those goals, five outstanding women were selected to represent the diversity of careers within the University. The panelists, Dr. Beverly Bishop, Distinguished Teaching Professor, Ms. Bonnie Butkas, Spectrum Editor-in-Chief, Elmira Mangum-Daniel, Assistant Provost for Resource Management, Gloria Paveljack, Staff Assistant, School of Law, and Jennifer Roth, General Manager of WBFO, were each given an opportunity to share the strategies of their own successes in a plenary session, and then to conduct small workshop sessions on specific skills, recommendations, problems, etc., relevant to career promotion. Topics of the breakout sessions included Workplace Dynamics, Networking, Voice Modulation, Teaching Skills, Juggling Many Roles.

Invitations to the workshop were sent to more than 2500 women; the final attendance of 240 was limited only by the capacity of the facilities at the Center for Tomorrow. The response of all organizers, panelists, and attendees was overwhelmingly positive. Evaluation reports revealed that participants looked forward to more, and perhaps more frequent, workshops.

The process of planning and coordinating the activities of the workshop was itself an enormously gratifying and job-enhancing experience for workshop organizers. Many constituencies in the University community were brought together advantageously to cooperate with and contribute to this workshop project. The Bookstore prepared a table of current books by UB women authors, offering them for sale and highlighting the accomplishments of those published scholars. The UUP chapters, especially Health Sciences Chapter, accepted a large financial responsibility for refreshments and mailing. The Offices of the Provost and the President were also especially helpful in defraying costs, which allowed the workshop to be made available at no cost to participants. A more detailed summary report -- finances, demographics, evaluations-- prepared by Ms. Judy Miller, Director of State Purchasing, who served as chair of the Voices workshop, is included in the Appendix to this report.

Take Our Daughters to Work

For the first time, UB participated formally in the April 26 nationwide project, sponsored by the Ms. Foundation, to bring young girls to work. The program, which targets girls aged 9-14, is aimed at promoting self-esteem for those girls, and informing them about career opportunities. For UB, the project had the additional advantages of informing girls about the wide range of educational facilities at UB and providing another forum for pleasurable, productive "network" interactions among women students, faculty, staff and administrators. The program was judged an enormous success by organizers and participants. Enrollment was at full capacity. More than 150 girls and their parents spent a
rewarding day that included organized visits to selected worksites (see Appendix), a self-esteem workshop, a group luncheon and an Awards Ceremony (see Appendix). The orchestration of this complex activity required an extraordinary commitment of time, energy, and professional expertise by the coordinating committee and other volunteers. Financial support and/or professional services were contributed from all corners of the campus; among the many sponsors were the UUP, CSEA, PEF, Office of Student Life, Medical School, Partner's Press, Counseling Center, Women's Health Initiative, Chemistry Department, Association for Women in Science, Office of the President, Office of Conferences and Special Events, Office of Public Safety. The volunteers on the coordinating committee came from academic departments, the Development Office, Public Safety, Computing and Information Technology, Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs, Office of Student Life and the Office of the President. Presentations at the Awards Ceremonies were made by Molly McKeown, Deputy to the President for University Relations, and Jennifer Roth, Manager of WBFO FM. Worksite sponsors were equally varied and representative of the rich resources and energetic goodwill of UB employees. Those sites included the Center for the Arts, the School of Pharmacy, School of Dentistry, School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, the Computing Center, WBFO FM, Lockwood Library, Public Safety, Ellicott Complex, the English Department, and others.

Many parent participants, site sponsors, and interested observers have already volunteered for next year's "Take Our Daughters to Work" day.

b. Calendar of 1995 Activities

The calendar year 1995 included many events similar to the demonstration projects undertaken by the Task Force in 1996. Unfortunately, most of these 1995 events were organized in isolation and some, sadly, were poorly attended because of a failure to inform the widest potential audience. Women's History Month celebrations were not an important focus in 1995, which was a major disappointment. That void was filled very successfully in 1996 by a coalition effort of interested groups, among them Women's Studies, the Graduate Group for Feminist Studies and the History Department, the Baldy Center, the Graduate School of Education, the women's Center. A central coordination, as well as centralized advertisement, fundraising, and planning, of activities recognizing women's activities and honoring women's accomplishments would increase their visibility, improve quality, reduce costs and serve the function of drawing wide attention to the interests and contributions of all women at UB.

c. Summary and conclusions

- Regular frequent events, analogous to the 'Voices' career development workshop, "Take Our Daughter's to Work Day", and Women's History Month observances, should be part of the University calendar, organized, coordinated and administered through an appropriate central office or standing committee.
• A mechanism should be developed, again through an appropriate central office, to identify women at UB who are qualified for and interested in administrative and/or managerial positions.

