WORKSHOP 2: PRE-TENURE LUNCHETIME 2-pg. MAIN POINTS SUMMARY
(Followed by individual table comments on each topic)

1. Does the classroom environment differ for male and female instructors? If so, how can we ensure that teaching is fairly assessed?

YES!!!
- Women are concerned with their appearance (or told to be concerned) yet it works only against us (too ugly, too pretty, too feminine)
- We all need to be aware of the data – can SSE provide summaries of the data on these issues?
- Must have both student evaluations and peer reviews
- What to do:
  - Training modules on implicit bias and metacognition before every online evaluation (consistently!)
  - Institutions need to analyze their data on student evaluations
  - Make students aware of the importance of evaluations
  - Evaluation should have specific questions rather than overall ratings

2. How can we ensure civility in our department, especially the inclusion of differing opinions?

- Civility as a technique of oppression? Reduce impact if too civil
- Activities to influence civility
- Talk to colleagues before faculty meeting
- Get tied into dept. groups
- Get to know chair/money allocation
- Get involved in how dept. is run
- Be involved in who is chair; get on chair’s advisory committee
- Require moderators to ensure voices are being heard at meetings
- Misattribution of ideas to men versus women

3. What are the most important work life or family-friendly policies for institutions to promote?

- Paid parental leave and paid family leave
- Students and postdocs should qualify for parental leave, even on short contracts; students and postdocs access to mental-health resources and sick leave
- Evaluation should be taken into account: leave but not specify why
- Grant extensions should be given and control of grants maintained while on leave
o Subsidize technician while PI on leave to keep productivity up – NSF has a policy on this issue.
o Vacation for graduate students
o Flexibility in parent leave – part-time option
o Administrators need education on policies
o Shouldn’t have to move institutions to advance care or qualify for funding
o Should have work-life balance education (like respect in workplace)
o Weight evaluation criteria different for advancement
o Not penalized for leave
o Accessible childcare
  o Subsidize/affordable
  o Facility near campus
o Have time limit to workday -- bring into culture
o Require permission to work past certain time limits
o Transparent policy on leave

4. Equitable workloads are key to faculty satisfaction. What do you perceive as the most important issues for department chairs and deans to consider as they make assignments?

o Transparency: concrete numbers and assignments made
o Equitable – the same for everyone
o Learn to say no: or ask for something in return
o Strategic assignments by gender so women don’t bear a disproportionate load of committee work
o Intro courses and new preps need to be evenly distributed. Not all teaching assignments are equal

5. What is the role of professional societies in achieving gender equity for evolutionary biologists?

o Demographic data of society membership as baseline for assessing bias in nominations and applications and awards
o Make an “Anne’s list” for society officers, symposia etc. (e.g. Society for Neuroscience”)
  o Committee of persons who find and ID diverse applicants/ nominees
  o Coordinate at society level and broader
o Ensure equity in applicants and nominees – say up front in calls for proposals that gender/racial equity is a criterion for evaluation and acceptance
1) Does the classroom environment differ for male and female instructors? If so, how can we ensure that teaching is fairly assessed?

