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Gender Equity in Higher Education

This issue of *Diversity & Democracy* extends the Association of American Colleges and Universities' (AAC&U's) longstanding commitment to addressing gender-based inequities in higher education, which began in the early 1970s with efforts to support women in higher education following the passage of Title IX. Building on this legacy, AAC&U’s editorial staff is infusing questions of gender equity across the association’s periodicals—for example, in this issue of *Diversity & Democracy*, in a recent issue of Peer Review on Gender Equity in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics), and in individual articles across AAC&U’s publications. AAC&U’s longstanding interest in advancing gender equity is one intersectional element of the association’s overarching commitment to equity and inclusive excellence—a commitment we are advancing with heightened energy during 2015, the association’s Centennial Year. Through publications like *America’s Unmet Promise: The Imperative for Equity in Higher Education*—which focuses on deep divisions in opportunity and outcomes by race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status—AAC&U offers tools to prompt campus discussions about “equity as a framework for higher education reform” (Witham et al. 2015, 1). This issue of *Diversity & Democracy* is part of a growing portfolio of publications that prompt higher education stakeholders to examine how inequity continues to manifest in various and intersecting ways on campuses, and to imagine higher education as a critical leader in advancing equity in society.

This issue arrives at a time when questions of gender equity—and of higher education’s role in advancing it—remain both contentious and complex. As Susan Albertine points out in these pages, higher proportions of young women than young men now hold baccalaureate degrees. Yet those women’s successes are not mirrored in all disciplines, at the highest faculty ranks, or within higher education leadership, and they do not always extend into the workforce or civic life. Intersecting aspects of women’s identities complicate the challenges women face on their educational and professional pathways: for example, as Alma Clayton-Pedersen reports in this issue, women of color in the STEM disciplines face a notorious “double bind” due to race and gender. Critically, as explored in these pages by Adriana di Bartolo, the very concept of gender has gained nuance and fluidity over recent decades, with important implications for transgender, gender nonconforming, and cisgender students, faculty, and staff. Many institutions are struggling to improve their climates for learning as sexual assault remains in the national news. Women’s colleges—once oases for students largely excluded from higher education—are reconsidering their missions and futures, one by one.

While this issue of *Diversity & Democracy* addresses all of the above and more, it leaves unexplored many topics that are nonetheless critically important to the project of advancing gender equity in higher education. Several of these topics have been addressed in other AAC&U publications over the years (see, for example, the archives of AAC&U’s newsletter *On Campus with Women*, published from 1971 to 2013, at www.ocww.org). They include the barriers to educational attainment for young men of color (Williams and Flores-Ragade 2010), the challenges facing parenting students (Peden 2014), and a wide variety of persistent gender-inflected inequities that affect educational outcomes, employment within higher education, and lifelong prospects across race, socioeconomic status, and other categories of difference.

While it is impossible to take a comprehensive look at gender equity in higher education within a single issue of a single publication, this issue’s authors raise key questions worth considering. What is the status of gender equity in higher education? How are the ways that gender is understood and discussed shifting? And what can higher education do to better address persistent gender-based inequities, both within and beyond its walls? This issue prompts readers to consider the implications of these questions within their own contexts, and to imagine a world where gender is but one aspect of identity to be celebrated rather than one of many factors that proscribe opportunity.

—from Kathryn Peltier Campbell
Editor, *Diversity & Democracy*

**Questions of gender equity ... remain both contentious and complex.**

---

**REFERENCES**


Gender Equity in Higher Education: Calling for Equitable, Integrative, and Intergenerational Leadership

SUSAN ALBERTINE, vice president of diversity, equity, and student success at the Association of American Colleges and Universities

Seven years after leaving a deanship and a tenured position in English and Women’s and Gender Studies for a new career in national higher education leadership, I find myself looking toward the decades ahead for women in higher education, toward our full and equitable participation in our democracy—which profoundly needs our help. At the same time, I find myself holding the concerns of women both apart from and within those of all our students and faculty—for the sake of future generations and their learning.

In this article, I want to offer three approaches to women’s leadership and leadership for gender equity in higher education, reflecting the complexities of our time and emphasizing the realities of the changing faculty. These approaches build on one lesson I have learned at the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U): the value of teamwork. AAC&U’s Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative points to teamwork as an Essential Learning Outcome for all college students (National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America’s Promise 2007). Employers report that teamwork skills are among the most important learning outcomes for students as they prepare for the workforce (Hart Research Associates 2015).

Despite agreement about teamwork’s value, on campus, the model of the self-reliant, autonomous, independent scholar still predominates. It has been, traditionally, a male model. But higher education is changing, and the model of the autonomous scholar no longer serves us well (see http://thechangingfaculty.org/). Nationally, more than two-thirds of faculty now work off the tenure track (Steiger 2013), with pay levels that are often extremely low (Curtis and Thornton 2013). While data on non-tenure-track faculty are notoriously hard to assemble, women appear to be disproportionately represented among them (Steiger 2013).

These faculty cannot afford to imagine their careers according to the old model of the independent faculty member aiming for and achieving tenure. They might, however, consider how teamwork and collective action can help them advance their own leadership and career growth. Intentional leadership for gender equity in the stratified world of the faculty may in fact be critical to the thriving of the academy. As the faculty change, it will take women’s “full participation” (Sturm et al. 2011) to ensure the well-being of our institutions and hence our thriving as a society.

Below, I offer three approaches to women’s leadership and leadership for gender equity, each of which requires team activity and collective action. These three approaches pursue leadership that is (1) equitable, (2) integrative, and (3) intergenerational.

Equitable Leadership

At AAC&U, we are conducting all our diversity and equity work under the banner of “inclusive excellence” (AAC&U Board of Directors 2013). We expect all our offices, meetings, and programs to apply “equity-mindedness” to our work (Bensimon 2007). Equity requires a principled and ethical approach focused on achieving proportional outcomes. For example, women should have a chance to participate equitably in opportunities; if half of all people are women, women’s achievements should represent half of all achievements. Equity-mindedness in higher education requires evidence-based thinking about disparities and stratification and points toward fair and informed collective action (Witham et al. 2015, 5–8). It demands attention to disparities across racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic lines and across gender lines.

For example, an equity-minded approach might call for action to address profound socioeconomic gaps at the undergraduate level. Students from the poorest families have a 9 percent chance of graduating from college by age twenty-four, while children from the most affluent families have a 77 percent chance (Cahalan and Perna 2015). But as Martha Bailey and Susan Dynarski have shown (2011, 16–18), inequalities in educational attainment among women of different socioeconomic statuses have risen far more sharply than those among men. While both men and women have increased their college participation and completion rates and high-income women now outpace all other groups, the attainment gap is much wider between high-income and low-income women than it is between high-income and low-income men.

Racial and ethnic disparities in college attainment, too, have persisted for decades. As of 2009, 14 percent of African American men and 22 percent of African American women ages twenty-five to twenty-nine held at least a bachelor’s degree. For young Hispanic men and women, these shares were 10 percent and 16 percent, respectively; for young white men and women, they were...
32 percent and 40 percent (Kim 2011, 6). Alarming, these gaps persist even as the US population is changing. More than four in ten millennials (ages 18–33) already identify themselves as non-white (Taylor 2014); by 2023, the majority of children will identify themselves in groups other than white (Act for Youth 2010). How will gender continue to complicate this picture?

Against the backdrop of changing demographics, gender integration of certain disciplines remains incomplete. Take physics as one example. In 2012, 20 percent of bachelor’s degrees in physics were awarded to women, compared with 36 percent of bachelor’s degrees in all science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields (American Physical Society n.d.). In the same year, 20 percent of doctoral degrees in physics were earned by women (American Physical Society n.d.). And at the faculty level, women compose about 13 percent of physics faculty members, a rate lower than for other STEM fields (White and Ivie 2013, 1).

Indeed, across faculty ranks, women are inequitably represented. According to John Curtis, “Women have entered the academic workforce in large numbers during the same period in which contingency”—full- and part-time positions for faculty off the tenure track, sometimes called instructional staff positions—“has emerged as the normative employment situation. Between 1976 and 2009, the number of women in instructional staff positions at degree-granting colleges and universities grew by 266 percent, whereas the number of men employed increased by only 62 percent during the same period” (2013, 29). As Curtis elaborates, women now hold 44 percent of all full-time faculty positions, but they are only 29 percent of full professors. Women full-time faculty members still earn 80 percent of what their male colleagues earn. These figures do not reflect the truly grim disparities that exist between white women and women of color—who “remain underrepresented and their achievements in the academy almost invisible” (Turner, González, and Wood 2008, 140). In 2005, 1 percent of full professors were black women, 1 percent were Asian women, 0.6 percent were Hispanic women, and 0.1 percent were American Indian women (140).

Within leadership positions, women have “continued to make modest gains in their representation among college presidents, with the proportion of female chief executives rising to 26.4 percent” in 2012 (Lederman 2012). Women’s representation is highest in community colleges, where one-third of presidents are women (Lederman 2012). Clearly, gender equity at the highest leadership ranks does not yet exist. The picture is more complex still when considering the status of women of color in leadership positions. As of 2008, white women held 38 percent of senior administrative positions, while women of color held only 7 percent (Touchton, Musil, and Campbell 2008, 24).

Considering these facts, it’s important to ask: What model are we presenting to our students, both men and women? How can we take an equity-minded approach to improving this picture, looking at multiple categories of difference at once and especially at points of intersection among these categories? Attending to equity means attending to a complex and sometimes clashing tapestry, and we can’t accomplish this work by thinking individualistically. We have to make a collective and intentional approach.

**Integrative and Intentional Leadership**

In my introduction to this essay, I mentioned AAC&U’s LEAP initiative. LEAP offers a purposeful and intentional approach to student learning based on key points of consensus about the aims of higher education, allowing for leadership and action that is collective but that also respects campus cultures and differences. By focusing on Essential Learning Outcomes (ELOs) that all students should achieve through college, one can discover an amazing array of pathways toward meeting those outcomes. For the purposes of integrating an intentional focus on women and gender across our work in higher education, I want to suggest that we revise the ELOs to put women and gender specifically in view.

The first broad category of ELOs is “knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world … focused by engagement with big questions both contemporary and enduring” (National Leadership Council 2007, 3). Many campuses are taking up big questions on local and global topics: sustainability, human rights, food, health, water. And many big questions involve women and gender. For example, why is there so much violence against women in the United States, with one in four American women experiencing physical domestic violence in her lifetime (Snyder 2013)? And why are far more women in public office in the developing world than in the United States, with Rwanda holding the highest percentage of women in parliament of any country and the United States ranking seventy-fifth (Inter-Parliamentary Union 2014)? We can and should explore big questions related to women and gender in our own educational contexts, disciplines, or offices.