• Leadership training programs should be devised to facilitate the progress of those women in their careers. An effort should be made to identify and celebrate current women leaders at UB, as well as accomplished alumnae.

• Regular public ceremonies honoring women leaders in the faculty, staff, and student body should become an integral part of annual University activities, perhaps with named awards, significant internal and external publicity, and strong support of University administrators, deans, chairs, etc. These events highlight the needs and the accomplishments of women and they provide the opportunity for women across the University to become acquainted, to share general and specific information about career paths, and to focus their energies for the benefit of all women at UB. In the view of the Task Force, these kinds of events can serve as both powerful employee morale boosters and as a source of excellent internal and external public relations for UB.

C. Subcommittee C: Charge #4

1. **Charge 4: Methods for developing a campus environment that is free of sexual harassment**

   a. Introduction

   The Task Force Subcommittee C sought "hard facts" to help them assess the nature and magnitude of sexual harassment problems on the UB campus. Institutional data on this issue were not available. To draw a picture of present circumstances and to formulate recommendations, the Task Force relied heavily on local expert consultants from the Office of Students, the Office of Affirmative Action, the UUP and CSEA, and the Law School. In addition, insights were derived from informal surveys, careful scrutiny of campus publications and many anecdotal reports. To place the situation at UB in an appropriate perspective, the Task Force studied extra-mural reports from other universities, scholarly reviews and the national media.

   b. **Existing strategies**

   Sexual harassment is a violation of federal law (Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendment and Executive Order 11246). A New York State Executive order and the policies of the SUNY trustees also forbid sexual harassment of employees and students. UB has a comprehensive policy that is consistent with, and in compliance with, state and federal guidelines. At orientation incoming students receive a clear written statement of those policies (prepared by the Affirmative Action Office); the Office of Student Life goes to considerable effort to ensure that all students, male and female, are properly informed on the matter.
A number of weaknesses and/or limitations of the existing strategies were identified by all the UB consultants. **First**, there is widespread ignorance, among both men and women, faculty, students, staff and supervisors about federal law on workplace harassment. In particular, most people do not realize that sexual harassment is recognized as a form of illegal discrimination, and that illegal harassing behavior is not limited to well-described "quid pro quo" behaviors but includes the creation and maintenance of a hostile, intimidating or offensive work environment. **Second**, most individuals are poorly informed about UB channels of grievance for alleged violations of the law. **Third**, those reporting channels are overloaded and/or otherwise inadequate, especially for students. As a consequence, often only the most troublesome cases and/or the most determined complainants are dealt with. All local experts were in full and independent agreement that formal complaints and grievances represent only a very small proportion of unacceptable behaviors.

**Fourth**, in the present system, the supervisors and administrators responsible for the first hearing of complaints are themselves frequently poorly informed about the law and sometimes have personal conflicts of interest that interfere with an objective and balanced review of grievances. Victims, with little confidence in the reporting channels, are often extremely reluctant to report improper behavior, fearing unsympathetic hearing, little or no action and possible reprisals.

A variety of sources, including written surveys of graduate and undergraduate students and of UUP members, provided clear evidence that harassment can occur on campus in all work/study areas, and may involve faculty-faculty, faculty-student, student-student and staff-staff relationships. At UB, as elsewhere, the overwhelming majority of inappropriate behaviors are directed against women, but men may also be victims. Some student publications are distressingly insensitive to the creation of a hostile environment for women students. The Task Force heard many anecdotes describing instances of the use by faculty of sexist language and off-color humor as a 'teaching device'.

There was consensus among the expert advisors to the Task Force that the otherwise excellent sexual harassment policy at UB is in urgent need of a carefully crafted mechanism to ensure enforcement. The present system accomplishes little but 'crisis-management' of the most overt problems and does far too little to encourage the deep-seated charges in attitude and behavior that will be required to free UB of sexual harassment.

The expectations of American women for harassment-free work settings have become markedly elevated in the last decade. Throughout the United States, rates of complaints have increased and the proportion of legal decisions in favor of victims has also increased, in many cases with substantial financial compensation for the victim. Our consultants were in agreement that if UB does not respond proactively to rapidly changing public standards of behavior, the institution will be at high risk for potentially embarrassing and possibly expensive legal action.
c. **Recommended strategies**

There are now many models for effective university programs to develop a campus environment that is free of sexual harassment. The Task Force recommends that development of a carefully crafted, written program be an extremely **urgent priority** for the academic year, 1996-1997. Knowledgeable Task Force members should work to develop such a program together with other interested and experienced parties, including representatives of the Office of Affirmative Action, Student Life, Counseling, UUP and CSEA, the School of Law. The essential elements for a successful plan are discussed below.

