Gender Equity in Academia: Lessons from the MIT Experience

Professor Lotte Bailyn

Occasional paper number 2

Gender Equity in Academia:

Lessons from the MIT Experience

The first Imperial College Athena Lecture

given by Professor Lotte Bailyn T Wilson Professor of Management Sloan School of Management
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

at Imperial College of Science Technology and Medicine on 15 May 2001

Occasional paper number 2

Gender Equity in Academia:
Lessons from the MIT Experience

Introduction

The first Imperial College Athena Lecture was given by Professor Lotte Bailyn the T Wilson Professor of Management at the Sloan School of Management Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) at Imperial College on 15th May 2001.

Professor Bailyn was the Faculty Chair at the time the Committee of Women Faculty in the School of Science at MIT submitted its report 'A Study of Women Faculty in Science at MIT'. The report can be found at http://web.mit.edu/fnl/women/women.html

In summer 1999 Imperial College was awarded one of the first tranche of Athena Project development grants. The aims of the Athena Project (established in 1999 by Universities UK, SCOP and the higher education funding bodies) are 'the advancement of women in science engineering and technology in higher education and a significant increase in the number of women recruited to the top jobs.'

Imperial piloted a number of mentoring strategies and gave a commitment to continue with any activities judged to be successful. The report can be found at www.ic.ac.uk/Athena.

The individual mentoring of young female staff in particular was judged to have been very successful and is now being rolled out to include all young academic staff both male and female. The College also agreed to organise an annual networking event for women in science. The lecture by Professor Bailyn was an integral part of the inaugural event. A number of exciting initiatives are developing as a result of Professor Bailyn's visit.

I am delighted that the Athena Project has decided to publish this lecture in its Occasional Papers series as part of its programme of disseminating good practice. Athena forms an integral part of the newly established Equality Challenge Unit, which has been set up by the HE representative and funding bodies to promote equal opportunities for all staff employed in the sector.

Information on Athena, its publications and its development programme, including the Imperial College mentoring initiative can be found on the Athena website www.athena.ic.ac.uk

Sir Richard Sykes

Rector of Imperial College

July 2001

Gender Equity in Academia: Lessons from the MIT Experience

Professor Lotte Bailyn

T Wilson Professor of Management at the Sloan School of Management
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Introduction

It is a great pleasure to be here. Imperial College has a warm place in my heart, and I have spent some very pleasurable and productive months here as a visitor. So it is a special pleasure to return here to talk about gender equity in academia, and the lessons we have learned from our experience with this issue at MIT.

I would like to begin by drawing out a few characteristics of the academic career, as context to what is meant by gender equity in academia. Then, I want to consider what accounts for the continuing inequities, and what it might take to create gender equity in this setting. Throughout, I refer to what we have learned from the MIT report on the women faculty in science, and its aftermath.

The characteristics of the academic career

There are many wonderful things about an academic career. It provides more freedom and autonomy than most high-level endeavors, it allows one to work on things one really cares about, and the system of tenure provides a level of job security unheard of in most other occupations. At the same time, there are some characteristics that make it particularly demanding.

An academic must fulfill multiple roles - teaching, research, service both to the university and to the profession - and that increases the level of demand. Indeed, it is a profession with a great deal of overload. Karl Weick, an imaginative organizational theorist, has defined overload not as the amount of demands that are made on a person - what he calls the input - but as the relation of that input to the timing of output.

A manager, who is taught to handle things quickly as they arise, has relatively little overload even though there are continuous demands on him. In contrast, the academic has long periods before an output appears - running an experiment, writing a book, are not things that can be disposed of quickly, hence by this definition, it is a profession with very high overload.

There is also another aspect of the career that increases the psychological demands it makes on faculty. A professor is supposed to be an expert in her field, one who has the answers to all the questions. There is pressure, therefore, always to appear knowledgeable, never to have to ask for help. That is a special burden which increases the psychological pressures of this profession. In contrast to management, for example, there are no consultants that can legitimately be brought in to help solve a problem. So mentors, as the report on the Imperial College Athena Project has shown, are very helpful for junior faculty, but are not assumed necessary once one has reached senior status.

