Report of the 2002-2004 Gender Equity Committee on
Junior Faculty in the School of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences
Jean Jackson
Sally Haslanger
December, 2007

CONFIDENTIAL

Introduction

The major task chosen by the 2002-2004 SHASS Gender Equity Committee was to look into SHASS junior faculty experiences, a project that complemented the previous SHASS Gender Equity Committee's investigation into the experiences of SHASS senior faculty women. Their Report, based on interviews of all SHASS senior faculty women (thirty) and fifteen male "comparables,"[1] was published in February 2002. One of its several recommendations was to investigate systematically SHASS junior faculty experiences and opinions. A Draft Report on the study of junior faculty women was discussed at SHASS School Council on May 21, 2004. At that time several interviews had not been conducted and others had not been fully transcribed. Jackson received the last transcript in January, 2005. She is deeply sorry this final Report has been so extensively delayed, and hopes that its information and recommendations will still be of benefit.

The members of the SHASS Gender Equity committee of 2002-2003 were Sally Haslanger (Philosophy), Associate Provost for the Arts Alan Brody (Music and Theater Arts), and Nancy Rose (Economics). During the fall we discussed what kind of projects we wanted to do. After looking into constructing a website with information on promotion and tenure we decided against it, as much of that information was being posted on the SHASS Dean's Office website. Interviewing junior faculty seemed much more important. We debated the best criteria to use for drawing a sample of junior faculty and what questions to ask. We practiced interviewing. In the spring we held two lunches, one for female and one for male junior faculty to hear about their concerns and receive any input they might offer about the interview project. We began interviewing in the spring of 2003.

At the end of spring term Nancy resigned and Donca Steriade (Linguistics) was invited to join. At the end of the summer Alan resigned. It seemed to then-chair Jackson that asking another faculty member to join was not the best way to go, given the time it takes to train people to conduct interviews. Because members of the previous SHASS Gender Equity committee (1999-2002) were seasoned interviewers, we decided to ask them to help out. We are extremely grateful for the invaluable service rendered by Donca Steriade, Deborah Fitzgerald, Suzanne Flynn, Diana Henderson, Anne McCants, and Ruth Perry. We also greatly appreciate the work done by Marsha Orent, staff assistant.

Also in spring term 2004 we met with the SHASS Equal Opportunity Committee to compare notes.

---

[1] Departmental colleagues identified by the women as comparable to them with respect to stage of career.

Designing the Protocol

In our discussions in the fall of 2002 we decided to ask broad, open-ended questions, thereby signaling to interviewees that we were interested in the junior faculty experience in general, rather than just gender-related issues. Our reasons for doing this were three. First, interviews of SHASS senior faculty had shown that they saw their gender-related issues to be embedded in the larger context of their discipline and how it fitted into SHASS and the Institute as a whole. We felt that junior faculty would probably see gender-related issues in similar fashion. Second, we wanted to avoid the appearance of a narrow, "for women only" project, especially given the demographics (thirty-one junior men, nine women). Most particularly we did not want interviewees to think they had to respond in a certain "gender equity" way, which ran the risk of our being given answers they thought we wanted to hear rather than candid ones.[2] And third, we wanted as many junior faculty as possible to identify with the project of making SHASS and MIT an optimal environment for junior faculty, which meant paying attention to *any* issues that concerned them.

Our lunches with junior faculty made us more confident that broad-based, open ended questions would yield the best results.

We also wanted to hear from a group we termed "gap" faculty: four men and four women who had been junior faculty when senior SHASS faculty were being interviewed, but who had been tenured in the meantime.

The junior faculty protocol is appended. The "gap" faculty protocol is very similar.

Drawing the Sample

The strategy employed by the previous Gender Equity committee for choosing interviewees did not seem appropriate for us because there were only nine junior females in the entire School, and not all of these would be able to provide a male "comparable" in their department. We obviously wanted to interview all the junior women, but choosing a sample of men and being able to justify our selection criteria proved impossible. We decided to shoot for interviewing all junior faculty, knowing that some would turn us down, and a random subset would not be interviewed for other reasons (e.g., on leave).

As noted above, we believed that interviewing as many junior and "gap" faculty as possible would itself serve as a consciousness-raiser, for the questions would encourage faculty to ponder issues they might not have otherwise been thinking about. Also, more interviewees would mean more interest in the final Report. Subsequent comments from interviewees indicate that they did, indeed, become more interested in the issues as a result of the lunches and interviews.

Interviewing Procedures

---

[2] An illustration is an interviewee's comment that a colleague had told him—hopefully jokingly—that he (the colleague) had "failed" his Gender Equity interview.

We interviewed in teams of two until April 2004, and then interviewed singly to save time. All but four interviewees agreed to be taped. We began the interviews with the following statement:

_____

> The tapes will be transcribed by a professional transcriber with no connections to MIT. The interview team and the transcriber will be the only ones with access to the tapes. The tapes will be destroyed after they have been transcribed. The transcription will be sent to the interviewee for editing. At this time the interviewee may add to, change or delete anything they want. The transcription will not contain the interviewee's name. We understand that the interviewee might be recognizable even with the name deleted; however, only the interviewee and the team will see the transcripts. The team will summarize the transcript, removing any information that could reveal an individual's identity (unless interviewee gives permission to distribute the transcript to the entire committee). The final Report will contain no material that might reveal an interviewee's identity.

> The topics we will cover include how you came to MIT, what your experiences have been as a junior faculty member, your opinions about your department, SHASS, and the Institute as a whole, and your situation with respect to balancing family responsibilities with career.

_____

This information was also included in the general "invitation to be interviewed" sent to all junior faculty.

The interview questions were made available ahead of time to any who requested them.

The findings reported below are based on transcripts from 12 interviews I participated in, notes from 6 interviews I participated in, and 15 transcripts from interviews conducted by other interviewers.

Readers need to be reminded that these interviews represent what interviewees said to us. We cannot conclude that the transcripts accurately reflect what people actually think. Nor are interviewees' accounts of events necessarily accurate descriptions of what actually transpired.

Findings

Note: because "junior faculty member" appears so often, it has been shortened to "jfm."

I have provided lots of quotes because they give a good idea of the diversity of the jfm experience, because reading quote after quote on an issue hammers the problem home to the reader, and simply because the variety of voices makes for a more interesting text than paraphrasing and summarizing them.

Reactions to being interviewed

All interviewees who made comments said they appreciated the project:

- A number of interviewees (mostly female, but not all) mentioned that they had read the earlier SHASS Gender Equity Report and had found it useful. For example: "the MIT Report on women helped me a great deal because I actually felt they were a set of common experiences you could see, because they were on paper….may be a good [way] to actually contribute to some kind of awareness."

Interviewees also provided evidence that the process of being interviewed provoked thinking about these matters:

- Comments were made to the effect that interviewees hoped what they had to say would help. Here is a reaction to the questions about mentoring: "Maybe I should start showing [my mentor] more of my stuff. I mean, he saw the manuscript. There are other things that have been written since then. Maybe I should try to get him more involved."

- Several interviewees mentioned that they had taken a while to decide whether or not to be interviewed. One said she had questioned the potential effect of the project: "I wasn't sure that speaking up would make that much of a difference."

- And one said "I do feel some sense of disloyalty," because she was criticizing some aspects of a department that had worked hard to ensure she had a positive experience.

Of course we do not know the thoughts of non-responders, individuals on leave or who had left MIT, and the one faculty member who told us he did not want to be interviewed.

Early experiences as junior faculty at MIT

Most interviewees reported being very warmly welcomed by their departments:

- Several commented favorably on the "unpretentious," relatively egalitarian ethos in their departments as compared to their graduate experience.

- One spoke about the "pecking order" at his previous university: "…actually it can be quite debilitating. It really promotes a kind of timidity…At MIT there wasn't a lot of huffing and puffing."

A number of interviewees reported a sense of isolation, in particular during their first year:

- An extreme example: "In the first year I was just very lonely and feeling, 'Oh, this place is horrible. Why would anyone have taken a job here?'"

- One jfm usefully explained the feeling of isolation as not due to failures on the part of the department, but to the structural change in their status: "the transition from graduate school to junior faculty can be very isolating. When you go from being in a big group with peers your own age, to being one of a small number in a group of people who are in a great range of places in their careers…and sometimes you're the *only* person who does what you do."

Department

We received a wide range of comments about departmental practices and cultures.

Most departments were described as warm and friendly:

- "[Colleagues] are very nice…people aren't deceptive or say one thing and do another…So I give a lot of credit to my colleagues for making life very livable…supportive and open."

- Another said there was "less of a culture" of colleagues asking questions simply to demonstrate their knowledge and intelligence, than had been the case in graduate school.

- Another commented: "I don't have to watch my back, I don't have to kowtow." A "gap" interviewee said his department was "very egalitarian…there's no sense of "Well, you're just junior faculty and…so I'm going to bully you."

- A number of jfms commented that they had the impression that "senior faculty are really pulling for the junior faculty," that there was "an enormous amount of support and good will."

- A "gap" interviewee said she actually was experiencing more conflicts with colleagues as a young senior faculty than she had as a junior faculty member.

- One interviewee approvingly said that in his department, except for promotion and tenure there was no real division between the senior and juniors, "as far as administrative burdens go or social life or teaching or anything like that."

- Some interviewees mentioned protection from departmental squabbles: "we were shielded from unpleasantness…I was never forced to take a stand on something that was going to cause me trouble." And, "there's some tensions between some of the faculty, but they are opaque to me…and it's fine, I don't have to choose sides yet."

Overall, flexible departmental policies regarding teaching assignments—what and when— received high marks (but see "Gender" section below):

- Many commented on the relative freedom they had with respect to their research: "my department didn't care what I did with my research as long as it was good quality, and strong, and recognized." And, "the main signals I'm getting, this is a research institution, so they just want to see me publish the best stuff I can."

- Many interviewees were grateful they were protected from being "overburdened" with regard to committee work. A "gap" interviewee said he had been shocked at the amount of administrative work he was assigned once he was tenured.

Some interviewees reported a feeling of social distance in their department:

- "We're somewhat fragmented. Not fractious in any way, but just a fragmented sort of place and everyone kind of does their own thing…people work with their office doors closed, which is the absolute opposite of my previous experience [at another university]."

- Another commented about the same department: "everyone feels like they're doing it on their own. Which is not necessarily a bad thing. This is a place that rewards entrepreneurship, including intellectual."