- **Education** is the most crucial factor for promoting a campus environment that is free of sexual harassment. There is widespread misunderstanding about legal definitions of sexual harassment. Many behaviors that were widely accepted in the past, and well within old cultural norms, are now proscribed by the law. Education to recognize harassing behavior is especially needed in a community as diverse as UB, which comprises people of very different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious and educational backgrounds. Students, faculty, staff and administrators must all be brought up-to-date on current legal and social standards of sexual harassment. Achieving community consensus on such a complex and often emotional issue will require much guided discussion and professionally supervised training. In each unit, regular sessions should be instituted to heighten awareness and increase sensitivity to the workplace problems created by inappropriate behaviors. Qualified, experienced professionals should conduct those sessions. Regular follow-ups, to monitor the effectiveness of training, should be part of the education program.

- A **well-defined mechanism** for reporting and dealing with complaints should be developed. The process must include guarantees of full protection and confidentiality for all parties. To establish the credibility of the process and encourage confidence, scrupulous care must be taken to ensure that reporting channels are entirely free of conflicts of interest. The process should be timely and efficient, with an emphasis on achieving satisfactory informal resolution at the lowest levels of reporting.

- An effective policy must include the imposition of sanctions and/or disciplinary action when informal resolutions cannot be achieved. A sexual harassment policy without "teeth" will be worse than none at all.

- A program of incentives and rewards should be established to recognize those units that take innovative and effective steps to develop and maintain a workplace free of harassment.

- A strong, unwavering leadership commitment is required to generate a truly harassment-free environment at UB. The attitudes, behaviors and enforcement decisions of senior management will be the key to effective strategies aimed at eliminating inappropriate harassing behaviors.
• Regular monitoring of the UB climate should be instituted. A rigorous, formal broadly-based survey should be conducted as soon as possible to establish a baseline for existing community perceptions about the magnitude and impact of harassment. Regular follow-up studies should be conducted to document improvements, the effectiveness of education and enforcement strategies and to identify persistent ‘trouble spots’.

d. **Summary and conclusions**

• UB policies on sexual harassment must be backed with carefully crafted enforcement mechanisms that protect victims and impose sanctions on perpetrators. Development of timely, efficient mechanisms to deal with harassment complaints should be an urgent priority for the academic year 1996-97.

• Education programs, supervised and administered by trained, experienced professionals should be instituted as soon as possible.

• A survey should be conducted to monitor present community perceptions and attitudes and to provide a baseline for tracking improvements.
VI. Recommendations

A. Introductory comments

Compiling a succinct list of practical recommendations from this very comprehensive review of the status of women at UB and sister institutions has been a daunting task. Several principles have guided the final formulation.

- **Consensus** - These recommendations reflect the collective wisdom of the Task Force and represent "the sense of the group".

- **Practicality** - These recommendations have been formulated for their inherent achievability, given current fiscal constraints and the inevitable sluggishness of administrative machinery in academe.

- **Specificity** - These recommendations are highly focused and timely. They are not an "all-time wish list", but address urgent needs.

- **Measurable benefits for UB** - We believe that most of these recommendations will promote the long-term health and vitality of UB. Creating a distinctive "woman-friendly" environment should encourage talented women to choose UB as a place to study and work. Public relations for alumnae(i) and corporate giving could also capitalize on initiatives for women.

The following section of specific recommendations is a summary restatement of material that has been reviewed in detail in preceding sections of this document. For full appreciation of the rationale and justification of each recommendation, the reader is urged to review the relevant material in Section III, Results.

B. General Recommendation

As an overall recommendation, the Task Force on Women at UB requests that President Greiner extend the mandate of the Task Force on Women at UB until a permanent alternative is in place. There are many models for administrative programs on behalf of women in academic institutions. Other schools have commissions, deans, vice presidents and/or standing committees, which function to:

- maintain intra- and extra-mural records and data
- Sponsor 'networking' activities
- serve as coordinators of activities, publicity
- increase university-wide awareness of women's perspectives and workplace needs
- identify women leaders
- conduct climate surveys
The members of the Task Force on women at UB are now highly knowledgeable about the spectrum of permanent institutional arrangements for an "Office for Women". It is essential for UB to devise a strategy that reflects local administrative styles and structures. For that reason, the details of such an arrangement should be worked out by a committee of appropriate representatives of the President, Provost, Senior Vice President and other Vice Presidents, together with selected Task Force members. As a minimum, the permanent arrangement should include:

- A prominent physical location, with essential support for telephones, mail, and other communication.