Finally, at least in the US system, the tenure time-table, having to prove that you are this expert in the first seven years of the career, creates another difficult demand. All of this makes the ideal, the perfect academic someone who gives total priority to work and has no outside interests and responsibilities.

This last is something the senior women faculty in science at MIT believe absolutely. They cannot conceive of any other way to be a first rate scientist, which may explain why most of them are not married and have no children. In some ways that may be the greatest inequity of all: the profession is set up in such a way that men academic scientists routinely have families, while women, given current rules, find it much more difficult.

The meaning of gender equity in academia

This brings me to what we really mean by gender equity. There are a number of meanings, the first of which is the meaning embedded in the legal structure, which equates equity with equality: equal pay, equal access to opportunities to enter an occupation and to advance in it, equal comfort in the work environment. All of these are very important, and it was lack of this equality that was demonstrated in the MIT School of Science. Women faculty members were few in number relative to the existing pool, they also had lower pay, less lab space, and were much less likely to be in central positions within their departments, and they felt consistently marginalized.

There has been much progress to ensure this equality, at MIT and in the workplace in general, but equality is still not the same as equity, and this definition ignores important aspects of equity. Equating equity with equality assumes the workplace is completely separate from the rest of life and thus ignores the fact that people have lives outside of their work. By being gender neutral, this first definition ignores the different life experiences of men and women and makes the current "male" model of the ideal academic normative, assuming that women can follow it as easily as men.

These considerations lead to a second definition which goes beyond equal opportunities, as important as they are, and is based on the realization that equal opportunity, even if it exists, is not equitable if constraints are very unequal. The argument is based on fairness, rather than equality, especially not equality limited only to the workplace.

Equity will not be possible if there exists one group of people (for example people with care responsibilities) who are systematically unable to meet the requirements of the ideal academic who gives full priority and all his time and energy to his academic work. Joan Williams, a lawyer, argues in her recent book, Unbending Gender, that since such a systematically disadvantaged group consists primarily of women, this situation is sex discrimination under current law and should be redressed in the courts. In other words, merely allowing women faculty to meet the criteria for academic success on terms that have been defined by men and represent their life experiences, does not necessarily guarantee equity. Therefore, an equitable situation should entail equal opportunities and equal constraints.

As opposed to the first definition, based on work place equality, this definition takes an academic's outside life into account. It has led to such practices as parental leave, stopping the tenure clock if you have a child, and so on. Again, all of these are very important, but because they do not alter the underlying expectations for promotion and tenure, they tend to be underutilized. As one of my junior female colleagues has said, she wouldn't dare ask for parental leave because it would be interpreted as a lack of

commitment to the academic career. Though this definition of gender equity represents an awareness of people's lives outside of their work and tries to accommodate their special needs, it does not deal with the issue that those people, primarily women, who might take advantage of these accommodations could pay serious career consequences.

The ideal image of gender equity

So what is the ideal image of gender equity? and I do mean ideal, because it is more a vision than any current reality. Such a definition would be based on integration, rather than separation, of the public sphere of economic work and the private sphere of family, community, and other personal involvements. Though an ideal, one can see what would be required to realize such integration. On the societal level, on the level of cultural norms, it would mean full legitimization of the private sphere: activities there would be seen equally as important and would be equally as much valued as occupational activities. On the part of the individual, it would mean equal commitment to each sphere.

Twenty-five years ago, the sociologist Stephen Marks wrote an interesting essay on the experience of scarcity of time and energy. His thesis was that this experience comes from unequal commitments, particularly from over involvement with occupation as a source of identity. He posited that the experience of lack of time is more the result of this unequal commitment than it is of the actual number of hours available during the day.

Gender equity in this third, ideal sense of full integration between the public and the private sphere, requires equalizing the value placed on economic and non-economic activity, but it is more than that. Such an integration would require also that work practices, structures, and cultural definitions of competence and success be embedded in the belief in, and acceptance of, a worker whose identity and commitments are legitimately anchored in both the occupational and the private world - what one might call an integrated worker, which contrasts sharply with the current image of the ideal worker as one whose sole and principal priority is to paid employment.