The second broad category of ELOs is “intellectual and practical skills, including inquiry and analysis, critical and creative thinking, written and oral communication, quantitative literacy, information literacy, and teamwork and problem solving” (National Leadership Council 2007, 3). Each of these skills has a rubric associated with it, created through AAC&U’s Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education
(VALUE) project (http://www.aacu.org/VALUE/). Each of these rubrics could easily be modified to emphasize women and gender. For example, the teamwork rubric describes the “capstone” performance criterion “Facilitates the Contributions of Team Member” as follows: “Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by both constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others as well as noticing when someone is not participating and inviting them to engage.” What if, instead of mentioning “team members,” this language referred specifically to women? Similarly, we might add four words to the descriptor for the capstone level of “Application/Analysis” in the quantitative literacy VALUE rubric: “Uses the quantitative analysis of data on women and gender as the basis for deep and thoughtful judgments, drawing insightful, carefully qualified conclusions from this work.” The data points I have woven into this article are just one place to start.

The third broad category of ELOs focuses on “personal and social responsibility,” embracing the following learning outcomes (which reflect my modifications): learning about women and gender within the realm of “civic knowledge and engagement—both local and global”; “intercultural knowledge and competence” in matters concerning women and gender; “ethical reasoning and action” focused on women and gender (National Leadership Council 2007, 3).

The fourth and final category of ELOs focuses on “integrative and applied learning … demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems” (National Leadership Council 2007, 3). We are at this moment living through a period of social awakening to differences that span more than just binary dimensions. What are the real-world implications when new understandings of gender complicate the neat binary barriers of the past? How should institutions, whether same-sex or coeducational, transform themselves now? Simmons College president Helen Drinan’s call for women’s colleges to welcome transgender students opens an array of questions for institutional leaders to explore and address (2014). Students certainly have a stake in this exploration as they apply their knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings.

**Intergenerational Leadership**

In order to be equitable, integrative, and intentional, leadership by and for women and across the spectrum of gender must also be intergenerational. This is particularly critical as second-wave feminists of the baby boom generation retire and a different and more diverse demographic of young women moves into adulthood. I have learned much about the need for intergenerational leadership from my daughter, Hannah. I am a second-wave progressive feminist; Hannah, now a junior in college, is a young leader. Hannah was president of her high school student government—a place where few girls choose to go. Indeed, in the United States, young men are more likely than girls to aspire to a career in student government—a place where few girls choose to go. Indeed, in the United States, young men are more likely than young women to aspire to a career in politics (Lawless and Fox 2013).

Last year, while preparing for the speech that eventually became this article, I decided to interview Hannah for her perspective on women and gender. I am proud of Hannah, but interviewing her felt risky. I wanted to ask her about “the f-word,” and I knew it would not be easy. And indeed, Hannah said some things that were hard to hear. Of feminism, she said, “That’s your generation. I don’t know a single person who says she’s a feminist.” Hearing this, I tried to keep my genial motherly smile, to refrain from preparing my faithful consciousness-raising counterargument. I decided to do some perspective-taking—to open my ears and listen. What I learned was instructive.

Hannah described seeing feminism as limiting because, in her view, it proposes to build action on a theory of women’s superiority. That sounded at first rather antifeminist. But I believe that Hannah’s ideas suggest something else. She and her friends—male and female, gay and straight along a spectrum—have a fluid understanding of gender and sexuality. They imagine gender identity far more freely and diversely than I did at their age. Moreover, Hannah understands gender as a useful category of analysis—one that she applies flexibly to the women and men in her world, while still understanding the disparities that often disadvantage women as well as the need to address power differentials. She gave examples from her own work as a YMCA camp counselor, where she and her co-counselors take purposeful approaches to empowering twelve-year-old girls.

Listening compassionately to Hannah, I understood her perspective in a way I had not before. I saw that I, as an older white woman, ought to listen with equal compassion to diverse women of other generations. There is good social science research supporting the positive impact of intergroup dialogue (see, for example, Schoem and Hurtado 2001), and the strategies and structures of such dialogue appear promising as ways of engaging intergenerational as well as interracial groups. The United Nations has recognized this in sponsoring an array of events and projects using intergenerational dialogue to address poverty, community development, and the concerns of women—for example, through its Economic Commission for Africa (UN Economic Commission for Africa 2013).

On campuses, intergenerational dialogue can occur between individuals—but more importantly, it can be organized intentionally as community
action to encourage tolerance, respect, mutual understanding, and collective effort. Indeed, I believe that intergenerational dialogues across the spectrum of gender and sexuality might be particularly helpful now for faculty, staff, and students.

**Conclusion**

In the United States, we are witnessing an unsurprising resurgence and accompanying backlash of disorganized public attention to women, sexuality, and gender. The recent spate of stories and fierce disagreement about sexual violence on campus is occurring at a time of unprecedented progress in the legal and social standing of gays, lesbians, and transgender individuals. Women, gender, and sexuality are everywhere in the news. It is possible that a woman will finally be president. But what about women in higher education? What issues demand our leadership—a new kind of plural leadership by women and for gender equity? That is a question on which we should focus our energy. A couple of years ago, Sheryl Sandberg popularized the idea of “leaning in” (2013), and maybe we’ll remember this era as the “lean in” moment. But I confess that my playbook does not say “lean in.” It says *reach out together intentionally, across all our differences and boundaries.*

As we bear down on evidence, reach out across difference, and aim for positive action, I hope we can be intentional and mindful. Let’s work toward intergenerational connection and equity-mindedness, and take personal action for collective impact. Let’s reach out to others who are unlike us, even if it means negotiating class and cultural differences. Let’s honor and embrace those differences—aware of our collective identities; proud of our capacities to both lead and nurture; using our bright, creative, contrary, and questioning habits of mind together.

**Editor’s note:** This article is an updated adaptation of a speech given at the annual meeting of Wisconsin Women in Higher Education Leadership on October 23, 2013.
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Undeniably, professions in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) are among the fastest growing occupations in the US economy. According to Evans, McKenna, and Schulte (2013), “by the end of the decade, the US economy will annually create 120,000 new jobs requiring a bachelor’s degree in computer science” to meet the demands of emerging fields like cloud architecture, forensic investigation, and geospatial technology. However, while the number of computer science baccalaureates has increased in recent years (NSF 2015), it continues to lag behind workforce demands in these disciplines (see figure 1), jeopardizing our nation’s capacity to remain at the leading edge of innovation.

Key to sustaining US global competitiveness is the country’s ability to harness the kinds of diverse perspectives that not only are known to fuel better scientific outcomes, but also are associated with the inclusion of underrepresented groups, particularly women and color (Cantor et al. 2014). While women of color and white women together represent the largest college-going segment of our society (NSF 2015), they remain a largely untapped—yet rich—source of talent in disciplines like computer science. Between 2002 and 2012, the percentage of baccalaureate computer science degrees earned by women declined from 28 percent to 18 percent (NSF 2015). In the same period, the percentage of black, Hispanic/Latina, and Native American women who earned baccalaureate computer science degrees declined from 7 percent to a mere 5 percent (NSF 2015).

A Rise in TIDES
The relative absence of historical accounts of women as “human computers” in the early 1800s has led to masculinization of the discipline, devaluation of women’s contributions, underestimation of women’s mathematical aptitude and, ultimately, gender inequity. While overcoming stereotypes is an important strategy toward increasing women’s representation in the computer and information sciences, the most promising approach is pedagogical reform (Tsui 2007) that is not only evidence based, but also culturally sensitive.

Despite the importance of such reform, STEM faculty often lack formal training in pedagogy and research-based learning theories (Vergara et al. 2014; Oleson and Hora 2014). Furthermore, many professional development opportunities aimed at helping STEM faculty enhance their teaching practices overlook the role of cultural competence in teaching and learning and fail to inextricably combine cultural sensitivity with advanced pedagogies. Additionally, professional development interventions are often devoid of the elements necessary to achieve sustained change in STEM teaching patterns.

To address these issues, the Association of American Colleges and Universities, with generous funding from the Leona M. and Harry B. Helmsley Charitable Trust, launched its TIDES (Teaching to Increase Diversity and Equity in STEM) initiative in 2014. TIDES recognizes and directly addresses the limitations of current undergraduate STEM reform efforts by increasing the capacity of STEM faculty to positively affect underrepresented STEM students’ interest, competencies, and retention in
the computer sciences and related STEM disciplines.

Since its launch, TIDES has supported nineteen institutions—including public and private institutions, minority serving institutions, liberal arts colleges, community colleges, research universities, and a women’s college—as they develop campus-level efforts aimed at empowering STEM faculty to implement culturally competent pedagogies. Two examples include the University of Puerto Rico–Humacao, a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI); and Bryn Mawr College, a women’s liberal arts college. Each of these institutions has taken a bold and innovative step not only toward improving the learning outcomes and retention rates of women and women of color in computer and information sciences, but also toward ensuring that inclusive excellence, as it relates to all underrepresented groups in STEM, becomes an inherent part of institutional purpose and practice.

**TIDES at the University of Puerto Rico–Humacao**

At the national level, Hispanic women continue to constitute only a small fraction of women who earn baccalaureate degrees in the computer sciences (figure 2). While the University of Puerto Rico–Humacao (UPRH) boasts of robust STEM enrollment among its underrepresented minority female undergraduate population, a scant number of these students elect to establish careers or enroll in STEM doctoral programs that require strong quantitative and computational skills. The UPRH TIDES project, “Cybernetic Girls Can Be Pinky: Increasing the Number of Female Hispanics into Computational Biology,” aims to increase the interest, competency, and retention of Hispanic women in graduate programs and careers in computational biology and related STEM areas.

**FIGURE 2. Women Baccalaureates in Computer Science**

Using culturally relevant teaching strategies, the UPRH TIDES project addresses three barriers to increasing the interest and retention of Hispanic women in the STEM disciplines: the masculinization of the STEM disciplines, the absence of faculty professional development, and the lack of intentionality toward culturally sensitive course redesign. With an undergraduate student population that is 70 percent female and 100 percent Hispanic, the UPRH’s institutional context as an HSI is central to this approach, as is its appreciation for the cultural domains that often preclude women from pursuing STEM degrees.

The cultural expectation that women will be overtly feminine is a central aspect of life as experienced by many Hispanic women. For instance, Hispanic females are often expected to be “pinky”—that is, to dress nicely, wear makeup, and become mothers. Girls are often discouraged from playing the video games that they frequently enjoy, which have been shown to increase interest in and curiosity about computer science. At the UPRH, even women students who are attracted to careers in STEM are often dissuaded from these fields based on cultural and historic perceptions that such careers are exclusively for men.