- Here is a third member of that department:
  We don't have a graduate program…and so what that means is there is very little sense of a collective enterprise…and that's both good and bad…What's good about it is you have more time to go do your own work and publishing…[a colleague in another department] said, "It seems like you're your own sort of little think tank over there." And I thought that was a good characterization of what we are. We really have a lot of freedom.

And a few interviewees complained about exaggerated social expectations:

One jfm complained that the expectation that they all be members of a family resulted in his colleagues being too nosy about one another's personal lives: "The faculty here in my section are very invasive. They like to say 'Oh, we want our department to be seen as a family.' And I was like, 'You're not my brothers and sisters or my parents.' So the first two years were hard for me." He reported being told several times during his first three years that he was "uncollegial."

Many interviewees commented about problematic aspects of being junior:

- "You are not entirely allowed to forget that you are junior faculty."   The same individual goes on to speculate that some of it might be:
  …paranoia cooked up by me and the other junior faculty.…Tenurability…in lots of cases seems to take the form of a kind of well-meaning anxiety on behalf of the junior faculty member, a desire to see them do well, and the fear that they won't because we are, after all, in a certain sense their charges…In another, more personal and dark sense, it can take the form of a kind of challenge to your standing.

- A number of interviewees spoke tentatively and somewhat ambivalently about their impressions of senior colleagues' interest in their research: "…[T]he cliché of 'MIT is a praise-free zone'…I don't know if anyone would ever say as much [i.e., praise his work]. But I think they notice. I don't know, most of them, I think, notice."

- Another ambivalent jfm: "Which doesn't mean that I think my work isn't taken seriously, even if they don't understand what it's about, or if they don't read it."

Several interviewees criticized the unequal distribution of tasks in their departments. For example, with respect to advising and committee service, "there are some people who are on twenty or thirty committees and there are some people who have been on none for several years." Another jfm complained about his top-heavy department with "enough senior members of the department who just don't, to my mind, seem to be contributing things in any discernible way." It was frustrating when they were "obstructionist" in meetings.

- Disputes among senior faculty sometimes involved their junior colleagues: "…some kind of schism opening up there…[it's] the only dissonance that I've noted…I felt a little bit like I was being pulled from one side to the other."

- Another member of that department: "I don't feel any sense of security here."

- About another department: "…I've been made aware that there are tensions in the department and I don't know how deep-cutting they are."

- And: "What it sometimes feels like is a score to be settled from twenty-five years ago and someone feels they are owed something and I have no idea what's going on…[it's] not one person, it's like two or three like that." It was "disheartening" he said, especially given that he was teaching an overload graduate workshop "out of the kindness of my heart." He had ideas for enhancing the graduate program that he could not get put on the departmental meeting agenda, "and yet we get these crazy, calcified kinds of factionalism."

  - One interviewee felt that during a search characterized by serious disagreements among senior faculty, one senior faculty member "engaged in borderline bad behavior in trying to recruit juniors to the cause." He said he and his junior colleagues felt they had to say something about the candidate, but what they said "was just so guarded, and so much 'on the other hand…'" that they misrepresented themselves.

  A number of interviewees complained about poorly run departments:

  One complaint had to do with extra work for them: "[I was given]…students who had problems, dirty work dropped in my lap that other senior faculty didn't want to do. So I had to play the heavy on things that were not…my responsibility, especially not the level I was at, my 2nd year."

  - The head of another jfm's department had insisted that he serve on a search committee while he was on leave, even though he had said "no" twice. He also commented, "I pretty much know who makes the decision, I just am not given the full rationale…a fact of life, the chair has this power."

  - Several reported having seriously considered leaving at some point because of departmental problems

Complaints about colleagues' inappropriate behavior were relatively few:

- "The absence of a graduate program makes junior faculty into graduate students. Every once in a while I feel just a little bit condescended to. But that's rare." And: "There was one senior faculty…who put me in my place before I even started, when I was hired, in a way that was both dishonest and inappropriate." This jfm witnessed junior colleagues being treated the same way, but the behavior was limited to this one senior male faculty member.

Faculty meetings

Many more interviewees than not said their opinions were taken seriously during faculty meetings, and the majority was pleased with the tone of meetings:

- "They're not pissing contests. We can argue without it being divisive. A couple of times new people have gotten too argumentative."

- Several jfms said they appreciated being asked to participate fully in hiring decisions.

However, interviewees also raised concerns about the role of jfms in decision making:

- Here is a "gap" faculty member's sensitive analysis of junior faculty's liminal status during faculty meetings:

  …schizophrenic…junior faculty are encouraged to participate. Yes they're protected, senior faculty are careful. But junior people might feel burdened by informal expectations. In faculty meetings, you don't want to be a wallflower, you need to participate. But the message is, don't get delusional about your place here. Don't get overly comfortable—but not uncomfortable either. It's a thin line, mostly successful, not always.

  This individual commented that on search committees, "the junior/senior lines break down, and junior faculty sometimes are not sure how to behave." And that it took her several years to "understand the subtext that's often present during meetings. Lots of these [interaction histories] date back to well before I came." She said she had learned how to recognize when such interactions were happening.

- A male jfm in this same department spoke at length about how the atmosphere "could be better…opportunities are missed to more…pro-actively structure the environment for interaction." His analysis focused on the ethic of egalitarianism in the department. People did not like to acknowledge hierarchy, and intellectual egalitarianism "is a nice value. But the reality is that's not the way it works," and that a very deep hierarchy produces people in the lower half who are "extremely vulnerable…junior faculty don't really have information." Jfms worry about decisions made about them "behind closed doors." And given that it was "not a level playing field," not an atmosphere where ideas could circulate freely, a "laissez-faire kind of situation" simply meant that "those who speak loudest get heard," and traditionally, "that kind of thing's been associated with men, that kind of male thing." In these "mandatory but totally unstructured…lunches…the junior faculty…feel uncomfortable. We sit there and wonder, 'well, what are we supposed to be doing here? What's really the point?' And there are risks for us." He described these big meetings as "unhealthy," something junior faculty are "dragged to." Small group interactions were healthy, he said, and formal large meetings were fine, and although "it sounds juvenile," meetings needed to be structured, in particular the "more aggressive participants…managed better." Other interviewees from this department made similar comments, for example, "some of the junior faculty have responded by not attending."

- One jfm spoke at length about how the tension and fractionalization in his department negatively impacted jfms' experiences. Decisions about hiring and graduate admissions could become quite politicized. One time he was told explicitly "you shouldn't stick your neck out here, because you're junior."

- Another jfm said she simply "felt afraid" in departmental meetings.

- Another jfm said that although there was give-and-take at department meetings, because "chairs have prerogatives" a lot of decisions were not voted on.

Funding and Incentives

All interviewees appreciated the amount of internal funding available for research and teaching:

- "But MIT is just so off the charts in terms of the pots of money and the places you can go to find things." And, "…financial support that made it possible to bring in people to speak…" And, "There are incentives for research, a lot of encouragement to go out there and…think big things and ask good questions and so forth. I wouldn't go so far as to say [they say] to take risks, because I think there aren't incentives to take risks."

- Many jfms commented favorably on being able to take two years' leave before coming up for tenure. The dean was often described as "extremely supportive" in this regard: "He's always been straight with me. He hasn't always given me what I wanted, but that's OK, I don't mind being told 'no.' I just don't want to feel bad about asking." Here is another: "I have applied to the SHASS fund a couple of times, so in fact I almost worry about being too fat and happy."

Two negative issues often came up with respect to internal funding: inadequate information and inadequate equity:

- A jfm felt that discretionary money should automatically be given to all entering junior faculty.

- Another spoke of "a sort of perpetual state of confusion about these various…grants," and recommended that an easily understood master list be posted on the Web.

- Several spoke somewhat resentfully of "pots" or "honeypots" they had heard about for housing and the like, and felt that allotment was not fair.

- A jfm criticized the way the department head apportioned funds: "No, I don't know how it works…very mysterious…he has a budget and then people get a certain amount of research money…a very opaque process…for sure you have differences in the amount of research money [jfms] receive."

- A jfm commented: "So maybe one of the things that could be done in new faculty orientation…mention that there is this pot of money out there for people to go to conferences [or a] quick research trip." He said he had not learned about this funding until his third year.

- Several jfms acknowledged that they had not applied for funds as often as they probably should have.

Administrative Officers (AOs) play an important role in managing opportunities for jfms:

- Here is every jfm's dream of an AO:
  And so right from the start I knew about every fund…that a lot of people, it turned out, didn't, hadn't heard about. And I was given access to previous years. I did the SHASS research fund, and our AO asked around and she got copies of proposals of previous members of the department who had done it and I got to read their proposals. And the same with outside grants that I've been doing, the AO has gone through the Development Office's [grant proposals]… to find sample proposals to clarify, things like that."

- Another jfm mentioned her "wonderful, amazing AO…there is not a deadline she will let you miss."

- A woman jfm commented that it would be preferable to have someone in the department who is in charge of grants and incentives. AOs perform this function in some departments, and reports on their competence in this respect ranged widely.

The vast majority of interviewees said that there was adequate information about availability of incentives. Yet disparities remain:

- Comments were made about only some faculty having learned how to "work" the incentive system—what one interviewee referred to as "street smarts" about obtaining support.

- Some had attended workshops that taught grantsmanship and tactics, while others seemed far less informed.

- One jfm complained that the named chairs went to the jfms whose fields closely matched those of senior faculty.

Salary

Although we did not have a question about salaries, several jfms both within and outside of Humanities units volunteered that they did not feel well compensated:

- "I was shocked at how low the salary was!" Several jfms complained about not knowing that they could attempt to negotiate salary or other benefits when they were offered the job.

- Many jfms strongly complained that the only way to get a salary raise is to get a job offer: "the dean said in a junior faculty meeting, 'well the way to get a salary increase is to get an offer.' He said it very blithely. 'If you're looking for an increase because you do good work, you're not going to get it.'"

- Another commented:
  …that's a very difficult situation to be in for all of us because you have to have this sort of aggressive energy. You have to actually spend time nurturing and developing an offer that you probably don't want. In my case, I don't want to leave! But I also need to make more money, if it's possible, to be in some sort of parity with colleagues in other institutions, and also because my family has some needs…

- And:
  I feel like I'm under pressure to go cultivate and pursue an outside offer in order to get the terms that I want, to [be able to] stay here. And that's not how it should be because I don't really want to work anywhere else. And I don't want to pretend that I want to. But I feel like if I don't do that…That's one of the very few things about the environment that I don't like. I haven't done that yet, but I will, and it's not good for MIT and it's not good for me to have to do that.