I have said that this is an ideal, a vision. It is critical, though, to have this third vision in mind, even when working for strict pay equality. For even if we meet the criteria of equal opportunity and pay and create policies to help people with families, but the ideal worker continues to be seen as one with no interests or responsibilities outside of work, we will only recreate and reinforce existing practice. And that will continue to disadvantage women. True equity requires modification of these existing practices to fit the vision of integration.

What happened at MIT

As you can imagine, nothing that was done at MIT came close to this integrated vision. Indeed, there is a strong belief at MIT, and I suspect at most universities, that all existing procedures for judging talent and for making promotion and tenure decisions are fair and gender neutral. The belief that merit can be judged completely objectively is a fundamental tenet underlying university practices. Hence the thought that to achieve gender equity one might have to reconsider some of these practices is very foreign.

Nonetheless, real progress has been made at MIT. In all the schools there is now concern about and monitoring of compensation and other resources, to ensure that they are distributed equally to women. There has also been some progress, at least on the level of awareness, in acknowledging that women faculty's lives typically encounter constraints that are different from those of their male colleagues.

Recently, MIT's president invited the presidents of eight other research universities, along with their provosts and two women faculty members from each university, to come to MIT for a day's discussion on women in academic science and engineering. It was remarkable: the presidents of Cal Tech, Stanford, Berkeley, University of Michigan, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Penn, along with their "delegations" met with the MIT group for a Sunday dinner and an all day discussion on Monday. At the end, they all agreed to work in their universities toward three goals:

> First, *to have the number of women on their faculties mirror the number they educate*, to prevent the erosion of women in technical fields at each step of the career line, from undergraduate to graduate to post-doc to faculty, what has been called the leaking pipeline.
>
> Second, *to ensure that those women already on their faculties have an equally positive experience as the men*. Senior women faculty's experience of marginalization is pervasive, not only at MIT but at almost all the universities we have heard from, and the recognition of this fact by these university presidents and their agreement to try to do something about it is an important point - especially since when the MIT report first came out, a number of these schools insisted that such problems did not occur at their universities!
>
> Finally *to have no faculty member - male or female - disadvantaged by family responsibilities whether for children, elders, or partners*. So in awareness, at least, how care taking responsibilities can affect academic careers is acknowledged.

They also acknowledged that to achieve these goals will require 'potentially significant change in the procedures within each university, and the scientific and engineering establishment as a whole'. (the full statement is at http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/nr/2001/genderstatement.html)

These goals are ambitious. Setting them out in this way is an important first step, but reaching them continues to be a serious problem, even though most universities have been trying for a number of decades.

Why inequities continue in academia

It is important to raise the question why, in academia and other top professions, there continue to be inequities, long after women have entered these occupations. What we learned from the avalanche of responses we received after the publication of the MIT report was that the leaking pipeline, the unequal compensation, and the experience of marginalization were all pretty universal. So what are the dynamics that account for this situation?

In answering this question, I would like to ignore two arguments, even though they are still part of the beliefs of a number of groups in society:

> The first is that women don't have the skills, or the interests, or whatever, to do serious scholarly work, particularly in technical fields.
>
> The second is that men intentionally discriminate because they don't want to share power, or feel uncomfortable dealing with women in a collegial way.

These beliefs still exist and have to be carefully monitored to prevent continuing inequalities in access to resources and positions of influence. But I suspect they are not the biggest part of the story, if for no other reason than they are covered by current laws. So I want, rather, to talk about more subtle dynamics that are at work, and that exist both on the individual and the institutional level.

Virginia Valian, in her book**,** Why So Slow, argues for a cognitive explanation of continuing inequity. She posits the existence of gender schemas, by which she means the implicit, largely non-conscious beliefs about sex differences that all of us, men and women alike, share. These schemas affect our expectations of men and women and our evaluations of their performance. The most important consequence of this for professional work, according to Valian, is that men tend to be overrated while women are more likely to be underrated. Thus professional women are at a slight disadvantage in every interaction, and these disadvantages cumulate over time to be big differences.

