

Appendix VII

Summary of

Staff / Faculty Mail / Phone Survey Results

Summary of Staff / Faculty Mail / Phone Survey

Demographics of the Samples

The Task Force conducted a mail survey of all Northwestern faculty in May and June of 1993, and a comparable mail survey of all Northwestern staff in July and August of 1993. The faculty survey yielded 711 responses of about 2,000 mailed, for a response rate of about 40%. The staff response was 1,650 of about 3,600 total, or a rate of slightly under 50%¹.

A telephone survey of a stratified random sample, conducted by the Northwestern University Survey Lab and containing essentially the same questions as on the mail survey, yielded 100 faculty responses, with a response rate of 83%, and 107 staff responses, with a response rate of 80%.² The results of both the staff telephone survey and the faculty telephone survey were not significantly different from the mailed versions, except in two respects. First, respondents to the mail questionnaire, at least among the full professors, were more likely to have been chairs of departments than those who did not return the questionnaire. Of the 197 male full professors returning the questionnaire, 36% (71) reported having been chairs of departments, compared to only 11% in the University as a whole. Of the 15 female full professors returning the questionnaire, 27% (4) reported having been chairs of departments, compared to only 9% in the University as a whole. These comparisons suggest that the individuals who returned the questionnaire were probably those most concerned with issues in the University and perhaps those most willing to take on a responsibility, such as being chair or returning a questionnaire. Respondents to the mail survey were also on several questions more likely to be dissatisfied with conditions at Northwestern than respondents to the phone survey. These differences did not appear on all questions regarding satisfaction, and sometimes the relationships were reversed. For example, more faculty in the telephone survey (75% of the women and 55% of the men) than in the mail survey (33% of the women and 26% of the men) felt at least occasionally excluded from professional opportunities in their department; more faculty in the phone survey (90% of the women and 69% of the men) than in the mail survey (80% of the women and 60% of the men) thought the University should provide some kind of child-care benefit in addition to the referral service and the FBRA account; more faculty on the phone survey were dissatisfied with their salary (37%) than in the mail survey (31%). Nor, when they arose, were the differences between phone and mail surveys on the satisfaction measures very large, averaging about 12% among the faculty and 10% among the staff. Because of these differences, however, we have used the phone surveys for the analysis in the Climate section of this report (Section VI), switching to the mail surveys when a question was not asked in the phone survey or when our investigation required larger total numbers than were available in the phone survey. We have noted when we are using the mail survey. On most questions the phone surveys served to validate the more numerous mail surveys, which would otherwise would have had response rates too low to be interpretable. The great congruence between phone and mail surveys overall was especially surprising because the two samples differed somewhat demographically.

An important demographic consideration was the difference in response rate by gender for both staff and faculty mail surveys. Of the 2235 Northwestern faculty to whom the survey was mailed, 26% are women, but 34% of the mailed responses were from women. Thus, although the number of males responding to the mail survey was larger than the number of women, as a percentage of respondents, the figure for women was higher. On the phone survey, the sample was purposely constructed to be comprised of 50% women. Each data set was adjusted in the data analysis to reflect the actual gender distribution in the University faculty population.³

The staff at Northwestern is about 60% women. Seventy-one percent of the responses to the mail survey were from women; therefore, again women responded at a greater rate than men to the mail survey. As in the faculty survey, the telephone sample was deliberately constructed to sample 50% women; again the data sets were adjusted in the analysis to reflect the actual gender distribution in the

¹The overall sampling error for the faculty mail survey on a dichotomous measure distributed 50/50 at the 95% level of confidence is +/- 3 percentage points; for the staff mail survey it is +/- 1.8 percentage points.

²The overall sampling error for the faculty telephone survey on the same measure at the 95% level of confidence is +/- 5.9 percentage points; for the staff telephone survey it is +/- 9.3 percentage points.

³This means that when survey percentages are reported for the faculty or staff as a whole, they are weighted to match the numbers of men and women actually at Northwestern.

University staff population. These adjustments also were made in comparing the faculty and staff responses.

The analysis that follows highlights responses to all four surveys, offering comparisons when significant differences were noted in the responses by gender or rank.

Respondents did not differ between the mail and phone surveys by race; about 3/4 of respondents were white. About 29% of the nonexempt staff are African-American, compared to about 6% of the exempt staff and 2% of all full and part-time faculty. Approximately these percentages returned the mail questionnaire (28%, 7% and 2%) and were contacted by phone (24%, 8% and 3%).