Other input from individual tables
- Female instructors interrupted more in classroom
- Teaching evaluations may address non-academic points (clothes, looks) and could impact evaluation statistics
- Female teachers seem to be more likely to be approached by students with their personal issues
- Would teaching evaluations differ if students do them online vs. in person?
- How you dress impacts both men and women but for women the effect has a greater potential to be detrimental (could be too sexy, too frumpy, etc.)
- Need more transparency for the public about what a scientist looks like (women may not fit the mold)
- The idea of what a scientist looks like (men’s suits, lab coats) may deter young women
- Is it beneficial to make women’s science stuff “pink” probably not
- Does assessment change depending on department – English vs. Science?
- Are women assessed lower/
- Qualitatively different
- Depts. Within science differ: computer vs. life sciences depending on gender breakdown
- Differs with level of instructor
- Do students have lower expectations of women? Different expectations?
- Students and colleagues have different expectations
- Students don’t like high expectations and flipped classrooms
- Can female instructors be liked and respected?
- Attire matters
- What happens when you don’t fit the stereotype?
- Women look younger
- Students push envelope with young females
- Students input shouldn’t be the only factor
- Good faculty mentors/committees
- Inappropriate remarks on evaluations
- Sexual harassment towards males and females
- Talk about bias in classroom
- Talk about female scientists
- First impressions very important
- Students need to understand the role of evaluations
- Can evaluations take implicit bias into account?
- Do female and male students rate female and male instructors differently?
- Codified expectations of outcomes in classrooms
- Student evaluations need to be very specific and focused rather than just a numerical evaluation
- Better preparation for classroom
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- Address implicit bias explicitly
- Tackle it at higher level: culture change but how?
- How do you address implicit bias early on in classroom (example from model organisms that highlight male bias)
- Reinforcing stereotypes can be combatted with humor
- Women really need to bring their own research into the classroom to demonstrate their expertise
- Dress code: professional and distracting
- Decline in tracking evaluations
- Women expected to be nice
- Sometimes, disrespect from colleagues
- One’s empathy can carry you through
- Research instead of anecdotes
- Co-teaching with note to disentangle
- Educate peer evaluators
- Definitions on implicit bias (theater troupe)
- Add implicit bias to other’s courses
- Make student evaluations mandatory
- Language of evaluations should be carefully worded: avoid gendered adjectives
- If we know what differences between male and female
- Women not expected to be authority figures
- Rate of men to women may skew procedures: more females say see less implicit bias
- More females in the classroom – less implicit bias
- More “I think” promotes bias
- Ignore lite requests – do not respond
- Implicit bias reflects on ourselves
- Enforce strict respect early
- Be very clear about requirements
- Teaching assessment needs to be very specific, focus on content knowledge (pre vs. post tests); examine for different instructors of different genders
- Have implicit bias discussion with students
- Must have both student evaluations and peer reviews
- Expectations for females: nice personal appearance; higher availability; higher emotional load; smaller work load; less professional achievement (not thinking the female has a PhD)
- Clarifying fair expectations for the instructor can help reduce bias
- Share a schedule (students will be aware of your responsibilities and limits in time commitment)
- Specify what they should be evaluating (how soon assignments are turned back based on that instructor initially established)
- Mention presence of implicit bias at beginning of course
- Explain the impact of evaluations
- Mention professional background when introducing to class
2) **How can we ensure civility in our department, especially the inclusion of differing opinions?**

Other input from individual tables

- Uncivil department is one where people aren’t being heard, are interrupted, or the discussion are unfairly weighted
- Solutions: guidelines for discussion: don’t interrupt, be willing to share your opinion, be respectful
- Conflation of leadership and bullying
  - How do you start exchange?
  - If widespread problem with many people who want change, department retreat or meeting
  - What if being a jerk isn’t inappropriate or is seen as being in charge
  - Show that dealing with situations that way is not productive
- In class discussions, the people who don’t comment are often women and minorities
  - Need to structure the classroom differently
  - Written answers ahead of time, work in small groups
  - Be aware of the problems when you are teaching
- Agree on the priorities of the discussion as a group
- Point out to people dominating the discussion that it isn’t okay
- Won’t work if purposeful or too opposing
- Talk to those personally outside department
- Self-policing important
- Incivility in implicit bias: people who dominate conversations reinforce implicit bias
- Different discussion in England: no discussion of paternal leave; 5-year career breaks for women
- Talking about redesigning curriculum becomes uncivil
- Civility between graduate students
- Often more women than men in some programs at the graduate level
- Disparity in discussion decreases as people know each other better
- Schedule informal social events
- Male grad students playing sports with male faculty: opportunity for informal social interaction
- Gaps with international students/postdocs: meet each other through international office, they need not be alone, but need help to interact with others
- Communication, setting guidelines, not interrupting
- Group lunches to “peer-approach”: addressing problematic issues
- Reaching out to those with differing opinions, etc.
- Establishing connections
- Faculty retreats or other ways to see each other outside work setting
- Enforced integration of different factions – groups, commonalities
- Assessment/oversight among departments
- Biggest problems: resources, faction, uninformed about how departmental decisions are made
- Be polite; don’t get defensive
- Be aware of everyone’s voice/opinion: make sure everyone’s ideas are heard
  - Ask “what do you think” of everyone
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- Think, pair, share
- Get people to contribute
- Coffee hour/ informal social engagements, lunches produce opportunities all faculty can participate
- Workshops on bias? Mention in discussion on how to engage, ask questions, offer differing opinions
- Explicitly point out “another old white guy” when talking about research/papers/awards to highlight unbalanced gender representations
- Have a forum where people can express opinion free of judgment
- Needs to be leadership that promotes the culture of tolerance
- Awareness of implicit bias and importance of civility in communication seems to increase at higher power levels/age
- When there is a violation of personal rights, there needs to be clear consequences
- Rules and codes of conduct must be enforced
- Have channels of advocacy
- Take into account cultural differences in communication
- Recognize history behind divisions in life sciences departments. For example biology vs. ecology receive same resources and funding?
  - Number of faculty – cause division because of a large numbers
  - Work towards finding opportunities that are more integrated (NSF/NIH)
- Democracy in decision-making. Increase transparency especially in terms of faculty decision-making
  - People can be more interactive; include all members of faculty/ Retreats
- Communication within dept. and between dean’s office could be clearer and open
- Discussion of implicit biases and how it’s related to gender – especially in terms of hiring process. Should children be included in letters of rec? Letters of rec have more about personality? How is this viewed? Good (impressive amount of pubs while raising a family) or bad (lack of commitment)?
- Actually voice your real opinions
- Assertive vs. nonassertive people
- Include males in AWIS meetings and discussions
- Be civil; don’t be civility police person
- Repeating female’s ideas – ascribing female ideas to men
- Women cut off when speaking by men
- Equal space for women
- Staff meetings; hands up, cannot be interrupted
- Moderate discussion
- Encourage quiet people
- Teaching younger men about misattribution, interruptions
- How to prevent steering meetings with male domination:
  - Set agendas in advance; have pre-meeting: encourage small group meetings to prepare approaches to a meeting
  - Make it clear that women as well as men hold implicit bias against women and other minority groups
3) **What are the most important work life of family-friendly policies for institutions to promote?**