For example, I have a young female colleague who is a senior chaired professor. She was asked at a reception by a donor to MIT what she did. On hearing her answer, the response was a surprised 'you don't look like a professor!' That remark is based on a gender schema. What it means is that someone who doesn't "look like a professor" has continuously to prove herself, which puts her at a disadvantage when compared to her male counterparts who fit the image. Gender schemas account for the fact that when experimentally comparing two identical CVs, one with a man's name and one with a woman's, the man gets a higher rating. The strength of this tendency is shown also in the following experiment:

> People are given a story to read. It talks about a person who is taking a welding course and fails the course. A second paragraph explains that the person was sick during the time of the course and had to miss many classes. When the story carries a male name, and people are asked why he failed, they say that he was sick and couldn't attend all the classes. When the story carries a female name, the answer to the same question tends to be: "because she's a woman."

Women are not good at welding. This belief is so strong that it even overcomes information that is readily available.

Gender schemas explain also the result of another experiment, where people rated a female CV for an academic position. In one condition, this CV was judged in a pool of eight, with the other seven being men; in the other condition the pool consisted of three women and five men. The CV in the former pool, where it represented the only woman, was judged significantly worse than in the latter. A single woman in a pool activates the gender schema, which brings along the implicit belief that women are not likely to be good academics because they somehow don't fit. But when there is more than one woman in the pool, then one has to make comparisons among the women and the impact of the gender schema is lessened. [*] This experimental result, by the way, has some obvious implications for academic recruitment.

---

[*] All of these experimental results are discussed in Valian.

These subtle dynamics in individual cognition are the ones we felt accounted for many of the inequities at MIT. Their effect is slowly becoming acknowledged, at least by those faculty and administrators who are genuinely concerned about this issue. Nonetheless, their pervasiveness requires continuous monitoring.

But there is more than individual cognition involved. Universities are gendered institutions. What this means is that the academy is anchored in assumptions about competence and success that have led to practices and norms constructed around the life experiences of men, and around a vision of masculinity as the normal, universal requirement of university life. Howard Georgi, the Harvard physicist, has made this point. Scientists, he says, are expected to be assertive and competitive. But then he asks: are these characteristics really necessary to do good science? His feeling is that curiosity and persistence are more important, and that coding assertiveness as a requirement works against women, since they are less likely to have this characteristic, and, if they display it, more likely to be seen as difficult and disagreeable (see http://www.aps.org/apsnews/0100/010016.html).

The fully autonomous expert role, already alluded to, is another characteristic associated with masculinity that may not be critical for first rate scholarship. And of course the American tenure clock, which requires greatest effort during the child-bearing years, is clearly better aligned with men's lives, as is the belief that to succeed in academia one must give first and total priority to one's work.

All of these assumptions and the practices associated with them disadvantage academic women. They are so ingrained and so taken for granted, that one forgets that they are not God-given, but are constructed by mere men. Though assumed to be necessary attributes of the academic career, they are, in fact, social constructions.

I would bet that if most scientists through the centuries hadn't been men who had women to support them as wives and assistants, at home and in the lab, the academy would not have evolved in this way. As it is, many of these characteristics, now all bundled together into an image of the ideal academic, are probably not necessary to produce new knowledge or to educate the next generation. The practices of evaluation and assessment of reputation that stem from them may, in fact, detract from some university goals such as interdisciplinary work or student-centered teaching.

What it might take to create gender equity in academia

The possibility that such beliefs and assumptions, which disadvantage women, may actually have some unintended negative consequences for the university mission, provides room to consider alternative practices. Let me give an example. We worked with a non-profit research foundation that provides grants to the developing world - not a university, but employing similar kinds of people. This organization was having problems getting women into their professional ranks, and assumed this stemmed from workload pressures that made it difficult to find time and energy for the care of families. They therefore hoped that we could work with them to ease this workload and thus create a more equitable work environment.

We looked at this situation from two interrelated points of view, through what one might call an integrated gender lens. First, we tried to gauge the effect that the way they structured their work was having both on the quality of the work as well as on people's lives - that's the integrated part. Second - the gender part - we looked at the differential impact of their policies and practices on men and women. From this analysis, a number of interesting things emerged. It became clear, for example, that what was most valued in the

organization was the introduction of new ideas into the developing world. This meant a heavy schedule of travel, and an emphasis on conceiving new projects at the expense, often, of reaping the benefits of ongoing and finished ones.