- And:
  …I find quite outrageous…that the way people's salaries are determined is affected by the extent to which they apply for other jobs or get other offers. Which is a really

horrible way for the system to work…it encourages people to do things that are very bad for them, very bad for their field…ethically somewhat problematic…to get their friends to work on their behalf without really being interested in a job.

- A "gap" faculty member of a top-ranked department:
  …unless I had an outside offer to present. And that's difficult for me because I don't think that I could realistically pursue an offer in good faith…I don't know how these things work, whether I could sort of finagle an offer where everybody knows it's not real…[I would] look for an offer from people that I have relationships with. I don't think I should sort of manipulate them. That just doesn't seem right.

SHASS Dean's Office

With respect to overall support of jfms, the dean and the dean's office received high praise from some and a few complaints from others:

- "They've been great. Great. Systematically great"; "…definitely kicks ass for me, a pro-humanities dean"; "It's quite incredible that every jfm knows the dean and vice versa."

- Here is a "gap" faculty comment: "In some ways it's clear what [the dean] wants. Things that will reflect well on the school make the dean happy. A simple equation; I can work with that." He added: "The dean has been very helpful and very supportive and I've gone out of my way to maintain a relationship with him—which is another piece of advice I give to my junior colleagues, you know? Make an appointment with the dean at least once a term and just go see him. He'll always see you, and think up a reason if you have to, but you don't really need one. So that he knows what you are doing."

- However, one "gap" interviewee resented the dean's telling his department head that parental leave could not be given a second time. He said he might leave, "not because I don't love it here but mainly because I'm not at all comfortable with the commitment of the administration to the department…it's like squeezing water out of a stone to get the administration to take seriously our staffing needs." This individual did subsequently leave.

Teaching and Students

Interviewees expressed a wide range of opinions about teaching at MIT. All said they cared a great deal about teaching:

- Many saw the relatively small class sizes in SHASS to be a definite plus. However, one jfm said that it would be fun to have one very large class. He added that his junior colleagues "are happy to have the most minimal teaching burden they possibly can…[they] don't share my goal of being a rock star."

- Here is a Humanities jfm: "[I told myself], 'Well, stop worrying about what the rest of the Institute thinks about you, because you've got these tremendous resources'…the classes are not large and yet they are filled with these wonderful, brilliant students and that's really enjoyable. I like teaching here."

- Most interviewees praised MIT students: "Wonderful, brilliant students"; "Magical teaching experiences"; "Undergraduates are great, they don't need any pushing"; "Shy,

but never arrogant or insulting. I enjoy myself"; "It's one of the best things about being at MIT"; "I really love teaching the students in ways that surprise me, keep surprising me."

- And:

  Best students imaginable. They have taught me tremendously. They are hard-working and proactive in terms of the learning process. They're totally smart but they don't know that, so it's always refreshing to be in class with them. They never feel they have to say something smart, they just say whatever is on their mind.

- Several jfms commented that they liked the challenge of teaching MIT undergrads; here is one:

  …I came to MIT to find students that were very, very comfortable solving problems in technical and scientific fields, but who were not very comfortable interpreting texts. And that meant I had to…try to figure out ways to reach out to them. So that meant coming up with courses that would appeal to the students, that would make it possible for them to bridge that gap…finding strategies and essentially to make reference to things that were familiar to them in order to make more familiar texts that were very remote to them, culturally and chronologically.

- An artist described the challenge in another way: "comparing MIT to [his previous university], here I'd have to *earn* every one of my students."

- Praise for graduate students was also high: "…exciting, I am very involved, I run lots of things…Grad students talk to junior faculty a lot, they feel more comfortable with them."

Interviewees also expressed complaints about teaching conditions:

- One jfm complained about the "systematic differences in teaching loads across MIT." His colleagues in a non-SHASS department "are just astounded that I teach two courses, let alone all the extra advising. They have 1-1 loads and often it's leading one recitation section." These colleagues, he added, did not have labs.

- Complaints about teaching MIT students were predictable: "[They] need to learn how to write"; "Students seem deranged with work"; "Students have seriously messed up issues with diversity"; "…punctuality. I tell them to set their alarm clocks, they say they can't do that"; "Students are obsessed with not being wrong"; "Students seem to go mentally ill more often here."

- One jfm spoke at length about this last issue: "This is important. MIT undergraduates have a level of craziness that is unusual…a higher percentage of people who seem like they might just lose it at any moment. And I have never received any institutional guidance on my role in dealing with troubled students…there appears to be no policy."

Advising loads seem to vary among departments with respect to senior-junior ratios:

- Interviewees from several departments complained about the "enormous variation" in advising loads, in particular the number of graduate advisees. One "gap" fm complained about this inequality, that department faculty who were roughly 35-40 years old did 80% of grad advising, plus more work in admissions. Advising is rewarding in itself, he said, but the department's failure to adequately recognize it is not fair.

- A jfm said that of course senior faculty do more advising because their letters of recommendation carry more weight "than a junior guy."

- In addition to appeal of research area, faculty members' popularity is a factor: "…there are people who are very good at working with students, and…people who are not very good…And the students figure that out." One "gap" fm felt that large amounts of time spent with graduate students should be recognized more than it is.

A number of interviewees compared the incentives for research and teaching and found the latter deficient:

- Here is one jfm:
  In terms of teaching, I don't think that there are incentives to do anything except get large numbers of students…I don't think any of those incentives are actual, I think there's just a sort of wish that classes have lots of people. But in practice, the incentives aren't really there…I don't have any sense that if I worked harder on my teaching it would be rewarded in any way, other than my own satisfaction.

- And:
  I do think that the incentive structure for faculty pulls you away from the classroom in a very significant way. And maybe…the classroom part of the teaching is not something that seems very well attended to. I can see how, when it comes to deciding how you choose to spend your time in any given day, you make this little series of choices and those choices don't push you into lots of meetings with students; they don't push you into those kinds of things.

- An interesting comment indirectly makes the same point: "I really like the teaching. So it's a welcome and dangerous respite…dangerous in the sense that if I had my druthers, I could spend more time on it."

- A "gap" interviewee thought that, as good departments tend to focus on their graduate programs, "little perks" would increase the likelihood of faculty enhancing and improving their undergraduate teaching, such as summer funding to "design cool stuff" for a course, or giving a course reduction after a faculty member had taught two freshman seminars (as overloads).

- Another: "I've gotten hundreds of thousands of dollars in [internal and external] research funds, never gotten any money for [good] teaching."

- And: "So I got promoted because my work has had an impact in the field. It hasn't mattered at all, as far as I can tell, that I've had an impact on some students." This jfm had had a "wacky" idea of including in a tenure dossier, in place of one paper, "a detailed description of a course" he had been teaching for several years that would include "…very detailed descriptions of what works and what doesn't, why the stuff that works does work…in order to make the course at least somewhat portable."

- Another: "there's no incentive to invest in teaching and no reward for being a good teacher, institutionally." He suggested putting aside funds, "a series of awards, $1,000, $2,000…for getting the highest evaluations in the department…available for small research trips or going to conferences." He added, "because even though you know that you still won't be rewarded for it in the tenure decision, at least along the way you are

being patted on the back." He knew about teaching awards, but saw them as much more limited than funds awarded for research. (He did not know about MacVicar awards.)

Departmental attitudes toward teaching

A significant number of interviewees expressed disappointment at what they saw to be lax or indifferent attitudes toward teaching among senior faculty and administration:

- One jfm complained that in his department "people don't really talk about their teaching with any excitement, they see it as a chore. They swap stories about how they cut corners. And it's quite rare actually to find a colleague who talks with enthusiasm about the class that they just had."

- A "gap" interviewee commented disapprovingly that when he was considering coming to MIT, a senior faculty member had told him to always "make sure you get at least twenty-five students in your undergraduate class because then you'll automatically get a TA and you won't have to grade any papers." This senior colleague "hadn't graded a paper for twenty years…So there was that kind of attitude."

- One male jfm spoke at length:
  I don't think in terms of either the department or Institute as a whole, in spite of all the rhetoric to the contrary, that anybody cares about teaching at the undergraduate level all that much…Nobody has ever gotten tenure because they're a good teacher. And it seems pretty clear to me that you can be a crappy teacher but a great researcher and get tenure promotion. But if you're the opposite, you're out of here. MIT is about research. And in the humanities it's about how you make engineers and scientists understand the kinds of rewards that one might get for one's research…I don't think, when push comes to shove, anybody who makes a decision about me at MIT cares all that much about teaching.

- One jfm was advised by her AO not to teach a HASS-D. "I found out later that she didn't want to have to deal with any paperwork."

- Another jfm complained that her AO had wanted to keep her from cross-listing her course with a department outside of SHASS. In addition, "they wanted to dissuade me from teaching CI courses, because they know that it would take more work, it added to the bureaucracy of the department."

Course evaluations

More complaints about departmental attitudes and practices:

- A male jfm said:

  I'm frequently told "evaluations don't matter," in direct and indirect ways, that's the message that I get. What I heard in my very first [job] interviews where they said, the chair at the time I was interviewing for the position was sort of explaining how promotions work and so forth and said, "You know, we look at your teaching evaluations, but you know, everyone is a good teacher." And those two sentences were the sum total of discussion of teaching. And not everyone is a good teacher.

- Another jfm: "…maybe once a year…a senior colleague would come sit in on a class and draft up some sort of report which I never saw…Usually what would happen is there would be a discussion on the way back from the class and that would be all I'd hear about it…I actually care a great deal about teaching."

- One "gap" interviewee complained that his classes were visited only twice. He received very helpful comments both times, and added, "there's a wealth of talent…that could be usefully shared, but it's not. Nobody has ever brought up the prospect of establishing some procedure where we occasionally sit in on each other's classes and compare notes."

- Some jfms never get to see their teaching evaluations: "I was surprised, really surprised, I never saw the evaluations myself, but [the dean] wrote me a letter about my teaching. I thought it was kind of weird that I didn't get to see the evaluations, but he thought that they were excellent, and he was very supportive." This male jfm was disturbed that a colleague who left because it was clear he was not going to be tenured had had no help with a difficult large introductory class he taught every year.