- Guarantees of convenient access to the highest levels of university administration.

- A smooth transition from the present Task Force to the permanent arrangement, in order to maximize continuity and maintain the impetus of ongoing efforts.

C. **Specific Recommendations** (by charge)

**Charge #1**: University policies and practices in hiring, advancing, and compensating women faculty, administrators, and staff.

- Data describing the distribution, representation, and compensation of women at UB should be collected regularly for biannual review. The tables and graphs in this report should serve as models for maintaining and updating those records.

- Archives should also be kept up-to-date of extra-mural reports on the status of women at other North American universities.

- Responsibility for maintaining and updating these data and archives should be assigned to the Task Force /Office for Women.

**Charge #2**: Strategies for addressing any inequities.

- Salary disparities revealed in this report should be rectified as soon as possible. A financial plan should be developed (and promulgated) to eliminate gender-based disparities within a reasonable time (i.e., 5 years). The greatest disparities are limited to a few units and/or payroll categories and affect a relatively small number of individuals. Developing timetables for closing those salary gaps would send a very powerful message about the commitment to gender equity.
In our society, financial compensation is a powerful symbol of the value and respect we assign to individuals and groups. Visible efforts to correct existing salary disparities would have a very positive impact on the morale of all women employees at UB and would go a long way towards developing a perception that UB is a "woman-friendly" institution.

- **Specific plans, with targets, are needed to increase the number of women in those worksites where they are significantly underrepresented.** Those plans should be developed within each unit, to accommodate special local needs, but they should aim for significant improvements in the foreseeable future. In addition, those plans should be promulgated to ensure that all employees within the unit are well-informed about them. Special attention should be paid to those units with the greatest and/or most inappropriate gender disparities.

- **Significant representation of women should be required on all committees dealing with important policy matters, including promotion, hiring, resource allocation, honors and awards, etc.**

- **Extra-mural practices and policies should be monitored (by the Task Force /Office for Women) to ensure that UB does not lag seriously behind national standards and to recommend policies to place UB in the avant garde.**

- **Existing programs to address inequities** (The President's Panel to Review Search Procedures, Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Development) should be strengthened to increase their impact on university policies, decisions, appointments and promotions.

**Charge #3: Improving the campus climate for women, with full consideration of the special needs of diverse groups.**

- **Adequate child care facilities should be provided on campus to meet existing demands.** The Task Force found that improved child care was an extremely urgent priority for women in all UB constituencies. A North Campus day care center was identified as a very pressing need. On-site day care is a highly visible symbol of an institutional commitment to create a "woman-friendly" environment. As a public relations measure, investment in child care facilities should have a rewarding payback in recruitment of staff, faculty and students.

- **Personnel policies should be developed that are friendly to 'care-givers', including flexible work schedules, job-sharing, tenure clock stops, etc.**

- **National /extra-mural observances about women should be supported and celebrated as important events in the university calendar.** Examples include Women's History Month, National Girls and Women in Sports Day, Take Our Daughters To Work Day. The Task Force/Office for Women should have a central role in planning, coordinating, publicizing, and promoting these events to ensure broad-based participation and successful outcomes.
Women's Studies and other academic programs/research projects on gender should be strengthened and expanded with moral and financial support. UB has been in the forefront of studies on women and gender since the early 1970's. Vigorous scholarly programs in women's studies are recognized to be an essential element in 'warming up' the 'chilly' climate for women in academe. It is critically important that UB not lose the energy and vitality of existing programs and that future planning permit those programs to develop to their full potential.

The Athletics programs need more women as head coaches and senior administrators. Promotion, publicity and celebration of women's athletic events should be coordinated through an Office for Women.

Positive images of women should be incorporated into the symbols, publicity and advertisements that represent UB to the public and to potential donors. The unequivocal message should be that women at UB are welcomed, respected, valued and integrated into all activities and functions.

A formal, rigorous campus-wide survey should be conducted to assess the current 'climate' for women at UB and to provide a baseline for monitoring changes.

A formal, rigorous campus-wide survey should be conducted to assess the current 'climate' for women at UB and to provide a baseline for monitoring changes.