**Other input from individual tables**
- Parental leave policies should be constructed to maximize risk of exploitation
- Substitute technician for parents on leave, extensions to grants, evaluation
- Leave
- Productivity is expected to be more or less
- Build into rules and expectations
- Leave it totaled and encouraged
- Equitable policy
- Extensions to grant
- Policies are not exploitable
- Leave mandatory?
- Equal productivity for those on and off leave
- Are work life balance issues different between cultures?
- Children increase variance of efficiency
- Work-life leaves from hiring through promotion
- Childcare
- Maternity/paternity leave
- Funding sources require that your change institutions post PhD disadvantages women
- Negotiating for yourself: spousal accommodation, etc.
- Implicit bias against women with families
- Address bias in hiring
- Educational institutions can provide training for women with babies to negotiate
- Address biases in publish or perish culture (i.e. women with fewer higher-impact papers)
- Female service undervalued/ outreach and mentoring/ female faculty members should be valued for these activities
- Lactation rooms
- Office with a door for nursing
- Flexible hours
- Access to maternity leave for grad students
- Short-term disability
- Short-term postdoc positions limit access to maternity leave
- Brazil now offers 4 mo. maternity leave for grad students on national scholarships
- Childcare but limited access (Brazil)
- Low grad student salary prohibits family life-style
- Alternative courses for alternative careers: European system promotes with free courses
- Paid parental leave allows women to take time off
- Possibility for half-time paid leave may help parents stay around; allowed women to work with supportive partners
- Stop-time in tenure-track
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Other input from individual tables
- Flexibility in leave-taking (part-time, job sharing)
- Paid vacation
- Part-time work and returning after time off for childcare, mental health etc.
- Flex time for a variety of commitments
- Paternity leave
- Longer family leave
- Paid leave
- Tenure clock extensions
- Postdoc extensions
- On-ramps – getting back in after time off
- Childcare and children on campus and at conferences
- Part-time work
- Visibility of people with boundaries: being allowed to have a life/mental health/etc.
- More available and social acceptable access to mental health
- Forced paid vacation
- Ice cream
- Mandatory work-life balance workshops?
- Combat presenteeism and cult of first-in/last-out
- Lab culture of regular hours as the rule: healthy workday, workweek etc.
- Office for parents
- Spare office with child play area where you can work and bring kids
- Reimbursement for child care costs
- Grant extensions for maternity leave
- Technicians for keeping the lab running during maternity leave
- Advertise that other universities offer these benefits
- Get NSF to balance portfolios for institutions with women: offer family-friendly certification
- NSF funding priority for universities that are women friendly
- Policies should be applicable to both sexes vs. are these concepts equivalents?
- Administrative education and transparency for all policies
- We need a formal, legislated system that reflects informal requirements/expectations
- In instances of tenure clock-stop, tenure letter should specify to review 7 years as 5 years, etc.
- Remember family friendly should accommodate not only children but also elders
- Flexible travel to locations to see spouse if long distance
- Equal value of alterative career trajectories to academics (includes family, industry, etc.)
4) Equitable workloads are key to faculty satisfaction. What do you perceive as the most important issues for department chairs and deans to consider as they make assignments?