Mentoring

Interviewees agreed that mentoring was important, but had different ideas as to what this might mean. Our questions "what should a mentor do?" and "what should a mentor not do?" elicited an outpouring of responses. A few jfms had basically positive reports to make about their promotion and tenure experiences, but many more had negative comments about the process, and a number of interviewees who had had a positive experience themselves criticized the way a junior colleague's case had been handled.

Interviewees were mostly in favor of regular mentoring:

- "…people maybe should be assigned [a mentor] really, just to make sure that everybody gets some [mentoring]."

- And: "[M]entoring could be done by a panel of faculty, it could be done by the chair or it could be done by putting it in writing in the offer letter…a million ways you could convey this kind of information to the junior faculty…[it's so crucial] that I would use every opportunity in the [jfm's] first two years to convey exactly this information."

- A number of interviewees liked the idea of someone in another SHASS department serving in a kind of mentoring function. One benefit would be "to interact with faculty members from outside your particular section…there are so few opportunities." Another benefit would simply be a greater likelihood of the jfm having complete information.

- Several jfms recommended that a certain amount of redundancy be built into the system: "Really smart, it's just more information."

- One jfm thought that a formal mentor would mean someone "obligated to be neutral in your promotion and review, [so] it could actually take away an ally."

There were striking differences across SHASS in the kind and quality of mentoring available, and in what interviewees wanted:

- Departments with a history of failed attempts to tenure jfms have particularly high levels of anxiety: "[The bad track record of the department] makes you think, 'Well, is

somebody going to pull the floor out from under my feet?' So you just do as much as you can, as best you can."

- One jfm said that he had no official mentor and "maybe there should be," but he felt he could "approach any member of the department and ask them if I had some problem." He felt that this would be the ideal situation, rather than designating a senior faculty member "who might not be the best person to give advice."

- Another jfm in that same department said that he did not have a mentor, and graduate students do not have advisors; all faculty mentor younger scholars. "That's the way our department works, and it could be good or bad for people...It wouldn't make any sense to have a mentor."

- One jfm was told by a colleague that in addition to publishing as much as she could of high quality, she needed to have more of a strategy: "And I don't know if there are other games that I should be playing. If I should be already trying to curry the favor of other people who might write for me when my dossier goes out?" She continued: "…so, in an ideal world [the mentor] would be going to conferences and setting up panels, putting me on the panel with him, and introducing me to people who later on would be able to comment on my work. That hasn't happened."

- Another jfm said that mentors need to describe "the basic nuts and bolts of reviews and promotion procedures," and give other kinds of advice—for example, he now realized that could have sent his book proposal out earlier, rather than wait until he had most of his revised book draft done. He also learned that "it seems that it's OK to multiply submit [a book ms.] as long as you're up front. So I learned those things the hard way."

- Another said he could have used "a bit better mentoring" in how to self-promote and get invited to give talks at different universities.

Several interviewees reported cases of grossly inadequate mentoring:

- Cases were reported of mistakes made by department heads when advising junior faculty about when they would come up for tenure. One jfm complained that it had only been in March of her third year that she was told "'Oh, you'll need to submit your materials in April.'" She had been expecting to submit them at the end of summer for a fall review.

- In one case lawyers had been consulted regarding "what the dean called 'a glitch,'" which had been put in writing. They had advised that there was a strong case for litigation, but the jfm decided not to go that route. Not only this jfm, but several other interviewees complained about the serious negative consequences of these mistakes.

- One "gap" interviewee, otherwise enthusiastic about his department, said that formal mentoring consisted of a senior faculty member visiting a class when jfms are up for either awot (Associate Professor without Tenure) promotion or tenure ("because the Institute, I gather, demands it"). There was no yearly meeting between the head and each jfm, nor other structured opportunity for junior faculty to present their work. In fact, jfms had formed a reading group and mentored one another.

- Here is a minority jfm: "A more formal designation of mentoring relationships would be important," and would make the process "less unequal and less discretionary. Just like in corporate America, blacks and women often do not succeed because no one has taken

them along, schooled them on both substantive work, company politics, on how the game is played. And without that advice, it is almost impossible to gain admission to the club, which is run by others…it shouldn't be up to the neophyte to find that help."

Intellectual mentor

Interviewees who responded negatively to the idea of an official, assigned mentor were thinking about intellectual mentoring. They expressed fears that the requisite "biochemistry," or "natural affinity" might be absent.

Most interviewees liked the idea of an administrative, official mentor, normally the department head, helping the jfms institutionally, and another colleague serving as the intellectual mentor:

- One jfm commented that the intellectual mentor should act as a "complement to, and if necessary a counterpoint to the words of the chair…So that the chair is speaking institutionally and on behalf of the dean…the mentor represents the department in a different way than the chair."

- A number of jfms commented on difficulties finding intellectual mentors within a department. One defined a "real intellectual mentor" as "somebody whose own research agenda had a stake in my succeeding professionally…there's no one [here] who thinks the quality of his own research is intimately connected with my being here."

What should a mentor do?

The specific questions about what should a mentor do and not do elicited very thoughtful responses:

- A jfm said, "They should provide all the information that there is about the process," which, he said, included helping the jfm find allies "in departments outside your own," because although many jfms know they need allies within their departments, they do not know that "you really need to be out there working with other sections."

- Another jfm, who subsequently did not get tenure, said he "definitely could use a mentor who made deadlines for me…I just keep going down other tangents. [My book] keeps getting richer but it's not getting longer."

- One jfm said a mentor should provide advice on publishing and on "handling the stress associated with a process over which you have almost no control, which is totally opaque to you." He also appreciated his informal mentor's introducing him to the mentor's network.

- A "gap" fm mentioned "hand holding…provide the kind of private space in which you can bounce off concerns…some sense of professional direction…also, probably some sense of reality—breaking oneself of the automatic habit of always seeing issues through one's own ego." Another "gap" interviewee, who was enthusiastic about his department, including the tenure and promotion process, felt that "senior faculty—I guess that would be me now"—need to mentor their junior colleagues much more than they were doing. That although the senior faculty were very supportive, saying to their jfms that they were

hired with the expectation of tenure, not all jfms, in fact, *are* tenured, and "[senior faculty] have some obligation…to help that process along."

- A male jfm in a department that has no regular schedule of mentoring or meeting with junior faculty suggested, "…that there would be a structure in place whereby [you]…meet with the chair, meet with a mentor, and meet with another senior faculty member, either at the same time or separately, to talk about where you are at the end of the first year [and] second year…ways in which you could strengthen your case at that early stage."

- One "gap" fm said that one's mentor should read "everything you write and advise you about when and where to send it out." A jfm commented about needing "to have someone to bounce new ideas off of," who would "force" the jfm "to reduce attention to teaching in order to be able to send the work out, [and also] provide advice about professional matters."

- Many fms recommended greater interaction between mentor and jfm: "I believe, like every two months the mentor and the mentee should have lunch."

- And: "…some way to make sure that the mentor does his job. Because [if not], what do I do? Do I go to my chair and make [my mentor] my enemy?...So some set of simple guidelines for what a mentor should do. Like *n* lunches per year."

- A similar comment: "I have one mentor. And he's really hard to talk to actually…every time if I see him for four minutes he says, 'OK, I have to go.'" When we asked whether he could change mentors the response was, "I'm not sure the next mentor is going to be much better, and…I know for sure the mentor with whom I am now will be offended."

In general the complaints we heard focused on inadequate mentoring. Recommendations focused on ways to nudge senior faculty to take mentoring more seriously:

- For example, "[I]n a certain sense…the mentor has to…impose him- or herself on the [jfm], because the [jfm] is kind of clueless for several years in the beginning…it's not enough to just say "I'm here for you if you need me…giving the kind of informal information [the head cannot provide]."

- Another jfm appreciated that her mentor evaluated a class and gave her a copy of the evaluation.

What should a mentor not do?

We have seen that for the most part fms spoke about sins of omission when answering this question. But there were other kinds of complaints: one jfm said that while he appreciated his very proactive mentor, he resented his trying "to turn my case into something else." Another said he would not like "too much meddling in a research process, but I guess that's common sense."

<u>Promotion and Tenure</u>

Not surprisingly, this is the topic that elicited the most negative comments overall, some of them rather sweeping. One "gap" fm said that even his senior colleagues saw the process as "monstrous." (Note that a certain amount of overlap with the previous topic is unavoidable.)

- One jfm favored abolishing tenure, saying he did not see its value. It was not needed for protecting academic freedom because "we have orderly recourse through the judicial system…replacing [tenure] with a five-year contract with the presumption of rehire would make much more sense…it would allow you to address, say, gender issues or racial diversity issues without having to do it all on the front end."

Most complaints were about inadequate information:

- Many interviewees indicated that they had been made aware that the top priority is research: "One thing I was grateful for…priorities are clear. I was told in no uncertain terms when I was hired, 'It's the research that's important.' That's a quote, OK? Which is good."

- But other aspects of the process were "opaque," "mysterious": "I don't know the whole mysterious MIT process." One minority "gap" fm had attended several workshops on the tenure process at another institution. He considered himself "very fortunate," he had learned "really valuable stuff," because otherwise "I would have been up a creek." He shared as much as he could with other junior faculty, "because I know that other people have had much harder times and gotten much less information."

- Another: "[t]here's just such mystique surrounding the promotion process and so little information."

- Another: "…even small bits of information" are surrounded "with a mystique that is maybe unreal." This jfm's colleagues "are fair people and well-intentioned, but it does have a feeling…of the institutionalized hazing process."

- A jfm spoke of "stress" between the head and jfms: "…I feel [the tenure process] is veiled with this real opacity and a scrupulous attention to protecting information. Information I'm not supposed to get actually gets to me. And so it's that feeling where I feel it's all draped in a kind of mystique."

- A jfm going through the tenure process wondered if anybody "ever sits down with a [jfm] and says, 'OK, …here's the procedure that you're going to go through, and here's who is going to be involved.' I don't think that was ever done. I was given the booklet…you get the forms, you read the forms. But once the process begins, I think there is just tremendous opacity."

- Another: "Basically what I was told [was] "you give us your materials and you will not hear anything until you hear either yes or no at the end of the process."

- A "gap" fm described a very bitter colleague who did not receive tenure and was "angry at the lack of information he got from the senior faculty."

