

Committee Members:

Nancy DeMore, Chair (Surgery)
Bernard Burk (Law)
Maxine Eichner (Law)
Beth Jordan (Psychology)
Kris Patterson (Medicine)
Christine Stachowicz (Univ Library)
Margot Stein (Dent Ecol)
Jane Thraillkill (English)
Brent Wissick (Music)

Anne Whisnant (Faculty Governance, *supporting the committee*)

Charge: “The committee addresses ongoing concerns of women faculty members, identifies obstacles to achievement and maintenance of equality in the representation and status of women on the faculty, and proposes steps for overcoming these obstacles” (Faculty Code, § 4-22).

Report of Activities: For the 2012-2013 academic year, the committee collected pilot data from representative schools across UNC-Chapel Hill. The purpose of this effort is to show whether or not there are gender associated discrepancies in tenure status, academic rank, or academic leadership roles at UNC. This study showed in most units there are substantial discrepancies in academic rank and tenure status between men and women. The Faculty Council approved Resolution 2013-9 On Monitoring the Status of Women in Leadership Positions. The resolution is stated below:

The Faculty Council resolves:

The Provost is requested to monitor the distribution of women compared to men in leadership positions, including tenure status, academic rank, and any other data deemed pertinent by the Provost and Dean as part of the five-year review of academic deans. When discrepancies in leadership positions held by women are identified, the Provost is requested to direct the dean under review to develop an action plan and timeline to remedy the situation, and to report progress in implementing the plan at least annually.

The dean of College of Arts and Sciences, the dean of the Graduate School, the dean of the Summer School, and the deans of the several professional schools are requested to monitor the distribution of women compared to men in leadership positions in their respective units, including tenure status and academic rank, as part of the periodic review of department chairs, division heads, section chiefs, and other principal officers of academic administration. When discrepancies in leadership positions held by women compared to men are identified, the deans are requested to direct the officer of administration under review to develop an action plan and timeline to remedy the situation, and to report progress in implementing the plan at least annually.

The initial goal of COSOW for 2013-2014 was to discuss with University leaders how this resolution could be implemented. However, the United States Supreme Court has issued decisions forbidding racial quotas and some kinds of racial preferences in state university admissions, which may limit the extent to or manner in which gender may be considered in state university hiring and promotion. Therefore, the committee sought to engage women in leadership positions across UNC to discuss other strategies that could promote women in leadership.

Given that there was overwhelming support from the faculty council for resolution 2013-9, we discussed what parts of the resolution could be brought into effect that did not include the "action plan and timeline to remedy" piece of the resolution, implementation of which may raise legal uncertainties. The reporting piece of the resolution would still be a significant step in making gaps more apparent and processes for promotion more transparent. Hiring and promotion information reported on an annual basis and published on either the Provost's site or some other venue such as

Institutional Research and Assessment, Academic Personnel or Faculty Governance could go a long way in communicating faculty priorities to administrators and the public. It would show that while we have a long way to go, gender-based equality of opportunity is a university priority. Our plan is to discuss implementation of this reporting requirement with the new University leadership before the end of the academic year, and to request university resources to assist the Committee in understanding any legal limitations on remedial plans