**Charge #4: Methods for developing a campus environment that is free of sexual harassment**

Development of a practical, university-wide policy on sexual harassment should be a major priority for the academic year '96 - '97. Task Force members have become well-informed about policies and practices elsewhere; they can provide expertise (together with other appropriate personnel) for designing policies that are suited to UB. Important elements in the formulation should include:

- professionally supervised education/ awareness workshops
- adjudication mechanisms free of all conflicts of interest
- specific, efficient, practical procedures to review complaints
- adequate protections for all parties to complaints
- mechanisms for informal resolution of complaints
- sanctions for inappropriate behaviors

**Charge #5: Methods for identifying, encouraging, and developing women leaders.**

Women should be well-represented in all university committees, search processes, policy making bodies, awards and honors committees.
A consultant panel of senior women should be constituted to aid in the identification of qualified women for such committee service, and to develop and encourage female junior colleagues to prepare themselves for university service.

Career development workshops, similar to the successful workshop organized by the Task Force, should be regular, frequent events. Supervisors should encourage and facilitate participation. The Task Force /Office for Women, representing all women's constituencies, should play a central role in organizing, planning, and evaluating these workshops. Cooperation and collaboration of the Offices of the Provost, Senior Vice President, and all Vice Presidents will also be essential for the success of these programs.

Specific initiatives should be instituted for the promotion of women's careers. Some possibilities include intra-mural internships in administrative offices, financial incentives to attend extra-mural training courses, seminars and/or internships for the acquisition of managerial skills, competitive financial awards to support career-enhancing research and/or education at UB or outside. Other institutions can provide us with successful models for these kinds of initiatives. The expertise of the Task Force should be shared with UB administration to devise the most appropriate versions for us.

Activities should be promoted that increase opportunities for women faculty, staff and students to develop career-enhancing "network" relationships. UB participation in the National "Taking Our Daughters to Work" event was an excellent example of such an activity. Regular public ceremonies to identify and honor women leaders, highlighting their accomplishments, would serve a similar "networking" function.

**Charge #6:** Developing a process of accountability at all levels regarding the progress being made toward achieving equity for women.

- Strong, unwavering leadership decisions that facilitate, promote and reward efforts to achieve gender equity will be the key to any process of accountability.

- A database, similar to that presented in this report, should be maintained by the Task Force /Office for Women.

- Specific, timely plans and targets for achieving gender equity of representation and/or compensation should be formulated by individual units.

- Achievement of these targets should be assessed regularly, with clear incentives and rewards for success.

- Regular, rigorous surveys should be conducted to monitor changing community perceptions of the "climate" for women.
• Finally, the findings of this Task Force (and subsequent updates), should be widely disseminated to the UB community.
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TO:

Provost Aaron N. Bloch  
Senior Vice President Robert J. Wagner  
Vice Presidents  
Deans  
Professor Peter A. Nickerson  
Chair, Faculty Senate  
Ms. Rosalyn Wilkinson  
Chair, Professional Staff Senate  
Professor Paul Zarembska  
President, Buffalo Center Chapter, United University Professions  
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Chair, Council 82, University Police Local 1792  
Mr. Michael Day  
Division Leader and Steward, Local Division #358, Public Employees Federation  
Mr. Joseph Fox  
President, Student Association  
Ms. Anna Geronimo  
President, Graduate Student Association and Interim Liaison, Graduate Student Employees Union

Attached, for your information, is a copy of the charge to the Task Force on Women at UB, the creation of which has been recommended by some of UB's labor leaders and endorsed by a range of campus constituencies. This group’s perspective and advice on issues affecting women faculty, administrators, and staff at UB will be extremely useful, I propose that we constitute the membership promptly so as to have the Task Force begin its work in earnest by mid-semester.

To that end, please note the information regarding nomination and appointment of members in the section of the charge entitled “Selection.” You are free to nominate, on behalf of your constituency, as many candidates for membership as you deem appropriate; in so doing, you may wish to consider the apportionment of membership to your constituency (also described in this document). Please submit all nominations to Ms. Kathryn A. Sawner in my office no later than March 14; feel free to call Kathy at 645-2901 with any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William R. Greiner  
President

xc: Ms. Kathryn A. Sawner
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State University of New York at Buffalo

TASK FORCE ON WOMEN AT UB

Charge

Within one year, the Task Force on Women at UB will assess the campus climate for women, examine existing data, and advise the President on:

1) university policies and practices in hiring, advancing, and compensating women faculty, administrators, and staff;
2) strategies for addressing any inequities;
3) improving the campus climate for women, with full consideration of the special needs of diverse groups;
4) methods for developing a campus environment that is free of sexual harassment;
5) methods for identifying, encouraging, and developing women leaders, and,
6) developing a process of accountability at all levels regarding the progress being made toward achieving equity for women.