Interviewees also raised the issue of transparency:

- "I could wish that it was a more transparent process to be sure…the issue of the second book is a gray area." And: "Well, I don't know how transparent…in the promotion process I was asked for a list of names…and then I got some feedback that said I should write more or, rather, publish what I write. Is that transparent? I don't know what to compare it to."

- A jfm spoke about a colleague turned down for tenure at the department level: "and it was quite a shock…to him and to the graduate students, and to his fellow junior colleagues, because he had an impressive publication record…The problem was something about the content."

- Several also complained about how prolonged and "dragged out" the process is. Here's a "gap" interviewee: "…on the level of structure of the place itself is that once you enter it, you enter this kind of silent zone, right? You have no sense of how it's going, when it's gotten through various committees…you're in kind of a vacuum for these 5-6 months….the worst part of the process."

Promotion to Associate Professor Without Tenure (awot)

- One jfm commented "The mid-term review process is kind of difficult…because it's pretty intense. It's basically like coming up for tenure twice, that process…I've never heard of any other school [with this system]."

- A jfm talked about his awot promotion, saying his case was "by no means unique":
  …could have been handled a little better…a series of miscommunications, messages didn't quite get through…[I asked] what was a dossier expected to contain and by what date?...[I was told one thing], which is what I'd been told four times before that. So two weeks before May 7th a different senior colleague said, "Oh no, no. What you've been told repeatedly by the chair is false." [They needed] the whole manuscript seven weeks earlier than I had been told.

- Here is a "gap" fm comment about the letter from the department head following awot promotion:
  You get a letter from the head…but it's incredibly diluted. I remember from mine, it was just generally encouraging but in such a bland and uninformative way that it was virtually useless. And again, the faculty are somehow…it's not "timid" exactly, but sort of reticent to alter the social dynamics in an uncomfortable way and say, "These are the issues that came up in the promotion case…where you're doing great…where you're not doing great and you really need to work harder."

- Several other jfms complained about "vague" fourth-year letters: "I mean it could have just gone into a lot more detail. It was two pages long."

Explanations offered as to why so many problems in the tenure process

- A "gap" interviewee comments:
  It's just that when you're starting out, you may have very little idea of what's expected…what's a reasonable timetable for turning out papers….is it OK if I just get one article out in my first year? So it can be a little bewildering to know what you should be doing in order to be progressing appropriately. And my senior colleagues, bless their hearts, were just not at all inclined to weigh in on that…it's awkward…If the work is more iffy, then you have to overcome certain social barriers to sit [jfms] down and say, "Look, we're going to have trouble with your promotion case if you don't fix up these issues."

- A jfm provided a similar analysis: "I think it's not especially well handled, mainly because academics are often interpersonally odd and not particularly good managers. So it makes a structurally very difficult process."

Examples of misunderstandings and problems

- One interviewee thought that only Humanities departments sent out for outside letters for promotion and tenure reviews.

- A "gap" fm thought that it was general policy to bring in a specialist in a candidate's field to "help them interpret those [outside] letters."

- One interviewee believed that there ought to be a "frank admission" that "it's hard to get tenure if you don't have an outside offer, [and] if you do have an outside offer from a peer institution, you will get tenure."

- A jfm had the impression from two senior colleagues that when submitting his list of potential reviewers he could include "some sort of 'get out of jail free card,'" naming a few people "I would not want it sent to, with no impunity." Then he was told that that was not the case. "I have no idea because these things don't seem to be written down anywhere." He said his list of names that included two people he did not want as referees caused a "hullabaloo because I wasn't supposed to put that in writing [nor] name two names unless I had actionable reasons."

- A "gap" fm complained that the letter he received following promotion to awot stated that one aspect of his performance was fine, but at tenure time the same aspect was said to be a pivotal problem: "so they should have been more open [in the promotion letter]."

- A jfm spoke about a colleague who did not receive tenure and had not been adequately informed of her status early enough, in particular, "informed that she should go and apply for jobs. [She should have been told] 'it's very likely, or it's a possibility that you will not be recommended by the department.'"

- A jfm who told us that she expected to be tenured, but was later turned down, reported being very satisfied with MIT: "…[They] don't put obstacles in your way. It's like it's hard to get tenure here, but here's like 'a whole lot of money, generous leave policy, generous maternity policy, we make it possible to get it done.'" Either she was simply overly optimistic, or there were some disconnects in mentoring.

Suggestions for improvement

The preponderant kind of suggestion for improvement had to do with ensuring that complete information is given.

- A male jfm said that senior faculty needed to say clearly at the beginning "'go socialize your work!'…as opposed to waiting until six months before they come up for tenure."

- And:

    [T]he senior faculty could do a better job of describing to the junior faculty the importance of being known within your sub-field…and giving them a sense of the sorts of people to whom they will go for outside letters…what the criteria are for

going to certain people and not others. What the criteria are for promotion, given what the letters say…so you should really know that…and over the next six years think about who these sorts of people might be, making sure they're engaged in your research, that they know what you're doing so when they get the letter and the package of material, it's not foreign.

- Some "senior" jfms and several "gap" faculty described ways in which they tried to ease the promotion ordeal their more junior colleagues were facing, including those in other departments. A female jfm commented that she was surprised that the junior people ahead of her hadn't said "here's the ropes from…a more informal perspective."

Gender

Every interviewee had thought-provoking points to make about MIT women faculty and the issue of gender in general. (An example of the latter is a jfm's complaint that the feminization of the humanities resulted in only women undergraduates taking his upper-level subjects.)

There were many positive comments.

- One "gap" interviewee said he liked the egalitarian atmosphere of his department with respect to gender. A penchant for "intellectual gladiatorial combat" characterizes his field, and he was grateful that his senior colleagues were good role models, as "they have no taste for it either." He thought that several women graduate students had chosen MIT over other schools because their undergraduate departments had been "hostile towards women." However, he added, our committee really should talk directly with the graduate students.

One quite encouraging finding was the extent to which male jfms wanted to talk about gender inequalities:[3]

- One said he was pleased that "we don't like alpha males or alpha male behavior" in his department.

- Another said he knew that "white men get a break," but that he wasn't always able to perceive how others were disadvantaged.

- Another: "I'm having a way easier time than my female colleagues, and some of them are senior…I'm sure it's partly being a white man in a white man's world."

- Another said "I'm sure students subconsciously grant me more authority because I'm a male professor."

- Another commented that it wasn't that his female colleagues *couldn't* speak as much as he, but that they didn't, which pointed to differences in socialization.

- I will quote one male interviewee at length

    That's where I think you really get into the gender differences, because a lot of stuff…how I was treated and how female colleagues of mine were treated. I will tell you straight out: I think there is a lot of gender inequity at the junior faculty level…And not at the policy level nearly as much as the daily decisions and the daily

---

[3] We do not believe that such comments are simply examples of political correctness.

interactions…So my experience has been—and mostly the other people I've known, women junior faculty in this school and in the department—they've had a much more difficult time…I walked back from the [meeting about the] second Institute Gender Equity Report with a junior female colleague…we had a very revealing conversation. This kind of thing where all of the street knowledge about getting along in the department and in the Institute, no one was telling her. And I had a bit of epiphany for me where I consider that now part of my obligation is to share that knowledge with people who are coming up. But no one had ever told me. I thought it was just chatting with my friends around the virtual water cooler. I'm not much of a water cooler chatterer, but I will spend the time now that I see that it's meaningful, real time for people.

With one exception, those male interviewees who commented on affirmative action initiatives directed at women were in favor of it:

- Several jfms criticized certain SHASS faculty members' negative attitudes toward such initiatives.

- One jfm mentioned "weird" conversations with faculty in other departments who belittled any comments about the need for more women.

- Here is another comment:

    I do see that it's very difficult for women here. I think it's difficult for women students here…I've always had good mentors who were women, but it's very easy to have good relationships with senior women when you're a man. It's not easy to do that when you're a woman. So it's not just a function of men. In fact, I think the fiercest battles are the senior women to junior women, that level. That interaction is just complicated in ways I don't understand. It's not just an "old boy" thing, because there's lots of senior women who have been very important to me here.[4]

- Another male jfm speculated that "it often seemed to happen" that female graduate students had it easier with male faculty and so wouldn't seek out female faculty members for support. "Possibly the explanation is that if you're a female senior faculty member, then you [got] a PhD at the 'School of Hard Knocks," and you think, 'Everyone else should go through the same miserable experience that I went through.'"

- Another male jfm said that his graduate school had had:
    …a very different culture from this place and it's much less open in a lot of ways. But MIT is not that open. I've worked [in corporations and independent research situations] and I've never seen an environment as difficult for women as this…even though…the corporation [where he had worked previously] was much more overtly sexist than this. But here, the things are all embedded in ways that are invisible and

---

[4] Note that the issue of conflictual relationships between junior and senior academic women is extremely complex, particularly when reported by a third party. Clearly sometimes one observes what one expects to observe rather than the reality. Interviews with female SHASS senior faculty members in 2001 contain complaints about male expectations that senior women faculty would automatically be threatened by, and envy, their junior female colleagues.

> hard to see. Everyone thinks they are trying to do the right thing, but the sum total is very different.

> He also said that the situation for women in SHASS looks extremely good compared to "a lot of other places around campus. There's a level of ugliness and unpredictability that I've not observed in SHASS."

- Another male jfm said that he was aware that he needed to be especially conscious about the female undergraduates and graduates in his classes, which, because of the subject matter, tended to attract male students. He had become aware that talking about sports before class began tended to exclude his female students, and was trying to curtail this practice.

- And another: "…a [junior] colleague, wants to have a child…she was told 'if you decide to have a child, you are making a choice as to how important your research is to you,' and she was shaken."

However one male jfm discussed gender inequities in terms of unfairly favoring women:

- "I knew that women were kind of advantaged in the workplace within academe. I didn't realize…how much so." If two people came into the exact same job, with the same qualifications, "the woman gets $10,000 extra a year in research money."

- Another issue was "…tenure and promotion…it's really obvious that it's an advantage to be a woman…The rule of thumb I've heard is one peer review journal article. Being a woman is worth one peer review journal article," adding that being an African American is worth two articles, and being an African American woman is worth four.

- A third issue was the "beer after work" problem; unlike the corporate world or public sector, he could not ask a female graduate student out for a beer at 9:00 PM, which meant he could not ask a male student either—"just a minor and continuing irritation."