The emphasis on travel, on what the organization called "hands-on grant making," was clearly more complicated for those, mainly women, without home support. But it had an unanticipated effect also on the impact of the foundation's efforts, since it subtly discouraged their grant recipients from developing their own expertise in running the projects that were funded. Similarly, the emphasis on being recognized for having a new idea emphasized autonomous competence over the equally important, but less recognized or valued, competence of coordinating the information that emerged and helping the organization extract the critical learning from it. The former was deemed more professional and was more frequently carried out by male employees. Thus women, and others whose coordinating contributions were equally critical for the organization's goals, found themselves less likely to meet the characteristics assumed necessary to be promoted to professional status.

These dynamics were hidden from organizational leaders, who assumed that all their procedures were effective from the organizational point of view and completely gender neutral. The potentially negative impact on both gender equity and effectiveness became obvious only by looking at the requirements of their work through this integrated gender lens. Then it turned out that some of their practices could change, not only to create more equity, but also to enhance the impact of the work of both men and women. They began to rethink the necessity of frequent travel to the field, and they moved to a team organization in the hope of downplaying the one-sided emphasis on the individual new idea as the only critical part of their endeavor.

The value of using an integrated gender lens is evident also in the famous study published in Nature about the award of fellowships by the Swedish Academy of Medicine. When a number of women extracted the records of the committee's decision criteria, they demonstrated how much stronger a female applicant's case had to be in order to be considered for an award, and how ties between male applicants and Academy members played a role in these decisions. Though seemingly only a problem for women, what this study also pointed out is how the criteria being used were not as objective as had been assumed. As with the foundation, this analysis revealed a bias in favor of one particular group, which excluded most of the women applicants but also some of the men.

Gender equity, therefore, is furthered by viewing work processes through such an integrated gender lens. By doing so we reveal taken-for-granted and largely non-conscious assumptions underlying entrenched academic practices that can then be deliberately questioned. In this way, it may be possible to find alternatives to the way that work is currently being accomplished that could be more equitable.

In a US research university, for example, one might ask whether the early pressure to produce because of the rigid tenure timetable actually leads to better scholarship in the long run. It certainly makes life more difficult for women, and a critical look at this practice might well show some unintended negative consequences also for men, as well as for overall university goals.

In the UK, one might want to ask similar questions about the research assessment exercise. One could also ask whether the quantity of published articles is the only way to judge a person's contribution to the university enterprise. Similarly, certain rules of authorship might come under question: for example, should the head of a lab, usually male, always be the first author? None of these questions have easy

answers. My point is that they are not ever asked, because the rules are so taken for granted and so assumed to be absolutely necessary for the success of the academic endeavor. Yet, most of these rules are gendered in the sense that they favor men's experiences and favor characteristics associated with masculine behavior, and thus contribute to the inequities we find in academia. Furthermore, the pressures and demands that flow from them may possibly not be optimal for the most creative work.

Lessons from MIT

This brings me back to the MIT report: what it has done and hasn't done, what we have learned from it, and what is still a problem. As you know, the women faculty in science, by working collectively and collaboratively with the administration, demonstrated to the Dean of the School of Science that there really were unjustified inequalities. Some of these women scientists, whose quality the Dean knew well, were getting lower salaries and had less lab space than men in their fields whose work was equally and in some cases less important than theirs. As soon as the Dean became aware of these discrepancies, he began to make changes, and even before the women gave him their final report, salaries and space allocations had been adjusted.

The interesting question, however, is why the Dean had not been aware of this before. All MIT salaries are reviewed once a year by the Academic Council, department by department, but this discrepancy had never been noticed. Why? The answer, I think, lies mainly in the dispersion of the women across departments. Every individual case can always be explained, and with only one or two women in each department, it was impossible to identify a pattern. It was only when the women across all of these departments got together and presented their collective concerns, that the inequalities became evident.