To overcome such misperceptions, the UPRH TIDES project provides faculty with professional development opportunities focused on the construction of gender, particularly as it relates to experiences in science. The program familiarizes faculty with critical gender theories and raises faculty awareness of implicit bias, with an emphasis on how these theories and biases affect the everyday experiences of Hispanic women in STEM classrooms. Faculty also learn advanced pedagogies and strategies for integrating computational and mathematical skills in relevant STEM course work.

Using these strategies, a team of biologists, anthropologists, and other STEM faculty are reconfiguring elements of their STEM curricula to better integrate computer science and mathematical proficiencies and applications in disciplines such as ecology, cellular and molecular biology, and the social sciences. This curriculum adjustment and redesign not only enhances the critical thinking skills of UPRH’s male and female Hispanic students, but also supports institutional efforts to increase the number of Hispanic women who matriculate in STEM doctoral programs.

Although the project is in its early stages, interesting data already are emerging. For example, while UPRH students reported a lack of knowledge about quantitative analysis and computational biology in an initial survey, they also indicated an interest in knowing more about discoveries related to computational biology, applications of the discipline in research situations, and career opportunities. Many student respondents also emphasized the importance of mentors and research experiences.

A second initial survey administered to UPRH students revealed significant misperceptions about the role of women in STEM (see figure 3, page 10). Male students were more likely than female students to think that males have better leadership capabilities than females,
that males have more natural talent for quantitative analysis, and that there is an equal playing field for males and females in science. Most students also reported that females in computational biology have working environments and salaries that are similar to those of men.

Interestingly, in a follow-up survey completed at the end of the first year of the UPRH TIDES project, most students reported a change in their perceptions. For example, in direct contrast to initial survey results, students significantly disagreed in the second survey with the statement, “In computer science-related jobs, women and men have similar working environments and salaries.” In addition, male students, more so than female students, reported increased disagreement with a statement indicating that one of the basic responsibilities of a professional woman is to raise children.

Indeed, the inclusion of gender equity as a major issue in daily classroom interactions appears to have begun altering the perceptions of both female and male Hispanic undergraduates in STEM. The UPRH expects to continue educating new generations of Hispanic STEM professionals to overcome gender misperceptions, particularly in the computational sciences.

**TIDES at Bryn Mawr College**

Bryn Mawr College, a liberal arts college for women, is committed to enrolling an ethnically and socioeconomically diverse population (see figure 4, page 11). In keeping with its founding mission of providing access to a first-rate education for women, Bryn Mawr has successfully encouraged many young women to major and pursue graduate study and careers in STEM disciplines such as physics and computer science, where they have been historically underrepresented.

As high-speed computers become more sophisticated and interdisciplinary fields such as computational physics emerge, leading scientists must be both liberally educated and computationally savvy. Institutions that seek to advance women’s success in these fields must systematically support pedagogies that encourage deep and active learning—an educational “process whereby students engage in activities” and with materials “that promote analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of class content” (University of Michigan CRLT 2014). To increase the representation of women in physics and other STEM fields, institutions also need to create inclusive environments where women experience opportunities to develop skill sets that are highly desirable in the fields of computer and information sciences. Indeed, to focus on the representation of women in STEM without considering the limitations imposed upon them that are unrelated to their aptitude obscures the more subtle issues that significantly contribute to gender inequities in these fields.

Through its recently completed Next Generation Learning Challenges project, which embedded computer science proficiency throughout sequences of courses required for the physics major, Bryn Mawr demonstrated that an approach to teaching and learning that blends online and face-to-face instruction can improve STEM student learning in a liberal arts setting while also facilitating meaningful faculty-student interactions and overall student success. Building on these earlier efforts, Bryn Mawr aims to transform the way it educates and trains STEM majors through its TIDES project, “Enhancing Computation and Information Science Learning Opportunities for Women Leaders in STEM.”

Through its TIDES project, Bryn Mawr aims to build online, self-paced modules that develop and reinforce computational skills for core STEM curricula, first in physics and later in biology, chemistry, and the geosciences. These modules will teach computational skills by encouraging active learning. Bryn Mawr is exploring the potential for these modules not only to build skills, but also to counter the racial and gender stereotyping that can discourage underrepresented students from persisting in computational and scientific careers.

Bryn Mawr’s TIDES project launched in 2014 with a summer retreat where project stakeholders, including physics and other STEM faculty, students, administrators, and staff, began designing a computational physics course that will serve as a vehicle for developing, piloting, and assessing

---

**FIGURE 3. UPRH Initial Survey Results: Perceptions of Gender Issues in Computational Biology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Female Responses</th>
<th>Male Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is an equal playing field for males and females in STEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males have more natural talent for quantitative analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males have better leadership capabilities and should predominantly occupy leadership positions in STEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale indicates complete disagreement (1) up to complete agreement (4). Female students’ responses indicated by ♂; male students’ responses indicated by ♂.
modular learning units in a blended learning format. At the retreat, participants discussed topics such as implicit gender bias and culturally inclusive teaching. They also developed working definitions of key concepts (e.g., algorithmic thinking, computational skills) as well as a short list of competencies that students should achieve in the context of STEM learning and of physics in particular. In addition, participants assessed relevant curricular elements currently in place at Bryn Mawr, criticized example course modules and pedagogical approaches, discussed resources focused on implicit gender bias and culturally inclusive teaching, and selected a computational environment for the new course.

To support the TIDES project’s objective of fostering culturally sensitive approaches to teaching, the TIDES modules will contain gender-inclusive materials—for example, highlighting the contributions of two women pioneers in computer science, Ada Lovelace and Grace Hopper. Additionally, TIDES efforts will be integrated with those of the Bryn Mawr Teaching and Learning Institute, which has the capacity to convene faculty for professional development, promote reflection and dialogue among faculty colleagues, and establish pedagogical partnerships between faculty and student consultants.

The inaugural TIDES Faculty Workshop will occur in May 2015 at Bryn Mawr’s Blended Learning in the Liberal Arts Conference, where nationally recognized experts will engage faculty in overcoming gender biases and developing culturally sensitive approaches to teaching in the STEM disciplines. In subsequent workshops, faculty will review the appropriateness of instituting modules for culturally sensitive teaching throughout all STEM curricula, provide training on how to use these modules in a blended format, and, ultimately, increase the self-efficacy of STEM faculty in implementing pedagogies that are evidence-based and culturally competent.

Conclusion
Recently, Freeman et al. (2014) concluded that examining the aspects of instructor behavior that can yield the most significant gains in STEM student learning may provide valuable insight into our understanding of how and why such practices can differentially affect certain types of student populations, particularly those from underrepresented groups.

To that end, the University of Puerto Rico–Humacao and Bryn Mawr College join the entire AAC&U TIDES community not only in examining advanced pedagogies, but also in empowering STEM faculty to adopt and sustain culturally sensitive teaching practices aimed at increasing retention and learning outcomes in the computer and information sciences and related STEM disciplines. We expect this approach to result in a cadre of STEM faculty in US higher education who are sensitized to nondominant cultural domains in every learning situation, aware of their privileged perspective within the classroom, and equipped with tools for creating the kind of inclusive classroom experiences that support learning and success for all students.
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Run Like a Girl … for Office: How Higher Education Can Advance Gender Equity in Politics
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NANCY THOMAS, director of the Initiatives for the Study of Higher Education and Public Life at Tufts University’s Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service

During Super Bowl XLIX in 2015, television viewers saw an Always advertisement asking, “What does it look like to run like a girl?” After demonstrating how running “like a girl” is understood as an insult among young adults, the ad turns to eight- to twelve-year-old girls who view “running like a girl” as an affirmative challenge. Warning that girls’ confidence goes down in middle school and advocating for change, the ad highlights how sexism is socially acceptable in the United States. Unfortunately, middle school is not the only problem: girls and women lose self-confidence at all educational levels, including college, setting them on a trajectory inconsistent with careers in politics.

In this article, we examine the stereotypes that girls and women face at all educational levels and describe the labyrinth that women enter when they pursue political careers. We then explore the role of higher education in building or undermining women’s confidence as they prepare for political roles. Finally, we point to shifts in American attitudes that foreshadow a more equitable future, and offer recommendations to help colleges and universities cultivate gender equity among the next generation of political leaders.

Stereotypes and Discrimination

Women account for slightly more than half of the US population, and they lead men in every educational measure, from completing high school to obtaining advanced degrees (Executive Office of the President of the United States 2014, 9). Despite these gains, they hold under 20 percent of leadership positions in most fields, including politics on a state and national level (Warner 2014). Women hold only 26 percent of US college and university presidencies (Cook 2012). According to a 2014 American Progress report, “It will take until the year 2085 for women to reach parity with men in leadership roles in our country” (Warner 2014).

Extensive research has identified several explanations for the “glass ceiling” women face on their way to advancement, including stereotypes and discrimination. Research findings are clear: gender stereotyping exists, even among well-meaning educators; it starts early and has serious implications for women’s progress. For example, in a recent experimental study, middle- and high-school educators responding to identical position statements presented by hypothetical candidates for student council rated “Emily” as “hard-working,” “bubbly,” and “inexperienced” while rating “Jacob” as “confident” and “charismatic” (Beane et al. 2014).

Consistent with this research, Schneider and Bos (2014) found that Americans assign positive leadership traits (e.g., “educated,” “competitive,” “ambitious,” “confident,” “well-spoken,” “assertive,” “charismatic”) to male politicians, while female politicians are viewed as having other characteristics (e.g., “emotional,” “compassionate,” “caring,” “honest”) that are not equated with political leadership. As Schneider and Bos conclude, “female politicians are simply not seen as having qualities requisite for the politician role in comparison to their male colleagues” (259).

Unfortunately, stereotyping starts early in primary school, continues through high school and college, affects employment, and—if women do pursue political careers— influences voters. Thus stereotypes influence the messages sent to girls and women about the leadership roles they should pursue. Stereotypes affect women as they aspire to traditionally male professions, including politics. Because stereotypes for politicians and females do not overlap, people find it difficult to envision women as political leaders.