All women interviewees commented on gender disadvantages:

- For some, it was primarily a question of departmental culture and atmosphere, a "macho attitude that makes me uncomfortable."

- And:

> …there are subtle ones and not so subtle. The nature of our discipline, it's mucho macho, the whole presentation, masculine. There's typically not a lot of discussion of gender in [our discipline], it depends on who's in the room. More attention is paid as the composition of faculty changes. A certain invisibility in the department. This relates to gender dynamics regarding what's important to study. One's behavior needs to be assertive, sometimes aggressive, and these characteristics are typically associated with men. If someone is less talkative, someone will invade their space. This will be interpreted in several ways: one, the less talkative one has no interest in the topic, or two, the less talkative one is weak or uncomfortable. I may have something to say, but not be willing to go to the mat about it. Conversations don't seem to flow or allow for comments about uncertainty…people making those points will be seen as weak…The subtlety of it can be annoying.

> She continues:

You don't know whether the individual has intended to inhibit you. Some, yes, take pleasure in crowding others out. Pure ego. I have to weigh…it takes a lot of energy, so I'm always making calculations whether to challenge or not. Gender…makes me very judicious and careful. I'm only sometimes willing to pay the cost of the consequences of their not knowing how difficult it is.

- A similar comment: "You have to assume some kind of aggressive, and to me an unpalatable, persona. It's hard to be heard."

- This woman said that faculty had been made to become sensitive to these issues in the undergraduate classroom, but that there was less attention paid to graduate students and women faculty. At departmental dinners there is:

    …a tendency always to talk to the senior person, usually to the senior male person. Not to people right out of grad school, but [to the] more established scholars. So I'd be at these settings where I have a lot to say, but there's no opportunity to say it…the male members—sometimes the senior male members but often the junior male members also—are busy referencing each other. And so it's hard to get a word in edgewise. And if you get a word in, people want to sort of swat you away as soon as possible so they can get back to talking to the real man.

- She complained about her ability to form professional networks being negatively impacted because she would leave such meetings without anybody having a sense of what her work is about: "I feel like the silent, invisible person in the corner." And because those events were far less enjoyable for her, she would end up avoiding them.

- A male jfm from the same department concurred, saying that although people were not being systematically shut out, "I just sense that traditionally that's associated, that's a gender issue that shuts women out. It probably does…It counts on the issue of building collegiality…and not in creating a bad environment." He said the department environment was "pretty good", but opportunities were being "squashed for making this a better environment, more comfortable."

Although one male jfm commented favorably on the "Marine Corps mentality" of MIT, most were critical:

- Here is a jfm: "this aggressive attitude…Although you can be like that, it's not natural [for women]. Seeing you as an MIT type—it's gendered, which makes it difficult for a woman. [My chair] said, 'you have these complaints, but we're the most egalitarian department at MIT.'" But he had been using "egalitarian" only with respect to rank, and was ignoring gender and race. She added that her department in her previous university "wasn't like that."

- One jfm said she had tried to improve departmental awareness by pointing out instances in which style, or topic matter (like baseball), puts women at a disadvantage. Although her senior male colleagues became defensive when she did this, "it could be to the good, helping to raise consciousness…There is a sense of wanting to do things better…the issue is not intentions but awareness." She wanted others to step in—like a sensitivity trainer, or the dean [because "power has something to do with raising awareness"]. "I've become the person who to some extent now…where people [ask] after dinner, 'were you offended?' It's a terrible position to be in."

- Another woman jfm commented that her department had so few women that there really were not any gender issues—but that colleagues were not gender conscious, and female graduate students probably had more problems than women faculty.

- Another jfm complained about the gender ratio in his department, noting that several women faculty members had left, "not in the best of circumstances."

Faculty from three departments commented on gendered difficulties with administrative staff:

- A female jfm complained of being "reprimanded, quite harshly," by her department's AO…"and she would cc it to my chair, which was really embarrassing."

- One male jfm commented:
  One of the biggest problems junior women face are the staff, who are almost all women, and do not interact well with junior faculty women. As an MIT faculty member you can choose when to teach, and where. But I've had junior colleagues whom the staff told they had to teach in this particular slot, and that there was no discussion about it. I almost have had places…where it literally was a one-to-one comparison…someone would say to me strikingly different things than what they would say to a woman in exactly the same position on exactly the same situation. So literally, the administrative staff is giving directions to a junior woman…"this is not negotiable…you will do this or that." Nothing like this was ever said to me…Staff feel more comfortable taking direction from men, and women have to really—[it's] all the same story that is written everywhere else—prove themselves in a certain way and men have the luxury of being socially disengaged and it not reflecting poorly on them. Women have to play that social game.

  He continued:
  That stuff matters because the staff allocate resources, either explicitly or de facto. They can choose how to get things billed; they can choose what qualifies under certain things; they can choose lots of different things. And a good relationship with the AO makes a big difference in your life. And it's just all-around harder, in my observation, for women to develop those relationships. There again, nobody ever sat the incoming faculty down and said "you can choose when you teach, you can choose how to bill things to your discretionary account, there are things you have leeway on." Or even things you have authority on. But if nobody tells you, you won't know. Your chair [could] tell you that the AO shouldn't be doing that.

  He described a case involving an administrative assistant who had been assigned to him for several years:
  …a very productive, good relationship. Then there's a woman junior faculty member…friend of mine. And I begin to hear things from my AA [Administrative Assistant] that they think she's bossy, she's bitchy—all the stereotype words. Which baffles me because I know this person reasonably well and I don't see her that way at all. But I also am aware that I don't observe her interactions with these other people. So at some point, things get shuffled around and my AA is assigned to her: "I don't know if I want to support this person, she has a reputation for all these things." "That's not my experience with her. Give her a chance." So she agrees and it all goes fine. To me that's a clear example of how setting a certain tone and certain

expectations of people for behavior improved the situation a whole lot. As opposed to a kind of collective agreement—because the staff all talk to each other.

He continued:

There were many, many cases that I've seen, like that, of it just being much, much harder for women to establish their credibility. The staff has been the most glaring one for me. Maybe it's because I see it the most in the daily experience of the department. But also because those are the things that make daily life harder, and I do think that the big structural impediments are not written in stone anywhere. There are these multiple little battles that people have to fight, and it's just energy that those people had to put into dealing with something that I was able to put into dealing with a graduate student who had a problem, or something that is more in the mainstream of what you consider your responsibility as a faculty member. I was really struck by the gender differences at the junior faculty level in all of these infrastructural ways.

There were also complaints about attitudes toward hiring women and underrepresented minorities:

- Here is a male jfm:
  I said, "can we look at the number of faculty at MIT…in terms of gender equity, how many male faculty and how many female faculty? Can we actually sit here [and hire a male when we have a short list of three women and one man]?"….And there was just no response. And I honestly don't believe there was malicious gender or sexism there, I think there was an inability to understand how these systems work, and a total inability to use language or to deal with how gender works…and the larger structure of MIT…there is no way to think through deeper structural inequities or paradigms of racism, sexism. I really believe that they just have no clue. So that when I'm [criticizing]…they're like "Well, that's not true. I'm not sexist." There was just no way for the faculty to deal on this level. Because it's that thing where you say, "I'm not racist. I'm not sexist. I don't care where someone is from." But then you can't see…

- Some women jfms commented on interaction dynamics. Here is a minority woman: "I watch gender play out at department meetings…[all the men] talk even if there's nothing to say, and there are a lot of pissing contests going on, a lot of male power jockeying…that goes on a lot. I don't even think they're in touch with it. That's what they're used to doing, getting airtime." She comments on a specific colleague: "he speaks dominantly and loudly and he curses a lot. And I watch the men around the table just eat it up. I could never get away with that. They love it, whether he's just said anything or not."

No serious sexual harassment cases were reported; however:

- One man mentioned "inappropriate comments about a blouse someone is wearing, comments that are more personal than they perhaps should be."

- Another said that he had heard of instances in which his female colleagues felt uncomfortable by casual remarks. "No huge violation, but uncomfortable." The inappropriate language, he felt, was a "generational issue."

Minorities

It is very unfortunate that because of the need to preserve anonymity we cannot discuss the majority of the problems raised by minority faculty members. Minority interviewees had deeply upsetting, discouraging stories to tell. And sharp criticism:

- "The school has a terrible history with respect to diversity. One faculty member left so embittered [that he quit teaching]." Another minority jfm reported experiencing a "deep-seated racism" that emerged in a departmental project that involved extra staff. Eventually a facilitator had to be hired, which "actually made a big difference." However, "the first sort of initial feelings of how you fit in [at MIT]…last, they can last a long time."

- One minority jfm was uncertain whether to stay at MIT: "There's such little diversity, African-Americans and Latinos. There are other universities, should I stay here? Students and faculty both. Especially in SHASS, there's simply not enough of a critical mass. So, do you want to have a conference? You can go to Harvard. It affects everything, socializing…your desire to do things at MIT, makes it less attractive." The question of how to improve the situation, "…comes up all the time. EOC [Equal Opportunity Committee] has tried, asking departments to be far more careful in the hiring process, at job talks. Vigilance is the key to continue, but the process is weak, unsatisfying. At this rate it will go on forever. I hear about near-misses, well, it's a vicious cycle. Who wants to be the Jackie Robinson in a department?"

- One minority female jfm commented that her department head had described what she did in a way she felt was "marginalizing, perhaps on the basis of race." She also felt that her new project was seen in negative terms by several of her colleagues because they felt "I had an agenda" and were disturbed about the "social and political implications" of her current work. When she asked her head to write a letter of recommendation for a prestigious grant, "he said he was troubled," and advised her to switch to something else. "I found it kind of upsetting, but I just worked through it and disregarded it." When we asked her what a mentor should not do, she said, "Well, just what [he] did. He was overbearing and what he gave was discouragement. And he wasn't even engaging with the [project's concerns]. He was asking me not to be who I am, to be like him, to play it safe." She had an informal mentor who read her writing and gave commentary. "And every semester she'd have coffee or lunch with me and was interested in me as a person, too. I felt somewhat seen by her."