Once the Dean and the President began to look at this pattern, they came to two important conclusions. First, this situation will not change just by waiting. The argument that women have only recently entered these fields and all will be well if we just wait long enough clearly was not applicable here. Indeed, the percentage of women faculty in the School of Science had remained constant for twenty years. Furthermore, the problems unearthed by this committee applied to women who had made it, who were in the National Academies, who were doing significant work, and yet had fallen behind their male colleagues in compensation, lab space, and centrality within their departments. This realization led to the second conclusion, namely that there was a systemic pattern here, not something that could be explained individually, and not of anyone's design or purpose.

Four years of hard work by the women enabled the President and Dean to reach these conclusions. In the end, these women faculty were in a much more favorable position: their morale was up and their work blossomed. And there it might have stayed. A group of women who felt unequally treated had decided not to seek legal redress but to attempt collectively to prove to their Dean that this was reality not perception, succeeded in this, and through his response reached a more equitable and more satisfactory position. But they also felt that this problem existed outside the School of Science, and they feared that the dynamics that had created the situation in the first place could easily recur. They wanted to inform and educate the community.

The problem was that the data that convinced the Dean were highly confidential. The original report outlined in great detail, department by department, personal material that was very private, often embarrassing, and no one wanted it to be made public. After a number of revisions that were still not

publishable, we decided on a narrative report of what had happened, how it came about and how the Dean responded. Our intent was to inform the MIT faculty, but when the report hit the front page of the New York Times, it informed a much wider audience.

The aftermath

So, two years after the seeming end of the affair and five years after the committee started its work, the real impact began, on MIT and beyond. Before that, gender had been silenced at MIT, as at most universities. Women might occasionally talk to each other about these matters, but even that was unlikely. The women faculty in science certainly never did. Each person assumed that what happened to her was entirely due to her own behavior and thus must be deserved.

The situation is very different now. The women faculty are getting together to talk with each other and share experiences, and gender is on the agenda of the top administration, and the numbers have increased. When the women started their investigation in 1994, there were 22 women and 252 men in the School of Science, or 8% women, a percentage that had not changed for twenty years. When the report was published in 1999, the ratio was 31 women to 235 men, or 12%. This year there are 34 women and 229 men, or 13%.

If I may digress for a minute, I was interested that the Imperial College Athena report gave the 1999-2000 figures in Science and Engineering at Imperial College as going from 25-30% women among the students to 5% of the professors. The equivalent MIT figures for both science and engineering in that year are 31% women students and 7% professors, hence very close indeed.

Back to MIT - there are also now gender committees in each of the schools, there is a Council on Faculty Diversity, and a variety of new policies are being considered. What is now accepted, at least by the women and the top administration, though not by everyone by any means, is that there are subtle gender dynamics that contribute to the leaking pipeline and to the more negative experience of the women senior faculty in comparison to their male colleagues.

Now two years after the publication of the report, there is beginning recognition that the fact that most of the women faculty in science are not married and do not have children is not only an individual concern, but has serious educational implications. What we know anecdotally, and are hoping next fall to check systematically, is that female graduate students are opting out of academic careers. They take one look at the life of the female faculty and decide they don't want it. Hence this presumably individual choice is actually contributing to the leaking pipeline. It has also become clear that the junior women faculty are no longer as willing to make these same family choices, and some of the junior men are also hoping to get more involved with their families.

In a study of biotech firms, for example, we found close to a 50/50 male/female division among the scientists. When we interviewed some of these employees, most of whom had been post docs at a university and had expected to have an academic career, they told us that they preferred the biotech environment because there they could do their scientific work with proper support without having to fight for tenure, or to worry about where the next grant is coming from. Though the men also reported this feeling, it came more often from the women. The pace, they said, was different and the focus was clearer, which made it easier to combine work with family.

Hence the rules and practices, both formal and informal, that currently exist in research universities, may sooner or later prevent them from recruiting the best available talent. It is particularly important, therefore, that the university presidents, at the meeting we had, set out as one of their goals that no faculty member should be disadvantaged by having a family. We need to model a better life for our students if we want to attract the best of them to the academy.