Navigating the Labyrinth

Women face formidable barriers in deciding whether to enter politics and once they seek office. Eagly and Carli (2007) argue that the metaphor of the glass ceiling should be replaced with the image of a labyrinth. The journey through that labyrinth begins at entry to a political career, and women and men get started differently. Women need more encouragement than men to run for office, but they are less likely to get it. Several studies have examined how men and women get started. Women enter politics by engaging in local, issue-based activism (Political Parity 2014, 8) or organizations (Sanbonmatsu, Carroll, and Walsh 2009, 16), while men enter politics through self-started campaigns (Sanbonmatsu, Carroll, and Walsh 2009, 8) or because they were encouraged by parties or elected officials (Lawless and Fox 2012, 12). Women are more likely to be Democrats than Republicans (Pew Research Center 2015, 12).

Women with political aspirations face a double bind: when they play the supportive “feminine” roles they have been conditioned for, they appear unambitious; and if they seem ambitious, they
are viewed as abrasive and “unfeminine.” Like men, they have to contend with the costs of a political career: loss of privacy, long hours and travel schedules, the challenges of balancing work and family, and even safety issues (e.g., when campaigning door-to-door). These concerns weigh more heavily on women than on men. For women facing or considering these challenges, role models and mentors matter; but with female political representation so low, women are less likely than men to find same-gender mentors.

Women are also deterred by perceptions of key components of political roles, such as negative campaigning, fundraising, and going door-to-door to meet constituents (Lawless and Fox 2012, 11). Women endure blatant disrespect, as illustrated by the sexist heckling and commentary that Hillary Clinton and Sarah Palin encountered during their 2008 campaigns (Farrell 2010). And women face the trap of being hand-picked to lead in situations involving a higher likelihood of failure. In their study comparing identically qualified women and men and the circumstances under which they are selected as leaders, Haslam and Ryan (2008) describe a “glass cliff” facing women: men are promoted to leadership positions when things are going well; women are promoted when things are precarious (544).

Countering discrimination and removing structural barriers will encourage women to run for office. Until that happens, however, women need extraordinary resilience and grit to enter and stay in the labyrinth.

**Higher Education and Women’s Confidence**

Colleges and universities play a critical role in promoting fair representation of women in our democracy. Because students begin to form concrete visions for their careers in college, stereotypes encountered there can be particularly destructive. Yet, in a recent study of innate “brilliance,” women across races and ethnicities—as well as African Americans across gender identities—were found to be underrepresented in fields that academics viewed as requiring innate talent and overrepresented in fields perceived as requiring motivation and sustained effort (Leslie et al. 2015). Although not specifically included in the recent study, the field of politics is one of these fields.

Women’s beliefs about their abilities can affect their engagement as leaders on campus. In 2011, Princeton University issued an internal report comparing the experiences of female and male students. Among its many findings, the report noted that women held leadership positions on campus, but women were less visible than men, and some reported being actively discouraged from pursuing prominent leadership positions. It also noted that women “consistently undersell themselves.”

In 2013, we published a CIRCLE Fact Sheet comparing the perspectives of college women and men that contribute to gender disparities in leadership, particularly political leadership (Kawashima-Ginsberg and Thomas 2013). We found that college women are less likely than their male peers to claim characteristics such as leadership ability, skill in public speaking, competitiveness, social skills, and popularity, all commonly named characteristics of political leaders (4). While in college, women’s perceptions of their own leadership skills slightly decrease, while men’s confidence increases (8) (see figure 1).

When they lose confidence and avoid leadership opportunities in college, women may suffer stereotype threat; they may believe that they do not deserve to enter leadership positions (Steele and Aronson 1995). For women who are members of other marginalized groups, these effects may be compounded by stereotype threat connected to their other marginalized identities.

By the time they consider politics, men are more likely than women to consider themselves “qualified to run” (35 percent of men compared with 22 percent of women). Among men and women who do not view themselves as qualified to run, 55 percent of men (versus 39 percent of women) nonetheless think about running (Fox and Lawless 2010, 9). Education is a gateway to a political career. Early socialization about stereotypes of girls and boys persists at the postsecondary level and affects how prepared women feel to pursue political careers.

**Good News: Changing Perspectives**

There are several reasons for cautious optimism: changing attitudes toward women in political office; evidence that, once nominated, women can succeed;
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Source: Figure adapted from Kawashima-Ginsberg and Thomas (2013); data drawn from Franke et al. (2010), 98.
and changing perspectives on effective leadership.

**Changing attitudes:** In 1937, 33 percent of poll respondents said they would vote for a well-qualified woman for president; by 2006, that number had reached 92 percent. Seventy-five percent of Americans say that women and men are equally capable political leaders (Pew Research Center 2015, 19). While studies show that bias favoring boys and men starts early and persists (e.g., Beane et al. 2014) the fact that Americans say they would support a female president is a good sign.

**An opening to the labyrinth:** State representatives, often the first elected position for both women and men, tend to be selected because they have experience in the community. Local leadership or activism or just good neighboring can provide women with a local profile to support their being elected.

**Likelihood of success:** Women may be less likely to be recruited or run for office (and to get the nomination), but once they become candidates, they are as likely as men to win primaries and general elections for state legislatures, governorships, and Congress (Eagly 2007, 7).

**Favorable ratings:** Once in elected positions, women are viewed favorably, albeit differently. According to the Pew Research Center (2015), women are seen as being better than men at working out compromises, being honest and ethical, standing for something despite political pressure, and being persuasive (22). In this era of political polarization and policy stand-offs, these are important leadership characteristics.

**Better leaders:** What constitutes “effective leadership” is evolving, and that evolution favors women. During most of the twentieth century, public opinion supported the idea of the individual as leader—a “transactional” model of leadership as top-down and hierarchical, with power and decision-making authority centralized (Dugan 2006, 217). In contrast, transformational leaders communicate the values and purpose of the organization or task, motivate by respecting their colleagues, reward positive outcomes, manifest optimism, and mentor and focus on the individual needs of their employees (Eagly 2007, 3).

The evolution from transactional to transformational leadership, however, is not accepted across industries, and politics is one field where transactional leadership has a stubborn hold. But that, too, may be changing. Over the past twenty years, deliberative democracy has been gaining traction, particularly at local levels (Leighninger 2006). In a deliberative democracy, governments invite public participation beyond voting, and everyday citizens actively engage issues through a process that invites and considers all, even unpopular, perspectives. This form of political engagement, like transformational leadership, plays to women’s strengths.

**What Higher Education Can Do**

Colleges and universities can take advantage of new knowledge and shifts in attitudes about what constitutes “good leadership” and prepare women for those roles. Some specific actions include:

1. Offer education and professional development for female and male faculty, staff, and students that deconstructs stereotypes. Everyone should understand the socializing agents at every stage of human development and their effect on how women and men view themselves as leaders.
2. Embed opportunities across campus for students to practice and faculty, administrators, and staff to model transformational, democratic leadership. Deliberative democracy can serve as a framework for student learning, classroom teaching methods, institutional decision making, and community-university partnerships (Thomas 2010).
3. Provide more students with opportunities to engage in simulations that use essential political skills. These include model United Nations, ethics bowls, debate teams, and dialogues across differences of ideology, social identity, and lived experiences.
4. Encourage staff and faculty to examine their own implicit biases, not only regarding women but across intersecting identity groups. This can be done through Project Implicit at Harvard University (https://implicit.harvard.edu/).
5. Conduct a version of the Princeton study (2011) to determine whether men receive more attention and encouragement than their female peers.
6. Provide women with information about how to access and navigate political systems so that they can find mentors and can make strategic choices that improve their chances for success.
7. Train women in the arts of campaigning. One promising two-day program, Rutgers University’s Ready to Run, covers the nuts and bolts of mounting a campaign, fundraising, staffing, navigating party structures, messaging, and mobilizing voters.
8. Teach political savvy. Existing structures, such as student government, clubs, and voter mobilization activities, provide practical leadership opportunities, which should be constructed to support deep learning. Campuses can also develop curricula and certificates in leadership, community organizing, and deliberative democracy.
9. Cultivate relationships with civic organizations that advance women candidates, and develop a network of people willing to serve as mentors and create opportunities for meaningful interaction between students.
and female politicians. Encourage internships with politicians and campaigns. 

10. Encourage political careers through the career services office. 

11. Apply these recommendations across all underserved populations. Women of color face even greater challenges of stereotyping, discrimination, and structural impediments to public office than white women do.

Conclusion

Stereotypes, discrimination, and structural barriers persist. Without consciously recognizing their views as discriminatory, Americans underrate women’s innate ability to lead while assuming that political leadership requires an innate ability. Both differential valuation of women’s innate ability and an assumption that political leadership requires particular traits and talents may explain why women are underrepresented as political leaders.

Based on several decades of research, we know a lot about how educational experiences at all levels affect girls and women. We understand the backgrounds and paths of women who pursue political offices, the obstacles they face, and the attitudes of Americans toward them. We know more than ever before about the factors that facilitate and impede their success while in office. And we have a better understanding of effective leadership more broadly, how leadership styles are evolving, and how that evolution might advantage women. This knowledge should be taught to all students, not just those with political aspirations, because awareness of the obstacles women face and understanding of implicit bias will move us toward a more equitable democracy.

Author’s note: We are seeking examples of campus leadership programs for women that have been assessed rigorously. Please contact Nancy Thomas (nancy.thomas@tufts.edu) if you have completed or are interested in collaborating on a study.
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Penny Proud, Lamia Beard, Ty Underwood, Yazmin Vash Payne, Taja DeJesus—all trans women of color, all killed since the beginning of 2015. As I think about these precious lives lost in violent acts of rage and hostility, I wonder how their deaths reverberate through our college and university campuses. For many trans women of color, just existing means that their lives are threatened: indeed, in 2013, more than half of all LGBT homicide victims were transgender women of color (National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs 2013).

On our campuses, the issues facing transgender and gender non-conforming (TGNC) students often get lost or conflated with issues related to LGBT or LGBTQ communities or students. Yet the experiences of TGNC students differ greatly from those of gay, lesbian, or bisexual students, and building capacity to support TGNC students looks very different from supporting students who are minoritized (i.e., marginalized due to a non-majority identity) based on their sexuality. Further, TGNC students of color are the least supported on our campuses despite being the most at risk. A focus on gender equity or gender justice on campus means creating support structures that intentionally take into account all aspects of these students’ identities.

Talking about Gender in 2015
For many years, the conversation about gender on college and university campuses was a conversation about women—often white and cisgender women. More recently, out trans women of color such as Laverne Cox and Janet Mock have questioned the construction of “woman” and what it means to be a woman. Further, women’s colleges are now struggling with what it means to be a women’s college, with many students, faculty, staff, and alumni advocating for trans-inclusive admissions policies.