Membership

The Task Force shall be comprised of five faculty members, three professional staff members, two classified staff members, and three students (undergraduate, graduate and professional). The President shall appoint two co-chairs from among this group.

Selection

The President shall appoint the members of the Task Force from a pool of nominees proposed by the Provost, Senior Vice President, Vice Presidents, Deans, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Professional Staff Senate Executive Committee, Health Sciences and Buffalo Center Chapters, United University Professions, UB Local 602, Civil Service Employees Association, Council 82, Local Division 358, Public Employees Federation, Student Association, Graduate Student Association, and Graduate Student Employees Union.

[Signature]

William R. Greiner
President
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State Purchasing  
224 Crofts Hall  
North Campus  
645-2618
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215 Parker Hall
South Campus
829-2001

Professor Richard T. Hull
Department of Philosophy
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Director
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Professor Erwin M. Segal
Department of Psychology
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910 Clemens Hall
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Accounting Services and Records
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Ex Officio:
Professor William C. Fischer
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Guest(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/9/94</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>President William R. Greiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10/95</td>
<td>Demographics, Salary, Affirmative Action</td>
<td>Ms. Barbara Burke, SponsoredPrograms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Vivian Fernandez, Personnel Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Loyce Stewart, Affirmative Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/95</td>
<td>Hiring, Promotion</td>
<td>Dr. Margaret Acara, President’s Panel for Review of Search Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Mirdza Neiders, President’s Review Board on Promotions and Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Barry Kobrin, CSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Jan Moritz, UUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/95</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7/95</td>
<td>Harassment, Student Life</td>
<td>Ms. Barbara Ricotta, Office of Student Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Lucinda Finley, School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/95</td>
<td>Academic Programs</td>
<td>Dr. Hester Eisenstein, American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Isabel Marcus, School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19/95</td>
<td>Climate Issues</td>
<td>Dean Louis Goldberg, School of Dental Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Paul Zarembka, UUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/95</td>
<td>Athletics, Outreach, Development</td>
<td>Mr. Nelson Townsend, Division of Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Mary Ann Sharrow, School of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Pam Cardoza, University Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Ms. Deborah Scott More, University Development</td>
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<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is a record of the plenary sessions of the Task Force on Women at UB. The major work of the Task Force was conducted at countless subcommittee meetings and in formal and informal sessions involving smaller groups of members, often with participation of our graduate assistants.*
Task Force Sub-Committee Assignments

Subcommittee A:

Charge #1 - University policies and practices in hiring, advancing, and compensating women faculty, administrators, and staff.

Charge #2 - Strategies for addressing any inequities.

Charge #6 - Developing a process of accountability at all levels regarding the progress being made toward achieving equity for women.

Membership: Ms. Ruth Bryant
Professor Susan Hamlen
Professor Donald Henderson
Ms. Gretchen Knapp*
Professor Ruth Meyerowitz
Ms. Ellen McNamara

Subcommittee B:

Charge #3 - Improving the campus climate for women, with full consideration of the special needs of diverse groups.

Charge #5 - Methods for identifying, encouraging, and developing women leaders.

Membership: Ms. Kathleen Berchou
Professor William Fischer
Ms. Judith Miller
Ms. Jennifer Newkirk
Ms. Jennifer Roth
Ms. Betty Williams

Subcommittee C:

Charge #4 - Methods for developing a campus environment that is free of sexual harassment.

Membership: Ms. Gail Brisson*
Ms. Gina DeBlase-Trzyna
Ms. Sharon O’Neill
Ms. Vivian Santora*
Professor Erwin Segal
Professor Margarita Vargas

Co-Chairs, Dr. John Staley and Professor Bernice Noble, served as ex-officio on all subcommittees.

* Graduated 1995
MEMORANDUM

To: All Members of the UB community interested in organizing a local “Take Our Daughters to Work” day

FROM: Professor Bernice Noble
UB Task Force on Women

With the approval of President Greiner, the Task Force on Women has undertaken to organize a program at UB for the 1996 observance of “Take Our Daughters to Work” day. We need advice and assistance in making this project a success and hope you will be able to help. If you cannot participate in the planning and/or execution of this project, please pass this memo on to friends and colleagues who could be available to help.

Enclosed you will find some materials about the national program “Take Our Daughters to Work” that were assembled for the Task Force by Deborah More of the Office of University Development.

Our first organizational meeting is scheduled for:

January 16, 1995
UB Council Room
Capen Hall, 5th Floor
3:00 p.m.

Please come and bring your friends! A successful program will have many long-term benefits for UB, for its women employees, and for the Buffalo community.