- Further, this jfm felt more isolated and more alienated around race than she did around gender. "I feel like women always struggle for the balance between asserting themselves and knowing what that can cost. So that's always with me and also as a black woman…I know women who speak up forcefully get labeled as strident." "As a black, you have to prove yourself, you're gong to have to be more cogent, your performance has to be tighter than anybody else's just to compete…What got ingrained in me was: make sure you're more polished and prepared." At one point she did speak up very forcefully about an issue extremely important to her. "And I remember feeling strange afterward…I had the feeling that it might hurt me…I imagined that they were thinking of me as strident…That's the kind of thing that women are always struggling to balance."

- Another minority jfm felt that "if you are going to promote diversity, you are going to have a diversity of scholarship. [Minority scholars] are going to ask questions that fall outside of what is traditional in their field." The jfm hypothesized that this contributed to problems with some colleagues.

- Another minority jfm complained that when she first came, her proposal to feature women of color in a course elicited an angry response from a white woman colleague: "Why women of color? Why do they get special treatment?" (A colleague told her later that the other people present had found that comment appalling.)

- A minority jfm complained about being mistaken for a student by a graduate student.

- A minority interviewee said that he had been told that his style of dressing was "aggressive." Although it was framed as a joke, he felt slighted, and wondered why his white colleagues did not realize that if he dressed extremely casually like them he ran the risk of being seen as "a janitor"—which had happened at a previous position.

- Here is a minority jfm complaining about racialized dynamics during department meetings: "these white guys feel like they're in the presence of something real…[they're having] an authentic people of color experience…So I think it has to do with some kind of fetishizing of being of color; it is a way to be right up next to it."

- A minority female jfm commented that she felt that a staff member would say things to her that the staff person would not say to a male fm, and that it was "…discouraging…disrespectful, in tone and content…I can't imagine her saying that to a male professor."

- A non-minority faculty member complained about both MIT's minority and disability offices. She had tried to admit disabled and minority graduate students when she had chaired her department's admissions committee, but could not arrange for the support they needed.

- A non-minority interviewee said "Minority recruiting is viewed as something that a junior faculty member who is coming up for tenure takes on. And we all know what that means…that ain't an important task." Predictably, not much energy is devoted to it in this department.

Family, pace and pressure

Although a couple of interviewees expressed sentiments to the effect of "the Academy, not just at MIT, is ideal for making families," most reported problems, although not all due to Institute policies and practices.

Several interviewees praised MIT's parental leave policy:

- A father commented: "that was just HUGELY important for us. It meant I could be with our first son for the first eight months of his life."

- One interviewee said that academe "becomes all consuming…much closer to something like the priesthood" than was the case for his friends in law or business. The default position, he said, is to ask "How can I fit my family into this profession?" But he also commented about his flexible schedule and that few people were "demanding to know where I am at any given time."

- Here is another jfm: "Things get sacrificed, but that's the reality of being untenured faculty at a place that demands a lot…I don't have much of a social life, I don't go out. I say hello to my husband every now and then."

- One jfm, a single father, complained bitterly about juggling family and work on his salary. His colleagues were supportive, he said, although he did not think they really understood his situation.

- Another jfm, also a father, commented that in a department where quite a few faculty did not have children or had had them after they were tenured, "I think there is this kind of wait and see attitude: 'Let's see if he can do it.'" In our interview with a colleague of his we were told that the father jfm had experienced "greater dissonance" between him and the department head, that the message to "keep publishing, keep publishing" had been made especially strongly to him. "He hasn't gotten as much support as a parent as he might need. In place of that support, there's only been a louder demand for more publishing." Perhaps the department head had only the best intentions here, but these two jfms did not see this behavior as supportive. We have an example here of junior faculty not only being extremely aware of how they themselves are being treated, but that they also pay great attention to the treatment their junior colleagues are receiving.

- Several interviewees said things like "family is discounted…family responsibilities are to be pushed aside." And, "people don't really think through the kind of standard that's being set…without a thought to the structure that it perpetuates and that it underscores." And, "so it becomes anecdotal when it's really institutional and structural, and that's a problem." The example given by this last male interviewee was a statement he had heard being made to a female colleague who wanted to talk about family responsibilities, "Oh you've always had everything you wanted, why should we think about that now for you?"

- A female jfm with two children commented that, "If you're really gung-ho MIT, you should basically be a single man, regardless of your biological sex…I feel like I'm an anomaly." She said that a colleague in another SHASS department had found that the senior women gave her the hardest time: "it's like, 'how dare you think that you can have two kids?' Like, 'I didn't have any kids, or I had one kid. And I had to sacrifice so much and look, you get to have two kids, you have it so easy.'"

Several interviewees mentioned the difficulty of getting children into on-campus childcare and being able to pay for it.

Extension of the Tenure Clock

A substantial number of interviewees had not heard of the policy for extending the tenure clock for birth mothers and other caregivers who make special requests. Several confused it with parental leave. Others were ambivalent about it. Many commented, spontaneously or with a question, about the possibility of the bar simply being raised, and some felt that such a result would be inevitable.

- One jfm feared that the message might be "Oh, you can do it but it's going to hurt you." Another: "So that if people are using the policy and there's the sort of unspoken

assumption that well, 'they [faculty] ought to have done more' or 'I didn't have the benefit of that,' then it's not that good to you."

- Another feared that "a stigma is going to get attached" to the policy.

- But here is a "gap" interviewee who sees the policy as "a fantastic idea." He characterized the doubting attitude illustrated above as: "'here we have a good idea that will help people, but no, the forces of darkness will have a way to counter it.' That strikes me as more of a reason to confront the forces of darkness head-on than to set aside the good idea."

- A jfm who wanted the clock extended as an adoptive parent did not approve of awarding it only to birthmothers. Another jfm wanted the extension available to both men and women.

Conclusions

It is clear from our interviews that SHASS faculty are extremely diverse. There is a wide range of disciplines, a great range in department size, and while almost all departments technically have graduate programs, the nature of these varies enormously. Nonetheless, although most of our recommendations apply only to some individuals and departments, a few are school-wide.

Progress has been made in many areas of importance to SHASS jfms, both with regard to gender equity and their general situation. Underrepresented minorities have access to special funding and other kinds of support. For the most part jfms are protected with respect to committee work and other kinds of service, to enable them to concentrate on doing the best possible research and teaching. The amount of sensitive, informed, and earnest attention to and concern about gender inequity issues on the part of many junior and "gap" male interviewees was truly heartwarming. Many interviewees indicated awareness that becoming known as a university that is women- and minority-friendly helps MIT attract the very best graduate students and faculty (both male and female).

But many areas continue to be sources of discouragement and disappointment, if not downright anger. For example, salaries continue to be greatly inequitable across departments, as well as within some departments, a consequence of recruiting and hiring practices. Another area is the role of Administrative Officers, whose actions can have a significant impact on a jfm's career—sometimes positive, sometimes not. We have evidence from several departments that their AOs might be treating younger female faculty differently—giving them less support—than the treatment their male cohort members receive. We have also seen problems with other kinds of departmental staff.

Way too many jfms believed that, as one put it, there is "no incentive institutionally for me to invest in teaching, in terms of my prospects for tenure and promotion. None." Whatever the reality is with respect to the importance of teaching in a jfm's progress, and with respect to policies that publicly recognize and reward excellent teaching, the perception among most younger faculty that teaching matters very little, is a serious problem. We have the impression that jfms take teaching very seriously; their senior colleagues and, especially, faculty in administrative positions should make sure they never give the impression that they are

indifferent to or only mildly concerned about faculty performance as advisors and in the classroom.

Mentoring is a complex subject. What is clear from these interviews is that junior and recently tenured faculty have a great deal to say on the subject, in the form of both criticism and suggestions for improvement.

We found evidence of deep disappointment with SHASS's promotion and tenure process. Admittedly, this is an area that will always be filled with tension, with many built-in structures that can facilitate misunderstandings and give rise to all sorts of negative emotions. All the more reason to make the process as transparent as possible, which means, first, providing information—in as comprehensive a form as possible, one easily accessed by junior faculty— and, second, by making sure *all* senior faculty fully understand the process.

While some of the structures that fostered unequal treatment of men and women have been dismantled, gender inequity remains a fact at MIT. The initial Report on Women in Science and the subsequent Reports from the Gender Equity committees in the rest of the Institute, along with other kinds of activities carried out by the five committees and other initiatives have done much to raise awareness of gender inequity and inspire efforts to improve the situation. But we have received many reports of behaviors that are acceptable, if not laudable, in men, being frowned upon when exhibited by women faculty—who are then judged as "strident," "too aggressive," and the like. Both women and men are capable of making these unfair invidious comparisons.

Another problem area is the inability on the part of some SHASS faculty to understand continuing structural impediments to equality, and a tendency on the part of some to dismiss well-established means of eliminating these impediments, or at least improving the situation.

The situation of junior and recently tenured minority SHASS faculty continues to be *vastly* in need of improvement. Accounts given by minority faculty about their experiences were extremely difficult to hear—and approximately 80% of these narratives could not be discussed in this Report here due to confidentiality concerns. Clearly the Institute and SHASS have a long way to go before minority faculty feel understood, respected, and not disadvantaged because of their minority status.

While MIT has made great strides with respect to policies that ease the strain of managing work and family, much more can be done. A concrete example is the Stata Day Care Center. Although an excellent example of an on-site facility, faculty with young children find it extremely hard to pay the fees.

Recommendations

Teaching
Give jfms every chance to read their teaching evaluations.

The head should arrange for one classroom evaluation by a senior faculty member to take place once a semester or, at the very least, once a year. Jfms should have access to the write-ups, and opportunity to discuss them with their senior colleague.

Regardless of the actual situation, it is clear that junior and "gap" faculty feel that teaching is not adequately recognized and rewarded. Jfms want greater recognition of good teaching—as reward, incentive, and message about MIT priorities. More incentives and awards for outstanding teaching need to be established, including teaching awards that include money, to be set up at both department and school (SHASS) levels. The amounts do not have to be large. The dean and department heads should facilitate as much interaction as possible between senior faculty and jfms to discuss ways good teaching is currently valorized at MIT, and to talk about their own teaching experiences. This can take the form of "corridor talk," faculty meetings or workshops to discuss teaching, encouragement to have jfms' classroom performance videotaped, and the like.

Funding
Departments should require that jfms apply nearly every time for available in-house funds. Limits on candidacy need to be clearly spelled out in the application forms. Jfms should be explicitly reassured that they need not worry about appearing greedy. And if at all possible, if a jfm applies and is turned down for dean's office funding, the second application should be funded.