Scholars such as Stryker (2008) and Wilchins (2004), along with transgender activists, continue to assert the difference between sex and gender. Gender identity—defined as a person’s internal sense of masculinity, femininity, both, or neither—may or may not correspond to one’s sex assignment at birth and physical sex characteristics (Wilchins 2004). Gender identity influences one’s gender expression: how one chooses to display or convey one’s gender through behavior or appearance. Gender identity and expression are further influenced and affected by one’s race, ethnicity, class, national origin, ability, sexual identity, and religious affiliation. Moreover, the practice of assigning a sex at birth based on perceived but often ambiguous physical markers, with a gender of masculinity or femininity simultaneously attached to the sex assignment, leaves little to no room for intersex people (Fausto-Sterling 2000).

With these definitions in mind, it is important to recognize that gender equity or gender justice in 2015 does not mean ensuring that “women” have equal access to the same opportunities as “men.” Instead, it requires a more dynamic understanding of gender, operating outside of traditional binaries while taking into account the multiple ways minoritized identities intersect and the institutional “isms” (racism, classism, ableism, etc.) that are barriers for many TGNC people, especially TGNC people of color.

Engaging TGNC Students
As we work to create more dynamic understandings of gender on our campuses, it is important to ask what we know about engaging TGNC students in their learning. In their study of student engagement on college campuses, Gonyea and Moore (2007) found that TGNC students who stated that they were “more out” were more likely to be active and collaborative in learning and to engage in enriching educational experiences (as defined by the National Survey of Student Engagement). Thus full engagement of TGNC students requires a campus climate that supports and encourages disclosure of one’s gender as a part of campus diversity.

And yet, in my own research, I found that TGNC students were less likely to be out than sexual minoritized students; that TGNC students who perceived higher levels of harassment on campus were less likely to be out; and that TGNC students who perceived higher levels of overall safety and classroom safety, as well as positive campus responses to harassment and discrimination, had greater odds of being out (di Bartolo 2013). To encourage disclosure, campuses must build capacity to support TGNC students, especially those with multiple minoritized identities.

Although institutional nondiscrimination policies that include gender identity and gender expression are imperative, they do not go far enough. Every aspect of academic and campus life should be reviewed for inclusiveness of TGNC students.

Creating a Gender-Just Environment
Student records systems should have an
option for students’ preferred names, which may differ from their legal names, and should allow class rosters that include these names as well as the pronouns students use. Although some TGNC students may have the resources and access to change their names legally, many do not, especially students of color, low-income students, and first-generation students. Records systems that have a preferred name option as well as a preferred name policy are especially important for these students.

Student health insurance should include coverage for medical transition, and campus mental health professionals should be trained to provide culturally sensitive counseling to TGNC students. TGNC students may experience depression and anxiety—not necessarily because of their transgender or gender nonconforming identities, but because they lack culturally appropriate support and encounter transphobia on campus and in the community. It is not the responsibility of our TGNC students, many of whom may be accessing mental health and medical resources for the first time, to teach their therapists about transgender issues.

For faculty, creating an inclusive classroom environment should be a proactive practice rather than a reactive one. For example, faculty can e-mail students before class begins, ask for their preferred names and pronouns, and change the roster accordingly. On the first day of class, faculty can ask students to introduce themselves with the names and pronouns they use, and they can repeat this exercise throughout the semester as students’ names and pronouns may have changed. Even if there are no TGNC students in class, this practice creates an environment of openness that catches students’ attention. Faculty should keep information on hand about resources and support for TGNC students. Finally, if they use the wrong name or pronoun, faculty should remember that everyone makes mistakes. Apologize, move on, and do better next time.

Residence halls, athletic and recreational facilities, career services offices, faith-based organizations, financial aid offices, fraternity and sorority housing, libraries, disability services offices, student unions, study abroad offices, cross-cultural centers, and community engagement centers should all be assessed for their inclusiveness of TGNC students, and should have policies and procedures for creating inclusive spaces. Importantly, we cannot assume that our LGBTQ Centers are inclusive spaces for TGNC students, especially TGNC students of color. Continued assessment of these spaces can move our campuses toward becoming more gender-just environments.

**Conclusion**

It is the responsibility of faculty, staff, and administrators to lead by example, proactively creating inclusive policies and practices instead of reacting when the first out transgender student arrives on campus. With intentions toward gender justice, our campuses can be places of inclusion where TGNC students can focus on thriving instead of just surviving. 🌍
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**Definitions**

**Gender**—the culturally specific presentation of masculinity or femininity—**involves**

- **Gender identity:** a person’s internal sense of masculinity, femininity, both, or neither, which may or may not be expressed outwardly and may or may not correspond to one’s physical sex characteristics and/or sex assignment at birth
- **Gender assignment:** a person’s gender designation at birth, correlated with sex assignment
- **Gender roles:** expectations imposed on someone based on their gender
- **Gender attribution:** how others perceive a person’s gender
- **Gender expression:** a person’s external presentation of their gender

In relation to gender, individuals may identify as one or none of the following:

- **Transgender:** a term used when an individual’s gender identity or expression differs from conventional expectations for their sex assigned at birth
- **Gender Non-Conforming (GNC) or Genderqueer:** a term generally referring to gender identities or expressions outside the gender binary
- **Cisgender:** a term for individuals whose gender identity aligns with their sex assigned at birth

—Adriana N. di Bartolo
The Power of Networks for STEM Women of Color Faculty

ALMA R. CLAYTON-PEDERSEN, senior scholar at the Association of American Colleges and Universities and chief executive officer of Emeritus Consulting Group, LLC

What are the best parts of your experience as a faculty member? Ask this question of a woman of color in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) disciplines, and her eyes will likely widen as she animatedly describes her research and how it addresses a problem she sees as important. She is apt to recount her delight in including her students in this research (as her first STEM mentor did for her). She might also discuss her success in increasing the number of students from underrepresented backgrounds who major in her discipline, and the evidence-based practices she has incorporated into her teaching to engage and empower her students.

What are the biggest challenges you face as a faculty member? Ask her this question and you will get a different reaction. She may worryingly talk about the challenge of being the only woman of color in her department, quoting the research on the disparately negative health outcomes for women in academe who look like her. She may remark that students seem to gravitate to her for assistance, which she provides generously while some of her male colleagues linger over their research and writing undisturbed. It seems a given that I will “take care” of our students, she may reveal, quickly adding that good advising is important if we are to increase the number of students of color in STEM fields.

She may then respond to your questions with one of her own: Why am I the only one, or one of just a few, who takes the time to provide our students this service? She may also be wondering silently, what consequences will my dedication to students have for my academic career?

Program Design

The faculty member in our opening vignette would be right to worry. It is well known that review, promotion, and tenure processes emphasize research over teaching and service. Although they fare better at underrepresented minority (URM) universities than at non-URM universities, women of color represent the lowest percentage of tenured and full professors across all sectors (Matchett 2013, 8); and these positions are the stepping stones to leadership. The chilly climate in academia for women, and particularly for STEM women of color (WOC) faculty who experience the “double bind” of being a woman and of being a person of color, has been well documented (Harvard Educational Review 2011). Knowing this, we must examine how cultural factors, including isolation as the only woman of color in a department and common assumptions about women of color faculty’s roles as student advisors, can inhibit these women’s rise to leadership roles in the academy.

The Preparing Critical Faculty for the Future (PCFF) program, conducted by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) and funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF), uses a combination of intervention strategies to address these challenges. In creating the program, we assumed that Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), which often have a critical mass of faculty members of color, would offer environments that support leadership advancement among STEM WOC faculty. We wanted to build on the strengths of those environments by creating opportunities for STEM WOC faculty at HBCUs to access robust networks—both of women like themselves, and of other faculty members and administrators committed to transforming undergraduate STEM education.

The first phase of PCFF, which ran from 2010 to 2015, consisted of professional development in leadership and pedagogy for seventy-two women—two from each of thirty-six HBCUs, divided into three cohorts. Each cohort participated in two symposia designed specifically for PCFF participants as well as in professional development activities embedded in AAC&U conferences and summer institutes. At the summer institutes, a five-person team from each participating institution (including the two STEM WOC faculty members, two other faculty or STEM support professionals, and a senior administrator) refined action plans for STEM curricular transformation. During and after their yearlong PCFF participation, the STEM WOC faculty led their institutional teams in executing these plans. PCFF’s second phase (running from 2012 to 2015) provides additional NSF resources to advance the most promising work of nine of these first-phase teams.

Strategies for Networking

The PCFF leadership team quickly learned that in order to lead transformational efforts in STEM, project participants needed more opportunities (1) to network with other STEM WOC faculty and (2) to connect with WOC leaders in STEM and other disciplines. We then increased support for program elements that included facilitated interactions (e.g., by supporting participants’
attendance at the STEM Women of Color Conclave, a two-day summit for STEM WOC).

At the two symposia, participants interacted one-on-one with other PCFF participants in their disciplines, attended presentations by and participated in small-group discussions with successful STEM WOC academic leaders (provosts, presidents, department chairs, and tenured or full professors), and engaged with WOC in other fields who had successfully addressed the challenges that WOC generally face in academe. In addition, between the symposia, participants engaged in webinars focused on a variety of topics such as personal successes and challenges.

Data collected on various program elements revealed networking to be among the most beneficial elements of participants’ involvement (see figure 1). While participants cited other lessons that were reflected in the content of program activities, they found the opportunities for open-ended dialogue particularly powerful. Seasoned STEM WOC faculty provided practical advice about managing time and resources, using technology, and urging institutional leadership to hold all faculty accountable for student success. Meanwhile, participants shared their similar experiences with their cohort colleagues and affirmed each other’s value as researchers who are also committed to ensuring that all students thrive.

**Lessons and Applications**

From participant feedback, we learned that although the climate for people of color is generally much warmer at HBCUs than at predominantly white institutions (PWIs), even at HBCUs, WOC faculty experience chillier climates in the STEM disciplines than in other disciplines. Many STEM WOC faculty experience these chilly climates in connection with being “the only one who looks like them” in a department, and their sense of isolation can be compounded by the expectation that they will act as the primary mentor for male and female students “like them.”

Given this reality, it is critical for educators at HBCUs and PWIs alike to disabuse themselves and their colleagues of the idea that women of color are the best or only advisors for students of color. Guiding all students toward success is a skill that white faculty and faculty of color must develop as the nation's campuses become more racially and ethnically diverse. Institutions can use a variety of strategies to make student success a shared responsibility, including teaching faculty to direct students to the appropriate campus resources for support with issues such as finances, psychological stress, family responsibilities, and academic strengthening when needed. Staff providing these resources must be culturally competent to ensure that students feel encouraged instead of demeaned for seeking assistance.