R.S.V.P. Bernice Noble
829-2439

Enclosures
February 5, 1996

MEMORANDUM

To: Provost
   Senior Vice President
   Vice Presidents
   Deans
   Chairs
   Directors

The Task Force on Women at UB continues to seek new methods to identify, encourage, and develop women as leaders for our university. Among other activities, the Task Force has planned two spring events supporting such community-building efforts at UB.

The first of these, "Women's Voices: Insights for a Successful Career," will highlight the accomplishments of successful women at UB. This March 7 career skills workshop will feature short presentations by several prominent women in the UB community, followed by small group discussions, and will focus on communication in the classroom and workplace. Emphasis on shared interests and needs will help promote community among participants. The three-hour morning workshop is free and open to women serving UB in all capacities.

On April 25, the Task Force will sponsor "Take Our Daughters to Work Day." This event, sponsored internationally by the Ms. Foundation, is intended to provide role models for young women by exposing them to the working world. On this date, adults—fathers, mothers, mentors, and friends—are encouraged to bring girls between the ages of 9 and 14 to work to learn about the diverse range of career and educational options open to them.

Please make faculty and staff in your units aware of these events. We would also appreciate your support for whatever arrangements interested colleagues must make in order to participate. This advance notice will help people plan their calendars; the Task Force will be sending out more information on both events in the near future.

Sincerely,

William R. Greiner
Girls' day stresses awareness

WORK FROM PAGE D-1

try that most American families can no longer afford," Savitt said, "and that's going to be even more true in the future. Our sons need to learn the work of caring."

Meanwhile, she said, participation in Take Our Daughters to Work continues to climb. A Roper poll conducted in 1994 found that 25 million Americans participated in the event, and 125 million had heard of it. In addition, 9 out of 10 people who knew of the event had a positive response to it.

This year, Savitt said, the foundation is projecting 40 million to 50 million participants, including such nationwide corporate sponsors as Ortho-McNeil Pharmaceuticals, People magazine, Deloitte & Touche, The Limited, Reebok, Metropolitan Life Insurance, J.P. Morgan & Co. and AT&T.

Locally, a range of organizations are holding formal, organized programs. The Pittsburgh Public Schools are granting excused absences tomorrow for girls who participate, as are some suburban districts. Ladbrooke at the Meadows will put a dozen girls through the operation, from the stables to the front office, introducing them to trainers, riders and grooms as well as marketing and sales specialists.

At Carnegie-Mellon University, 5 girls will shadow their sponsors in the morning and tour a mix of art and technology departments in the afternoon. They will also hear former mayor Sophie Masloff speak about how and why she got into politics, and a rowing coach talk about the experience of coaching.

Pepsi-Cola expects 17 girls to learn about marketing, business planning, sales, computers and delivery systems.

Magee-Womens Hospital will introduce 70 girls to a range of doctors, professors, nurses and administrators who will describe their careers, training and education.

At Ernst & Young LLP, 20 girls will discuss themselves and what they hope to learn; then they will be matched with an employee who can provide that experience.

The South Hills Chapter of the Women's Business Network will host a dozen girls at a meet-the-entrepreneurs session with business owners, attorneys, chiropractors, CPAs and fitness trainers. They will also offer hands-on time with a computer software program on career choices.

Not coincidentally, the American Association of University Women has chosen tomorrow to release its groundbreaking study, "How Schools Shortchange Girls," to the general public for the first time. Originally published in 1993, it was primarily available to educators, policy-makers and the media.

The report, conducted by the Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, compiled 1,300 studies that documented the gender bias that pervades American classrooms. The study explores why girls and boys enter school roughly equal in ability and emerge 12 years later with girls behind in key areas such as math and science.

Copies of "How Schools Shortchange Girls" are $12.95, call (212) 460-5742.

Take Our Daughters to Work enters third round

W

then the Ms. Foundation for Women designated its first

...Day three years ago, the idea behind it was simple: Organizers hoped that introducing real models, they would help counteract role models they would get through the workplace, showing them other paths to use in their lives.

Meanwhile in Cleveland, the boys completely dominated the session, the girls shrunk back. The boys did all the talking. They physically dominated the room and took over the conversation. And the girls just faded into the backround.

Ms. Foundation, however, wants to point out that all such events are not created equal, setting the stage for theFOUNDATION to put a positive solution on the public agenda.

"That's why we created this day for girls," Savitt said. "They are our future. It's our responsibility to put a positive solution on the public agenda."

Ms. Foundation has two goals: the first is to put a positive solution on the public agenda; the second is to create an educational event for boys and girls together. As the third event arrives tomorrow, some firms are continuing that trend.