In conclusion

This brings me to my final point. Despite the important progress we feel we have made, there still are aspects of the situation that are not yet under consideration. There still is very little awareness, certainly at MIT and I suspect elsewhere, of the gendered nature of academic rules. How criteria of evaluation, timing expectations, conventions of authorship - to name a few - help men more than women. Nor is there awareness that reputations are constructed, and cumulate from slight advantages that favor men, and slight inequities that disadvantage women. This, I think, is a key remaining challenge: to unearth the gendered aspects of academic life, in order to be able to question their continuing applicability, particularly for women faculty.

At MIT, we feel we have come a long way. We are now using the experience of the women faculty in the School of Science to ensure that women in all the schools are treated fairly, and that everyone understands the rules. What we are not yet doing, and what eventually will be necessary if we are to achieve gender equity in academia, is to question the nature of the rules themselves.

References

Marks, S.R. Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. American Sociological Review, 42 (1977), 921-936.

MIT A Study on the Status of Women Faculty in Science at MIT, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1999)

Valian, V. Why so few? The Advancement of Women, Cambridge and London: MIT Press (1999)

Wenneras,C. and Wold, A. Nepotism and sexism in peer review, Nature 387, 22 May 1997 341-343

Williams, J. Unbending Gender, Why Family and Work Conflict and What to do about it, New York: Oxford University Press, 2000

Athena publications

1999 Development Programme Reports

1 Bolton Institute - Mentoring Women in SET
2 University of East Anglia - ResNet2000
3 Imperial College - Might Mentoring Help?
4 Nottingham and Loughborough Universities - Skill Acquisition and Mentoring During Early Career Stages
5 The Open University - Beating Barriers and Constraints in HE Careers
6 Sheffield Hallam University - Progress-Developing a Mentoring Training Programme
7 Report on the 1999 Development Programme
8 The Athena Project Good Practice Guide 1999

2000 Development Programme Reports

9 The University of Edinburgh – Bridging the Gap
10 Heriot-Watt University – DRAW: The Development and Retention of Academic Women
11 The University of Luton – Inclusive Committees
12 The University of Oxford – Encouraging Applications from Women Scientists
13 The University of Surrey – Moving Up
14 Local Academic Women's Networks (LAWNs)
15 Report on the 2000 Development Programme (in preparation)
16 The Athena Project Good Practice Guide 2000 (in preparation)

Occasional Papers

1. Women scientists in higher education: a literature review (September 2001)
2. Gender Equity in Academia: Lessons from the MIT Experience (January 2002)
   Professor Lotte Bailyn
   The first Imperial College Athena Lecture

Copies of the above and information on the Athena Project can be obtained from:

The Athena Project
Equality Challenge Unit
4 Tavistock Place
London WC1H 9RA
athena@ecu.ac.uk
www.athena.ic.ac.uk

Athena publications

1999 Development Programme Reports

1 Bolton Institute - Mentoring Women in SET
2 University of East Anglia - ResNet2000
3 Imperial College - Might Mentoring Help?
4 Nottingham and Loughborough Universities - Skill Acquisition and Mentoring During Early Career Stages
5 The Open University - Beating Barriers and Constraints in HE Careers
6 Sheffield Hallam University - Progress-Developing a Mentoring Training Programme
7 Report on the 1999 Development Programme
8 The Athena Project Good Practice Guide 1999

2000 Development Programme Reports

9 The University of Edinburgh – Bridging the Gap
10 Heriot-Watt University – DRAW: The Development and Retention of Academic Women
11 The University of Luton – Inclusive Committees
12 The University of Oxford – Encouraging Applications from Women Scientists
13 The University of Surrey – Moving Up
14 Local Academic Women's Networks (LAWNs)
15 Report on the 2000 Development Programme
16 The Athena Project Good Practice Guide 2000 (in preparation)

Occasional Papers

1. Women scientists in higher education: a literature review
2. Gender Equity in Academia: Lessons from the MIT Experience
   Professor Lotte Bailyn
   The first Imperial College Athena Lecture

Copies of the above and information on the Athena Project can be obtained from:

The Athena Project
Equality Challenge Unit
4 Tavistock Place
London WC1H 9RA
athena@ecu.ac.uk
www.athena.ic.ac.uk

The Athena Project
Equality Challenge Unit
4 Tavistock Place
London
WC1H 9RA
email: athena@ic.ac.uk
www.athena.ic.ac.uk