Robust networks of support for students of color in STEM would have the additional benefit of supporting WOC STEM faculty in their faculty roles. Imagine what our campuses would be like if institutions took steps to ensure that all faculty accepted responsibility for all students’ success. If that were the case, imagine how differently the STEM WOC faculty member in our opening vignette might respond to the questions we posed.

**Author’s note:** AAC&U is grateful to NSF for recognizing the need to support WOC faculty at HBCUs as key leaders in the work of transforming undergraduate STEM education for students underrepresented in these fields and others. Thanks are also due to Jennifer Blaney for her analysis of the qualitative data. For more about PCFF, watch for our monograph forthcoming from AAC&U in 2015.
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made such accommodations, with 42 percent of women and 37 percent of men reporting that their partner had left a job in service to their career. Thirteen percent of deans who are women had left a job in support of a partner’s career as compared with 7 percent of men who reported having done so.

Pathways to the Deanship
The average age at which the deans had earned their highest degrees was similar for men (30.4 years) and women (30.9 years). Overall, slightly more than half of respondents had earned degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields, although this was more often the case for men (56 percent) than for women (48 percent).

Male respondents were more likely to be employed at a doctoral or research institution than women (38 percent of men versus 20 percent of women), while women were overrepresented at master’s-granting institutions relative to men (68 percent of women versus 52 percent of men). The difference in representation at baccalaureate-granting institutions was smaller: 10 percent of male respondents and 12 percent of female respondents reported working at baccalaureate-granting institutions.

More than half of women respondents became dean in 2010 or later; the majority of men were initially named dean between 2005 and 2009. On average, respondents were first appointed dean about twenty years after earning their highest degrees (20.6 years for men and 19.6 years for women). The number of positions (title changes) did not vary significantly by gender (7.3 for women versus 7.5 for men), nor did the number of title changes predict the average number of years before becoming dean. Across genders, disciplinary background mattered: those from STEM disciplines took longer (21.0 years) to reach the position of dean than those from other disciplines (19.1 years).
Common wisdom suggests that in comparison to men, women more often take on administrative positions before achieving full professor rank, and that they consequently hit a glass ceiling at lower levels of academic administration (see, for example, Ward and Eddy 2013). But among respondents, fewer than 10 percent of either gender (9 percent of women and 6 percent of men) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “Looking back on my career path, I wish I had remained as a faculty member longer.” A gap between men and women did emerge in response to a second prompt: “I did not actively seek out my first academic administrative position.” Here, 73 percent of women agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, compared with 57 percent of men.

**Leadership Plans and Ambitions**

When asked to think about their next career step, the deans most commonly responded by indicating a desire to be provost or chief academic officer (with 37 percent of women and 39 percent of men citing this response). Thirty-seven percent of women and 41 percent of men indicated that they intended to remain at their current institution when taking that next step. However, women were much less likely than men to be willing to relocate geographically, with 59 percent of women and only 41 percent of men indicating agreement or strong agreement with the statement, “When thinking of my next career step, I am committed to staying in my current geographical location.”

When considering long-term career aspirations, another noticeable difference by gender emerged. The percentage of men and women articulating the desire to become a provost or chief academic officer over the long term was fairly similar: twenty-five percent of women and 22 percent of men. However, women were much less likely to conceive of themselves as a president at some time in the future. Only 13 percent of women anticipated becoming a president, compared with 30 percent of men.

**Discussion**

Our survey confirmed a discrepancy in proportion of representation, suggesting that the pipeline issue has not been resolved. There was surprisingly little difference among the deans as a whole demographically: they are largely white and overwhelmingly live with a partner and with children under eighteen.

Because the personal characteristics and career paths of respondents did not differ by gender as much as we had expected, it was difficult to draw conclusions about how different circumstances might affect progression to the deanship. At the same time, women are more likely than men to be single, and a larger percentage of women than men are parents, although fewer women than men have children under eighteen living at home. Further, that women reported being more likely to have partners who made career accommodations in support of the woman’s career and to have made accommodations themselves in support of a partner’s career hints at the resources they consequently hit a glass ceiling at lower levels of academic administration. They were more likely than men to have been recruited rather than to have volunteered. And they indicated less interest in ascending to the presidency than did men. Women deans seem also to be more place-

**Our survey confirmed a discrepancy in proportion of representation, suggesting that the pipeline issue has not been resolved.**

---
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Shifting Culture to End Campus Sexual Assault

As attention to campus sexual assault has grown in recent years, much of the groundwork necessary to create significant social and cultural change is already under way. Student activists, legislators, the White House, the Justice Department, and the press have created a climate of heightened awareness, pressuring and prompting colleges and universities to address sexual assault on campus. Collectively, members of our higher education communities must embrace this moment of awareness and combat campus sexual assault—holistically, comprehensively, and directly.

Working holistically, comprehensively, and directly, we can transform campus cultures that foster sexual violence against students into cultures where sexual assault is intolerable and unacceptable.

Sexual Assault and the Learning Environment

Sexual assault is devastating. It leaves young women and men who are brimming with talent reeling from its repercussions, rather than flourishing in an environment that supports their goals and dreams. Sexual assault changes lives and frequently denies students a safe environment in which to learn. A survivor might have to face his or her assailant in a small academic seminar, or might need to navigate the hurdles of reporting and moving through the adjudication process without proper emotional, psychological, or academic support. Survivors of sexual assault and rape are more likely to suffer anorexia, depression, and posttraumatic stress disorder and to abuse alcohol and drugs (Krug et al. 2002). Unsurprisingly, many survivors experience severe difficulty continuing on their academic and professional paths in the wake of an assault.

Sexual Assault is not new to campus life. But the focus is now on colleges and universities to address this public health challenge in ways that are pervasive across campus and that build equitable and inclusive learning environments. Colleges, with their tremendous intellectual capacity, are poised to shift campus cultures and imbue them with humanity and respect. College presidents can lead this change, calling on all stakeholders to participate in a shared effort to create campuses that are free from sexual assault and committed to educational equity.

Holistic Cultural Change

To accomplish holistic cultural change focused on sexual assault, college administrators need tangible, on-the-ground solutions that are adaptable to their particular contexts. At its core, cultural change requires commitment, time, and accountability. A framework for holistic cultural change should include six primary areas of focus:

1. Positive survivor support with options for reporting: To enact systemic cultural change on their campuses, colleges and universities should engage all constituents. Survivors need to feel safe to report an assault, and they need to be fully informed of the available reporting options: a survivor may choose to report to the police, to the school, to both, or to make a confidential or anonymous report. For survivors, disclosing sexual assault can be an intimidating, terrifying, and retraumatizing experience. All campus staff, particularly sexual misconduct staff, should be trained in responding to trauma and equipped to offer, in a nonjudgmental manner, emotional support as well as information about medical and mental health resources and academic, housing, or financial accommodations.

2. Clear policies on campus investigations, adjudications, and sanctions: Institutions need to examine all aspects of their sexual assault policies and procedures. In addition to engaging experienced, trained investigators, institutions should have and abide by clearly written, strongly worded sexual assault policies that are available to all campus constituents. Ideally, these policies will spell out an institution’s adjudication methods and clearly state the sanctions for those found to have violated school codes of conduct. Because serial offenders commit the majority of sexual assaults (Lisak and Miller 2002), schools also need to conduct broad investigations to identify evidence of other assaults committed by an accused student. Finally, policies should ensure that the investigative process is well documented, fair, thorough, and timely. Through such a comprehensive
approach, institutions can provide students with a just investigative process and reduce Title IX and Clery Act liability.

3. Robust, multiteried prevention education at all levels of the institution: It is important that prevention education occurs regularly throughout all four years of a student’s education, starting at orientation and continuing with consistent messaging and education until graduation. Bystander training is a promising approach to transforming social norms to make sexual assault intolerable within peer groups (Katz and Moore 2013). A student may receive bystander training from a social role model (such as a senior student athlete) during the first year, participate in an educational booster program in the sophomore year, receive training in prevention education as a junior, and become a trainer teaching incoming first-year students in the senior year. Ideally, students will receive reinforcing messages across all four years that sexual assault is not tolerated on campus. Additionally, faculty, staff, and key student leaders—from professors and coaches to resident advisors and fraternity presidents—should receive prevention education and training to reinforce these messages.

4. Public disclosure of sexual assault statistics and related information: Schools are required by federal law to report incidents of sexual assault, but sexual assault is vastly underreported by those who experience it (Kruttschnitt, Kalsbeek, and House 2014). Survivors may hesitate to report their experiences due to stigma, victim-blaming, a misunderstanding of sexual assault, and a lack of faith in the system to produce justice for sexual assault survivors. Institutional policy and practice is essential to creating an environment where students feel confident about reporting sexual assault. Institutions can strengthen data collection, gather more reliable statistics, and increase transparency by implementing (1) campus climate surveys, (2) regularly released campus assault reports, (3) comprehensive reporting practices, and (4) means of sending clear messages to parents and to the campus community.

5. School-wide mobilization in partnership with campus organizations and student leaders: Creating a campus that adopts and values a culture of respect requires involvement and support from all constituents. Students, survivors, athletes, campus leaders, the Greek community, the LGBTQ community, faculty, administrative staff, campus police, and other employees can work together to create and enforce a positive culture. Changing the culture to promote gender equality, reduce homophobia, and challenge practices that contribute to sexual violence is critical to reducing the incidence of sexual assault on campus. Students, faculty, and staff can together set norms that condemn sexual violence and promote a culture of respect. Institutions can promote school-wide mobilization against sexual assault by providing (1) visible, ideological, and financial support for student organizations engaged in sexual assault prevention and service provision, (2) a diverse range of sexual assault prevention programs, and (3) a defined leadership team for campus prevention and service provision that includes student leaders and faculty.

6. Ongoing self-assessment: Self-assessments provide crucial information as colleges and universities work to strengthen their responses to sexual assault. Institutions should engage in regular self-assessment using a variety of data sources to benchmark their progress and to identify gaps in programming and services.

Conclusion
The pursuit of an equitable and inclusive learning environment on college campuses will take focus, dedication, and time. Just as Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) reduced incidents of alcohol-related deaths through a multipronged approach involving education, policy, survivor support, and national dialogue (Fell and Voas 2006), so too can colleges eradicate campus sexual assault. Culture of Respect, a nonprofit organization focused on eradicating sexual assault on college campuses, is helping institutions work toward this goal.

Culture of Respect’s CORE (Culture of Respect Engagement) Blueprint, following the six-pillar strategy outlined above, is a roadmap to changing campus cultures. Culture of Respect is launching a pilot program to assess the outcomes of the CORE Blueprint and accompanying CORE Evaluation on college campuses. We are currently recruiting institutions of all kinds to participate in this program and encourage readers to contact atombroskorman@cultureofrespect.org for more information.