Other input from individual tables
- First discuss patterns we’ve observed/read about for inequity
- FIRST STEP: getting people to acknowledge that inequity exists
- Education, sciences that support existence of problem
- Keep track, concrete numbers: transparency
- N of committees served on, classes taught, time spent in/out of department; break down types: intro classes, diversity; prestige and access to leadership
- At pressure point (tenure decision) how can you deal with inequitable requests? Be direct, give evidence
- Need support: mentoring relationships/programs; even informal lunch groups to discuss such issues; give voice to yourself and others
- Assign intro classes across new and established faculty
- How to say no to expected level of engagement?
- Top-down pressure to accept assignment at career pinch points (run-up to tenure)
- Do females mentor more?
- In government jobs
  - More hierarchical than academia
  - There are women in lower level jobs and top jobs but few in intermediate management. So how do you move up?
  - Big gender stuff: women more likely to volunteer and receive requests for positions that require helping others
  - Women appointed to organizational committees; men appointed to strategic committees
- Advocacy: do you require females on all committees?
- Are men more likely to say no to disagreeable/time consuming tasks?
- Women: will they do a more thorough job with some admin tasks, or is this a stereotype?
- Are women more concerned about how people perceive them?
- Strategic representation, not necessarily having women on every committee
- Women tend to get more service requests
- Base workload on ability to juggle multiple assignments
- Don’t make assumptions about family life and how this will affect productivity
- Attempts to gain multiple perspectives taps the same small pool of minorities over and over; need more equal pools to have more equal service
- Transparent assignments for service. Be aware that not everyone has to have the same number of appointments
- Is it better to acknowledge male/female differences or not?
- We need to make the role of “service” more respectable: why is it so devalued by both women and men?
- Different loads at difference times (pre/post tenure etc.)
- Chairs share knowledge that women can say no and it shouldn’t count against them
5) What is the role of professional societies in achieving gender equity for evolutionary biologists?

Other input from individual tables
- Gather data, actual demographic data
- ASN if 37% female; research awards ?% Female (over what time frame?)
- Keep track of the data, make the data visible
- Inviting equal parts in gender, ethnicity and age for talks at symposium
- Going in at same rate but are they dropping out? Minorities/women
- Benefits of membership made clear
- Outreach programs
- 3 societies focus on activities in ADVANCE grants
- Open up implicit bias discussion to everyone, not just women and minorities
- Include male and female members, separately can have mentor groups/meetings between women and minorities
- Mentoring of women at different stages
- Continued support
- ADVANCE GRANT: include for a tri-society Anne’s list
- Professional societies should be involved to achieve gender equity
  - Lobby for better childcare and maternity and paternity leave at universities and funding agencies
  - Offer awards specific for women
  - Offer training in implicit bias
  - Publish special issues on implicit bias with data
  - Communicating with other countries who are “better” than the USA in certain areas related to addressing gender bias
  - Sexual discrimination, sexual harassment, treating female colleagues as equal; offer training in all these issues
- Provide an “awareness certification” for universities
- Train women to counteract biases through their own behavior
- COLLECT DATA: Someone shared a story about the awards process in SSE – low numbers of women applying and winning
- ASN does well with equity in officers but awards are a problem. % of winners reflect pool of applicants, but applicant pool is low
- Possibly self-selecting process on the part of applicants? Need data
- Need to collect basic demographic data at the society level
- Grad students relate that they need to be pushed by mentors and advisers into applying for prestige awards
- Need more role models of senior students applying
- The women that we do see are rock stars, or at least that’s the perception
- Blind journal submissions – would that combat some implicit bias? Hard to do for open science preprints
- ASPT and other taxonomic societies don’t have any subgroups studying this at all
- What would it take to make professional societies focus on this?
- Is it the role of societies to offer professional development?
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- If not from societies, where do people get this sort of advice? Networking and mentoring is critical to enabling participation with societies
- Maybe more opportunities for socializing as a networking opportunity
- Do female-specific awards create more problems, or do they help?
- Very aggravating to be accused of only getting something because of tokenism
- Workshops and events directly addressing issues
- Awards – negate imposter syndrome in early career, inspire young scientists when given to senior scientists
- Data on gender balance of nominees/applicants vs. recipients
- Publications – bias in publication and authorship – implicit bias
- Data on submission/acceptance by gender
- Blind review? A B Plants how many journals do this?
- Profiles online at society websites
- Women don’t put themselves forward, even at grad school stage
- Symposia – visibility, invitees, organizers – get data
- SSE has rejected gender symposia
- Explicit language in call for proposals
- Mentors/sponsors – committee of sponsors
- Providing childcare