The Ms. Foundation, however, wants to point out that all such events are not created equal, setting the stage for theFOUNDATION to put a positive solution on the public agenda.
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TAKE OUR DAUGHTERS TO WORK DAY:
Creating a Positive Atmosphere Toward Women at UB
Thursday, April 25, 1996

Background
- 4th annual event sponsored internationally by the Ms. Foundation
- 25 million (1 out of every 6 Americans) participated in 1994
- focuses on girls ages 9 to 14 years old
- This program was developed by the Ms. Foundation as a response to research which found that in early adolescence girls experience a profound decline in self-esteem and confidence.
- On this day, across the country, adults are encouraged to bring a girl (daughter, niece, neighbour, grand-daughter, friend) to work.

Benefits to Girls
- makes them feel special and gives them confidence in their ideas and dreams
- are acknowledged as valuable future adults in the working world
- learn about different jobs women hold at UB and the many career options open to girls
- see women working in diverse ways, traditional and non-traditional
- experience many role models
- understand the importance of education and staying in school

Purpose of Sponsoring a Program at UB
- improve campus climate for women
- demonstrate to women that UB recognizes special needs of women - Women Count!
- provide women at UB with a sense of solidarity
- bring potential students to campus
- enhance UB’s image in the community (good public relations opportunity)
- highlight women’s roles at UB
- cultivate potential women donors

Materials and Support Available from Ms. Foundation
- Merchandise: t-shirts, coffee mugs, office kits, buttons, etc.

“Take Our Daughters to Work” at Carnegie Mellon University
- Program: morning - girls accompany hosts in work environments
  lunch with speaker, former mayor ($3.00)
  afternoon - girls choose tracks which include site visits and presentations
  across campus in small groups
- 75 girls participated
- great press
- CMU students acted as guides

Deborah More
Director of Donor Relations and Stewardship
Office of University Development
Ph: 829-2630 Fax: 829-2636 Email: more@ubvms.cc.buffalo.edu
Dear Friend:

Welcome for the first time -- or welcome back -- to Take Our Daughters To Work™, the national campaign that has so successfully put the concerns and tremendous capabilities of our adolescent daughters on the map. More than 25 million adults helped change the lives of girls by bringing them to work on Take Our Daughters To Work™ Day 1994. In fact, nine out of 10 Americans whose companies participated felt that the experience was positive for their workplace, and more than half (56%) of Americans who didn't know about the day think their company or organization should get involved in the future. The Ms. Foundation for Women hopes that you'll make a difference by joining us in planning Take Our Daughters To Work™ Day 1995!

Take Our Daughters To Work™, the public education program of the Ms. Foundation for Women, was launched in 1993 in response to disturbing research findings on the adolescent development of girls. While pre-adolescent girls are usually spunky, confident and more than happy to voice their opinions, something happens during adolescence that causes many girls to "lose their voice." Studies by Harvard University researchers, the American Association of University Women (AAUW), and the Minnesota Women's Fund indicate that during adolescence girls often receive less attention in school and in youth-serving programs, suffer from lower expectations than do boys, and tend to like or dislike themselves based on aspects of their physical appearance. It is during these formative years that countless girls also grapple with eating disorders, teen pregnancy, poverty, substance and sexual abuse, and distrust in the promises of education. Research has shown that by intervening with girls before these problems take root, we can help girls to grow up with confidence, in good health and ready to fulfill their dreams.

Now in its third year, Take Our Daughters To Work™ will take place on Thursday, April 27, 1995 and every year thereafter on the fourth Thursday in April. This year's theme, A Girl Is Watching. What Is She Learning? spotlights the educational value of the day. Also new this year -- and bound to generate excitement throughout the entire community -- is our 1995 Organizers Kit. Updated and expanded, you'll find that this year's Organizers Kit is chock-full of answers to the most commonly asked questions, innovative ideas for activities, and methods and strategies for implementing Take Our Daughters To Work™ Day in your area. The Organizers Kit is a must for any Take Our Daughters To Work™ chair or point-person, parents, co-workers, local officials, and the press.

We look forward to working together, and hope that you will support the Ms. Foundation's far-reaching efforts on behalf of girls. For more information or to order our 1995 literature and merchandise including Take Our Daughters To Work™ t-shirts, coffee mugs, baseball caps, office kits, and trading cards, call toll-free 800-676-7780. Every purchase you make helps to sustain our program-- and to ensure that girls everywhere are visible, valued, and heard!

Sincerely,

Gail Maynor
Take Our Daughters To Work™ Director

©1994 Ms. Foundation for Women. All rights reserved.
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