Working holistically, comprehensively, and directly, we can transform campus cultures that foster sexual violence against students into cultures where sexual assault is intolerable and unacceptable.
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According to the World Bank (International Bank 2011) and a host of other global development agencies, educating girls and women benefits not only them, but also their communities, societies, and nations. In 2015, every woman in the world lives in a region where she can legally participate in some form of higher education, and she can do so with men—either in a fully coeducational setting or on a gender-segregated campus that enrolls women and men. Yet women's colleges and universities worldwide continue to grow in number and enrollment. Although women's colleges are decreasing in number and remain small in size in North America, Western Europe, and Australia, they are growing in size and number in the Middle East and Central, South, and Southeast Asia (Renn 2014). In East Asia, several women's institutions are thriving with no sign of declining enrollments, and a handful of relatively new women's universities operate across Africa (Renn 2014). In a world where women are legally permitted to attend universities with men, why are there so many women's institutions? What do women's colleges and universities bring to national and international contexts for higher education?

In 2008, I began a research project to answer those and other questions. I relied initially on colleagues from Mount Holyoke and Smith Colleges for access to Women's Education Worldwide (WEW, www.womenseducationworldwide.org), an international organization of women's colleges and universities. I then conducted site visits at thirteen institutions in ten countries (Australia, Canada, China, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, South Korea, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom). I explain my sites and research methods in detail in Women's Colleges and Universities in a Global Context (Renn 2014). From interviews, focus groups, campus observations, and document analysis, I learned that women's colleges and universities around the world serve five main purposes in the early twenty-first century. They provide (1) access to higher education, (2) supportive campus climates, (3) leadership development, and (4) gender empowerment; and (5) they function as symbols within national systems of higher education.

Access
While women have legal access to mixed-gender education everywhere in the world, there remain a number of regions where religious and political extremists enforce their own values and prohibit coeducation or, in some cases, any education for women and girls. Terrorist attacks on individuals such as Malala Yousafzai in 2012 and on groups such as a busload of students from Pakistan's Sardar Bahadur Khan Women's University in 2013 offer extreme examples of hostility toward girls and women seeking education. Even in less extreme contexts, cultural, religious, and political resistance creates a practical need for women's educational institutions (Altbach 2004). In India, I met Muslim and Hindu students whose families would not have permitted them to attend college with men. Conservative Christian students in Kenya told me they could not have left their villages to study at a coeducational national university in Nairobi, but their parents consented to their attending a women's university. And some women in the United Arab Emirates had family wealth that would have supported their attending one of the mixed-gender international universities in their city, but their families sent them to the state-run women's institution. There are financial and academic arguments related to the role of women's colleges in providing access to higher education, but cultural reasons form the core of this case.

Campus Climate
In every country I studied, students and faculty described how the campus climate supported women's learning and development. Free from the constant gaze and criticism of men, students thrived across the curriculum, in fields...
traditional for women in their societies (e.g., education, nursing, arts and humanities) and nontraditional (e.g., business, science, engineering). Male and female faculty told stories of sexual harassment and discrimination they witnessed or experienced in mixed-gender graduate programs, and were proud to offer a welcoming educational environment for women. Students described stepping up and speaking out in courses, sports, and cocurricular contexts in ways that felt they would not if men were also present. In Australia, where I studied a women’s residential college within a larger mixed-gender university, students described their college as buffering them from a social climate that was hostile to women in the wake of sexual assault allegations against members of the neighboring men’s college. Women’s institutions maintain campus climates that support student learning and development.

Leadership Development

Worldwide, women’s colleges and universities function as engines for student—and institutional—leadership development. Students know the names and stories of alumnae who made or are making a difference in the world, and they know that their alma mater expects the same of them. A few students I interviewed felt daunted by the responsibility, but most felt that their institutions were preparing them to take leadership in civic and professional life. Formal leadership programming, combined with the reality that, as one student said, “we can’t just wait around for a man to take charge,” creates an ideal context for developing women as leaders. A study of student leaders at WEW member institutions (Renn and Lytle 2010) indicated that in nations where coeducation is the norm, many students choose women’s colleges in part because they know that they will have these opportunities. In addition, in every nation I visited, the majority of faculty and institutional leaders in higher education (presidents, chancellors, rectors, principals) were men—but only one of the women’s institutions I studied had a male leader. Women’s colleges and universities provide key opportunities for female academics to strive toward senior leadership roles in higher education.

Gender Empowerment

Women’s colleges and universities play a role in gender empowerment on campus, locally, and nationally. They sensitize students to consider gender inequality and serve as hubs for political and social organizing and events (e.g., speakers, book launches). The Canadian women’s college in my study hosts its city’s women’s center. Students in India planned a Take Back the Night March for International Women’s Day. In South Korea, Japan, India, and China, women’s centers or programs within these institutions are intellectual hubs for academics working on gender issues nationally and internationally. Like the other roles women’s colleges play, gender empowerment occurs within local contexts; a faculty member in Japan spoke of the balance her institution was attempting to strike among empowering women, advancing STEM education, and honoring tradition.

Symbols

While performing the other four roles described here, women’s colleges and universities also serve as symbols within their national systems of education and in society more broadly. Where coeducation is the overwhelming norm (Australia, Canada, China, Italy, Kenya, United Kingdom) they cause the observer to ask why, in the face of this norm, they continue to exist. The answers draw attention to what is often lacking in women’s experiences in coeducation: positive campus climate, optimal leadership development, gender empowerment. Where gender-segregated education is somewhat to substantially more common (India, Japan, South Korea, United Arab Emirates), women’s institutions symbolize access and opportunity. Wherever they are, women’s colleges and universities play a symbolic, countercultural role that points to the purposes of education and the need for gender equity in educational outcomes.

Looking Ahead

My study creates an international portrait of women’s colleges and universities in the early twenty-first century. In the last fifty years, substantial shifts have occurred in women’s rights and gender equity around the world, with consequent shifts in the landscape of women’s higher education. If these shifts continue, it is possible that in fifty years women’s institutions will play a much smaller role in providing access to higher education. But I predict that it will take much longer for coeducational institutions to offer equitable environments for women’s learning and development, and that the other roles that women’s colleges and universities play will remain vital.
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In 2002, my colleague Irene Beck and I established the Women and Gender Research Initiative to promote community-based programs and research that help prevent and address gender-related oppressions. Housed in the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies at DePaul University, the initiative became the Beck Research Initiative for Women, Gender, and Community (BRI) in 2010 to reflect the ongoing vision and support of the William and Irene Beck Charitable Trust as well as an expanded mission focused on encouraging full engagement of community members, faculty, and students in community-based projects that affect social change through policy, advocacy, and community development.

In 2004 with Heather Flett, a longtime domestic violence professional and advocate in the Chicago community, is Take Back the Halls: Ending Violence in Relationships and Schools (TBTH).

Addressing Relationship Violence
Designed to prevent relationship violence among teens, TBTH incorporates service-learning and research components for both high school and college students. It gives teens the opportunity to examine issues such as domestic violence, sexual assault, sexual harassment, and sexual abuse, as well as the variety of social structures and inequalities that shape violence in different contexts. It creates a space for high school students to talk about issues affecting their lives, generate ways to raise public awareness, speak out against violence, and advocate for change in their schools and communities. In short, TBTH aims to empower teens—as well as the college students with whom they work—to become community leaders and active participants in the movement to end violence.

Heather Flett and I created this university-community collaboration to address an epidemic of youth relationship violence. Research suggests that dating violence is common and widespread among adolescents, experienced by between 9 percent and 46 percent of teenagers (Johnson et al. 2005). Moreover, a study by the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation (2001) found that 81 percent of high school youth reported sexual harassment from peers. As noted in that report, studies on sexual victimization have indicated that 15 to 20 percent of high school females reported experiencing forced sexual activity.

These interpersonal violence issues also are prevalent on college campuses, making a community-based service-learning program engaging high school and college students particularly productive. Indeed, public awareness of sexual violence at colleges and universities was brought into sharp focus recently with the release of Not Alone: The First Report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (White House Task Force 2014). In this political climate, with many college campuses grappling with what have now been identified as inadequate institutional responses, a community-based service-learning program such as TBTH has particular relevance (Catlett and Proweller, forthcoming).

Advancing Learning for Social Justice
TBTH is based on best practices for dating violence prevention programs. High school student participants from three urban high schools meet weekly.
throughout the school year to examine a range of questions and create activist and advocacy projects related to relationship violence. These meetings are facilitated by specially trained staff as well as university student interns enrolled in an interdisciplinary service-learning seminar, Women’s and Gender Studies (WGS) 387: Teen Violence Prevention. All students in this course participate in TBTH.

Based in feminist pedagogical principles, TBTH provides a structured opportunity for students to thoroughly ground themselves in social justice work. Through WGS 387, students collaboratively explore youth perspectives on violence and consider the ways in which economic, social, political, and cultural contexts influence violence in adolescents’ lives. Situated within a critical framing of service learning in conjunction with feminist theory and pedagogy, course content provides structured opportunities for students to critically reflect on their own social locations and to understand how power differentials operate in their relationships with urban high school youth.

Research that we have conducted on college student intern experiences in TBTH points to the program’s potential for creating an effective context “for students to reflect on the complex relationship[s] among service learning, power, and privilege, and to see themselves engaged” in transformative community-engaged work (Catlett and Proweller 2011, 34). Furthermore, our most recent research suggests that critical interrogation of structures of power has the potential to be “existentially disturbing” (Butin 2010, 20) for college students, disrupting how they understand themselves in relationship to others. This experience, we argue, is necessary in order for students to identify and challenge the foundational aspects of systemic inequalities, thereby creating opportunities for them to consider and advance social justice (Catlett and Proweller, forthcoming).

Looking Forward
We are committed to a process of gradual and deliberate growth focused on the BRI’s founding mission and vision of community-based work that is integrated into course curricula in meaningful and intentional ways. For example, our Service Learning and Internship Program (SLIP), launched by the BRI and the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies in the 2010–11 academic year, builds “long-term partnerships with both feminist-informed community organizations and other DePaul University departments and programs in order to produce multidisciplinary, multcourse, and multiyear projects that serve our students and community partners” (BRI 2015b). SLIP is designed to help students integrate theory and praxis, engage in the work of social justice, and develop practical experience that is essential to the learning process as they prepare for careers after graduation. While pursuing work like this, we remain mindful of our goal to create a vibrant community of scholars, including faculty, students, and community partners, that reaches across disciplines to advance scholarship that centers the needs and perspectives of the communities with which we collaborate.