In each department a person should be responsible for distributing information about funding opportunities. This should include periodic face-to-face interaction with junior faculty about these opportunities, deadlines, etc. E-mail announcements and/or hard-copy memos should continue to be distributed, but we have found that dissemination of this information in other forms is needed. Descriptions of available Institute funding sources should be easily accessible on the SHASS website.

SHASS departments and the dean's office should work to establish as much transparency in funding opportunities as possible.

Mentoring, Promotion and Tenure
A mentor should be assigned to each new jfm, and during the first year the jfm should try to find an intellectual mentor, if this has not already happened. (A clear exception is Linguistics, which works without formal mentors or graduate student advisors.) Normally the department head serves as the administrative mentor, and if for some reason the head cannot perform this function for all junior faculty, then another senior faculty member should formally take on the job. Department heads should review each jfm's progress and discuss it with them every semester or, minimally, every year. This already-established policy is most definitely not practiced 100% of the time; most interviewees did not know about it.

In addition to the department head and a jfm's intellectual mentor, all senior faculty need to be much more proactive with respect to reading their junior colleagues' work, discussing it with them over coffee, and arranging for events like workshops or lunch colloquia in which junior faculty present their work in progress. Jfms should be periodically encouraged to be more

proactive with respect to talking with their senior colleagues about their work. If there is any impression that a jfm is blocked or otherwise not moving along on their writing as fast as they should, the jfm and mentor should jointly agree on specific deadlines for submitting drafts of the work.

Three cases were mentioned by interviewees in which department heads seriously misled the junior candidate about one part of the promotion and tenure schedules. Given the potentially make-or-break consequences for the candidate—as well as how quickly such mistakes circulate among SHASS junior faculty—extra caution should be taken to make sure that heads thoroughly understand their responsibilities in this area.

We gathered a great number of jfm complaints about inadequate information about the promotion and tenure process. It is also clear that some jfms are poorly informed about other important SHASS structures and policies (for example, many have only partial understanding of the membership and functions of School Council). We recommend that, in addition to the dinners with junior faculty hosted by the dean, that she meet yearly with junior SHASS faculty to discuss promotion and tenure procedures. Differences among departments with respect to timing and criteria for promotion and tenure could be clearly spelled out during this meeting. We also recommend further discussion about creating a user-friendly booklet to be given to incoming junior SHASS faculty. Posting this information on the SHASS website is a good step, but it is not sufficient.

Jfms need to know that being advised to apply for other jobs does not indicate rejection; rather, it shows a conscientious department head. They should be told that this kind of prudent advice is given to almost all junior faculty. Jfms need to know that being offered a job in another university is *not* a requirement for getting tenure.

There is so much misunderstanding about the mythical "second book" requirement for tenure in most SHASS departments that we recommend that each department write up and distribute each year a document that describes in as detailed a manner as possible the general expectations in their discipline. For example, inform jfms that a new research project, clearly distinct from the dissertation project, is required. And that although a second published book, or even a completed ms. is not required, the new project has to be far enough along for outside letter-writers to be able to evaluate it.

Junior Women and Minority Faculty

Departments should do everything they can to raise awareness of continuing structural inequities, as well as the insidious sexism and racism that appear without the actor's awareness— "embedded in ways that are invisible and hard to see." Many policies at both SHASS and Institute levels to decrease or eliminate inequity have been put in place, some of them examples of "positive discrimination," in keeping with affirmative action guidelines. But raising awareness of the problems that lie "not at the policy level nearly as much as the daily decisions and the daily interactions…" is also crucial if MIT and SHASS are to become a truly welcoming environment for women and minorities. If "everyone thinks they are trying to do the right thing," if "there is a sense of wanting to do things better…the issue is not intentions but

awareness," then sensitivity training, consciousness-raising workshops, and similar programs can help reduce the extent to which faculty are unaware of "how gender [and racial formations] work." If well-intentioned faculty are provided tools with which to "think through deeper structural inequities or paradigms of racism, sexism," and begin to notice what happens "in the daily experience of the department," where women and minorities have to fight "multiple little battles," they will come to understand that sexism and racism aren't always "malicious." The dean, department heads, and other persons in authority (e.g., AOs) have to firmly communicate the importance of addressing these problems ("because power has something to do with raising awareness"). Hopefully at some future date faculty will respond to criticism and proposed changes without defensively stating things like "Well, that's not true. I'm not sexist/racist." Rather, they will have acquired an understanding of "how these systems work," as well as "language to deal with" discriminatory behavior and attitudes.

Appendix I

Interview Protocol for Junior Faculty

Instructions:

At beginning: ask permission to tape record. Then say that the identity of the faculty member will be protected:

The tapes will be transcribed by a professional transcriber with no connections to MIT. The interview team and the transcriber will be the only ones with access to the tapes. The tapes will be destroyed after they have been transcribed. The transcription will be sent to the interviewee for editing. At this time the interviewee may add to, change or delete anything they want. The transcription will not contain the interviewee's name. We understand that the interviewee might be recognizable even with the name deleted; however, only the interviewee and the team will see the transcripts. The team will summarize the transcript, removing any information that could reveal an individual's identity (unless interviewee gives permission to distribute the transcript to the entire committee). The final Report will contain no material that might reveal an interviewee's identity.

The topics we will cover include how you came to MIT, what your experiences have been as a junior faculty member, your opinions about your department, SHASS, and the Institute as a whole, and your situation with respect to balancing family responsibilities with career.

1.   **Coming to MIT**

Can you tell us a little about yourself? What did you do before coming to MIT? At what stage in your career were you at the time?

Can you tell us some of the things that were important in your decision to come to MIT?

Were you considering other positions or offers at the time?

      (depending on answer) Can you tell us about them?

Did you ask for any particular conditions? (potential items for negotiation: salary, start-up package, space, research support, teaching responsibilities, moving expenses, child care, housing)

      (depending on answer) Were they met?

Did you have any reservations about coming here?

      (depending on answer) What were they?

Were other family or personal issues factors in your decision?

2.   **Goals**

At the time of your decision to come, did you have any specific ideas about what you were hoping to do or accomplish here?

      (depending on answer) have you been able to move toward these goals?

Changes in goals?

3.   **Networking**

Please talk about the personal and professional connections you have made since coming here.

      (depending on answer) with junior faculty, senior faculty, male/female, mentor, administration, outside dept., outside MIT?

4.   **Department**

How would you describe the atmosphere in your department with respect to junior faculty?

      (depending on answer): are there any gender issues you've become aware of?

How have you been treated by your senior colleagues?

Have you felt uncomfortable in discussions with anyone because you felt they were behaving inappropriately in some way?

> (if asked for an example: a female junior faculty member feeling that her senior colleagues at times seem to see her as very young)

How do you feel about your participation in your department?

> (depending on answer): Do you feel your input in department decision-making has been taken seriously?

> Have you been disappointed in your colleagues' responses?

Have you sought special considerations or help from your colleagues or department head since coming to MIT? What have been your experiences in this regard?

> (depending on answer) examples: leaves, special teaching or work arrangements, funding?

> Did you seek advice before making these requests? Any particular difficulties?

Please discuss your overall opinion regarding availability of information with respect to the tenure process, in your department and in SHASS.

Please talk about the mentoring arrangements in your department, and your experiences with the system and your mentor to date.

> Were you officially assigned a mentor?

> What should a mentor do?

> What should a mentor not do?

What have you appreciated so far about your relationship with your mentor?

> Not appreciated?

> Any suggestions for improving the mentoring system in your department, or other SHASS departments that you know about?

People sometimes have two mentors: an administrative/official one who helps the faculty member institutionally, and an intellectual mentor.

Do you have an intellectual mentor?

    (depending on answer) Would you like one?

5. **Incentives, rewards**

Have you been given encouragement in the form of incentives to reach your maximum potential in research, creative work, teaching, service?

    For example, grants, salary increases, funded chairs, awards

Do you feel you received adequate information about the availability of these incentives and awards?

Have your contributions been recognized?

Are there any ways you can suggest improving the incentive and award system at MIT or improving access to information about it?

What has your experience been with respect to your department's facilitating your research? Space? Funding? Understanding with respect to teaching duties?

What has been your experience with respect to the dean's office facilitating your research?

6. **Teaching, advising responsibilities**

What are your teaching responsibilities?

    How many new subjects have you worked up?

    Are your subjects assigned to you, or are they self-initiated?

    Do you find your teaching responsibilities manageable? Appropriate?

Do you teach outside the department? Outside MIT?

Please discuss your advising roles and responsibilities

    What kinds of advising do you do?

    How are advising responsibilities distributed in your department?

    Do you think that men or women students seek you out differently?

Do you feel you do as much (or more or less) advising as your peer colleagues?

Of graduate students?

Of undergraduates?

What have been your experiences with MIT students?

Have any of your colleagues reported incidents in which students behaved inappropriately?

7. **Committee and other administrative responsibilities**

Can you talk about your participation on department, school or Institute committees since coming here?

Were you assigned to equally prestigious and important committees as your junior colleagues?

What was your workload on committees, compared to your junior colleagues?

8. **Have you ever considered leaving MIT for career, family, financial reasons?**

9. **Family**

How do you divide up your time with respect to responsibilities at MIT, research, and family demands and priorities?

Please discuss the issue of balancing family responsibilities and doing everything possible to be awarded tenure.

(depending on answer) Do you have enough time to do all of these things you want to do?

Have you had to make especially difficult choices in balancing family and career?

(depending on answer): What makes balancing manageable?

Difficult?

What are your opinions about the extension of the tenure clock with respect to your situation or others that you know about?

(depending on answer): Have you heard rumors to the effect that extending the tenure clock is unwise because "the bar will be raised higher," canceling out the benefits of the extension?

What is the overall atmosphere in your department with respect to the faculty's family obligations?

(depending on answer): Meetings times?

Other expectations regarding evenings?

Flexibility with respect to teaching schedules?

10.   **Gender and Underrepresented Minorities**

Do you think that there are ways, unintentional or intentional, in which being a man or a woman affects opportunities and experiences at MIT? Being a minority?

(depending on answer): Examples?

On the whole, how would you judge the general climate of your department and MIT in general in terms of its overall support and encouragement of men and of women? Minorities?

How does the climate here compare to other universities you've known?

Are there any issues we haven't covered? Do you have any questions?

We request that you not discuss this interview with your colleagues until we have finished interviewing so as not to influence their responses.

Thank you.