We remain mindful of our goal to create a vibrant community of scholars, including faculty, students, and community partners, that reaches across disciplines to advance scholarship that centers the needs and perspectives of the communities with which we collaborate.  

For more information about the Beck Research Initiative and its service-learning projects, visit http://beckresearch.org/.
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By claiming agency and voice, first with one another and then in the larger context of our institutions, we could open up new democratic spaces that lead to political and social alliances aimed at creating more inclusive colleges and universities.
We can disrupt the behavioral codes and bridge the structural divides that segregate women from one another—discovering, among other things, what pressing issues each of us face as working women, where our issues differ, and where they cut across rank and level.

New Bonds of Freedom
Some might argue that breaking ranks and telling stories are only small gestures that affect too few individuals on campus. But the Global Fund for Women invests its funds in just this kind of work: funding small groups of women, believing that these groups can effect transformative change in their societies. The Global Fund for Women’s theory of change moves across the axes of the individual and the systemic, the informal and the formal (Global Fund for Women 2015). If higher education could be influenced by similar groups of multiracial, multicultural women who have broken ranks in order to enact shared goals, it might be more ready to be the institutional citizen that its local, national, and global communities need—and deserve.
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Issues of Concern across Ranks
By breaking ranks and telling our stories, we can disrupt the behavioral codes and bridge the structural divides that segregate women from one another—discovering, among other things, what pressing issues each of us face as working women, where our issues differ, and where they cut across rank and level. Issues related to sexual harassment, pay inequities, parental leave, child care, elder care, and advancement are likely to be shared by all, if experienced with particularity. But some issues will be localized. While most faculty have a senate for collective governance, most staff have nothing comparable, unless they are unionized. And some gender-driven policies might not be equally applied: for example, parental leave policies that apply to faculty but not to staff.

It is exciting to think that the rebellious women on campus who dare to join ranks by defying their bounds might be able to invent or reinvent formal structures to accord women power and make sure all women’s voices are heard. Women’s commissions like Penn State’s are one such structure that, at their best, include representation across sectors. Alliances between women across dividing lines will allow us to begin working for each other’s issues: to ensure more expansive pathways for staff to earn GEDs and take college courses; to increase the wages of clerical, service, and maintenance staff; to support a slate of women in elections for important union positions.

Breaking ranks to address these issues would require beginning in small ways, in modest clusters, to step over the trip wires designed to keep us fearful about crossing boundaries. We could start by telling our own stories. How did we come to do what we are doing? How does that differ from what our mothers did? What kind of work did we do before being employed at this campus? What else do we wish we were doing or might do next? What do we hope for the next generation of girls and women?

Breaking ranks and exchanging stories will not be easy. It will mean working through mistrust, unease, and power differentials; it will require careful listening, especially by those with markers of greater rank, whatever those might be. But as we build alliances that quietly evolve over time, we can begin to conspire to make changes so that every woman (indeed, every person) working at our institutions is flourishing. As bell hooks asserts, “inclusive ways of knowing and living offer us the only true way to emancipate ourselves from the divisions that limit our minds and imaginations” (1994).

We are a faculty aware of how few women faculty there were, but shocked—and then deeply embarrassed—to discover, as data accumulated, that most employees at my institution were women. They were working in different but still prescribed ways and with even less power and influence, fewer perks and protective policies, and definitely less income than my faculty colleagues. These women were handing me food in the cafeteria line, working as departmental secretaries, and mopping the floors I walked on each day, but their numerical dominance escaped me. I had already learned to see only my own kind. It kept all of us less empowered.
NEW PUBLICATION

America’s Unmet Promise: The Imperative for Equity in Higher Education

By Keith Witham, Lindsey E. Malcom-Piqueux, Alicia C. Dowd, and Estela Mara Bensimon

Released as part of AAC&U’s Centennial, America’s Unmet Promise: The Imperative for Equity in Higher Education makes the case for the urgent need to expand access to and success in high-quality educational programs for students traditionally underserved in higher education. It addresses students’ access and success in terms of traditional measures like college completion as well as important indicators of educational opportunity like participation in high-impact practices.

The authors present an equity-minded guiding framework that can be used throughout higher education. They suggest principles for evaluating equity and advancing institutional change, with a specific focus on improving outcomes for students affected by stratification in educational opportunity by race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. This publication is an excellent resource for launching conversations among educational leaders and practitioners about diversity, equity, and institutional change. To order, visit https://secure.aacu.org/store/.

AAC&U Resources on Women and Gender in Higher Education

On Campus with Women Archives

From 1971 to 2013, AAC&U’s periodical publication On Campus with Women (OCWW) provided readers with up-to-date information on women in higher education, with a focus on women’s leadership, the campus climate, curriculum and pedagogy, and new research and data on women’s participation in higher education. Sponsored by AAC&U’s Program on the Status and Education of Women, OCWW was published in print until fall 2002 and in an exclusively online format after that date. Archives are available online at www.ocww.org.

A Measure of Equity: Women’s Progress in Higher Education

Published in 2008, A Measure of Equity: Women’s Progress in Higher Education documents areas of progress and identifies needed action to move even further down the path toward equity for women in higher education. This publication details specific areas of concern and actions that would advance gender equity in colleges and universities. The research examines women’s access to college, areas of study in undergraduate and postgraduate work, and women’s status as faculty, administrators, and college presidents. To order, visit https://secure.aacu.org/store/.

Educational Outcomes for Men of Color

AAC&U has published materials over the years on the particular challenges facing young men of color in higher education. These include analysis by Ronald Williams and Adriana Flores-Ragade on “The Educational Crisis Facing Young Men of Color” (published in Diversity & Democracy) and articles within a special issue of On Campus with Women on “A ‘Boys’ Crisis’?: Who Is Really Missing?” To access these materials, visit www.aacu.org.

Peer Review Issue on Gender Equity in STEM

The spring 2014 issue of the AAC&U quarterly Peer Review focuses on the topic of Gender Equity in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). The issue explores current trends in higher education related to recruiting, retaining, and advancing STEM women and women of color faculty. Articles advance the research knowledge base and emphasize institutional exemplars of STEM gender equity. To read articles or purchase print copies, visit www.aacu.org/peerreview/.

AAC&U’s Kelly Mack Honored by Diverse: Issues in Higher Education

AAC&U Vice President for Undergraduate STEM Education and Executive Director of Project Kaleidoscope Kelly Mack has been recognized as one of the “Top Twenty-Five Women in Higher Education” selected from across the nation by Diverse: Issues in Higher Education. AAC&U’s Board of Directors and Staff congratulate Kelly on this honor. We thank Kelly for her leadership and commitment to advancing STEM learning, liberal education, and inclusive excellence in American higher education.
## Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement Calendar

The following calendar features events on civic learning sponsored by members of the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Action Network and others. For more information, please visit AAC&U’s CLDE Calendar online at [http://www.aacu.org/clde/calendar/](http://www.aacu.org/clde/calendar/).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>CLDE MEMBER EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>4–6</td>
<td>American Democracy Project / The Democracy Commitment / NASPA Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement Meeting</td>
<td>New Orleans, Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7–11</td>
<td>2015 AAC&amp;U / Aspen Institute – Wye Deans’ Seminar on “Citizenship in the American and Global Polity”</td>
<td>Queenstown, Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10–13</td>
<td>Bonner Foundation – 25th Bonner Program Anniversary Celebration and 2015 Summer Leadership Institute</td>
<td>Davidson, North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13–15</td>
<td>Interfaith Youth Core – Interfaith Leadership Institute</td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25–27</td>
<td>Frontiers of Democracy 2015</td>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>18–24</td>
<td>AAC&amp;U/Aspen Institute – Wye Faculty Seminar on “Citizenship in the American and Global Polity”</td>
<td>Queenstown, Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>7–9</td>
<td>Interfaith Youth Core – Interfaith Leadership Institute</td>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>27–30</td>
<td>Engagement Scholarship Consortium – 16th Annual Preconference and Conference</td>
<td>University Park, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>Imagining America National Conference</td>
<td>Baltimore, Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8–10</td>
<td>AAC&amp;U Global Learning in College Conference</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale, Florida</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## AAC&U and the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Action Network

As part of its commitment to preparing all students for civic, ethical, and social responsibility in US and global contexts, AAC&U has formed the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Action Network. The CLDE Action Network builds on the momentum generated by the 2012 White House release of the report *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy’s Future*. Coordinated by Caryn McTighe Musil, AAC&U senior scholar and director of civic learning and democracy initiatives, the network includes thirteen leading civic learning organizations that are committed to making civic inquiry and engagement expected rather than elective for all college students. *Diversity & Democracy* regularly features research and exemplary practices developed and advanced by these partner organizations and their members:

- American Association of State Colleges and Universities
- Anchor Institutions Task Force
- Association of American Colleges and Universities
- The Bonner Foundation
- Bringing Theory to Practice
- Campus Compact
- Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement
- The Democracy Commitment
- Imagining America
- The Interfaith Youth Core
- Kettering Foundation
- NASPA–Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education
- New England Resource Center for Higher Education

---
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Upcoming AAC&U Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network for Academic Renewal Global Learning in College</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale, Florida</td>
<td>OCTOBER 8–10, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About Diversity & Democracy

Diversity & Democracy supports higher education faculty and leaders as they design and implement programs that advance civic learning and democratic engagement, global learning, and engagement with diversity to prepare students for socially responsible action in today’s interdependent but unequal world. According to AAC&U’s Statement on Liberal Learning, “By its nature…liberal learning is global and pluralistic. It embraces the diversity of ideas and experiences that characterize the social, natural, and intellectual world. To acknowledge such diversity in all its forms is both an intellectual commitment and a social responsibility, for nothing less will equip us to understand our world and to pursue fruitful lives.” Diversity & Democracy features evidence, research, and exemplary practices to assist practitioners in creating learning opportunities that realize this vision. To access Diversity & Democracy online, visit www.aacu.org/diversitydemocracy/.

About AAC&U

AAC&U is the leading national association concerned with the quality, vitality, and public standing of undergraduate liberal education. Its members are committed to extending the advantages of a liberal education to all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Founded in 1915, AAC&U now comprises more than 1,300 member institutions—including accredited public and private colleges, community colleges, and universities of every type and size. AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitator, forging links among presidents, administrators, and faculty members who are engaged in institutional and curricular planning. Information about AAC&U membership, programs, and publications can be found at www.aacu.org.

AAC&U Membership 2015

- MASTERS: 31%
- BACCALAUREATE: 24%
- ASSOCIATES: 12%
- RES & DOC: 17%
- OTHER*: 16%

*Specialized schools, state systems and agencies, and international affiliates