The median age of all full-time and part-time faculty at Northwestern is in the 40-45 year range. The median age in the mail survey was in the same range, but the median age in the phone survey was older, in the 46-50 year range. The median age of staff at Northwestern is younger than the faculty, in the 35-39 year range. The median age of staff in both mail and phone surveys fell in this range.

The median salary of staff at Northwestern falls in the \$20,000 to \$30,000 range, as did the median salaries for staff in both the mail and phone surveys. Median faculty salaries fall in the \$55,000 to \$65,000 range (\$45-55,000 for women, \$55-65,000 for men), which was comparable to the range on the phone survey. Faculty responding to the mail survey had the highest median salaries of any respondents, in the \$65,000 to \$90,000 range.

No significant differences were reported between the mail and phone surveys among rank, status or campus for those responding to the staff questionnaire. About half were in executive, managerial or other supervisory positions, with another fourth in secretary or clerical positions. About 45% were exempt (vs. nonexempt) in both surveys and about 2/3 worked on the Evanston campus.

On the faculty surveys, however, while no significant differences were recorded in rank, there were differences in location of employment between the mail and phone respondents. About 47% of Northwestern full-time and part-time faculty have appointments in the medical school, which corresponds well to the 45% of faculty in the mail survey but is considerably more than the 23% in the phone survey who had appointments in the medical school. About 23% of the faculty have appointments in CAS, which corresponds well to the 28% on the mail survey, but is smaller than the 36% on the phone survey who had appointments in CAS.

Interviews in community meetings on both campuses led us to conclude that the Chicago campus faculty, especially women, held very strong views about employment climate issues, including but not limited to women's issues. Many people expressed frustration at feeling isolated from the main Northwestern campus and said their views of employment climate issues were rarely solicited or heard by anyone who could do anything about them.

Thirty-three percent of the women full-time and part-time faculty at Northwestern have appointments as assistant professors (compared to 34% on the mail survey and 35% on the phone survey), but only 24% of the men (compared to 22% on the mail survey and 17% on the phone survey). Seventeen percent of the women have appointments as associate professors (compared to 25% percent on the mail survey and 19% on the phone survey), compared to 21% of the men (19% on the mail survey and 19% on the phone survey). Only 11% of the women have appointments as full professors (17% on both the mail and phone survey), compared to 39% of the men (49% on the mail survey and 54% on the phone survey). About 30% of faculty responding had held some administrative appointment during their career at Northwestern.

Significant differences in wage earner status were observed based on gender and faculty/staff status. In the faculty phone survey, 36% of the men reported being sole wage earners for their families, compared to 25% of the women. Among the staff, 48% of the men and 45% of the women reported sole wage earner status. This high percentage of staff women having the sole financial responsibility for themselves and their families should undercut the common idea that women do not need as high salaries as men because they can be supported by their spouse.

Faculty tend to be long-time NU employees more than staff. Forty-eight percent of the staff have been here fewer than 4 years (41% on the mail survey; 44% of women and 40% of men on the phone survey). Among faculty, 56% of the women have been here less than six years (60% on the mail survey; 42% on the phone survey), compared to 37% of the men (37% on the mail survey; 18% on the phone survey). Almost half the male faculty (46%) have been here eleven years or more, compared to only 22% of the women.

Promotion, Reclassification and Mentoring

Staff women and men received promotions or reclassifications since coming to Northwestern at about the same rate, and they perceived their opportunities for promotion to be similar. About 47% of staff men and 49% of staff women on the mail survey said they had been promoted and 54% of men and 54% of women said they believed they had opportunities for promotion. Overall, about 70% of staff in both the mail and phone surveys said they had a moderate or serious concern about their chances for promotion.

Faculty questionnaires differed on the set of questions about promotion and status because of the differences in career opportunities. University data indicate that only 8.9% of female full professors are department chairs, compared to 11.1% of male full professors. An even greater difference appeared in the mail questionnaire, in which 36% of the male full professors reported having been chairs of departments, compared to only 27% of female full professors. When all possible administrative appointments were combined (deans, central administration, other administration), gender differences still were striking: 76% of men on the mail survey and 23% of women reported serving as administrators.

Gender differences among staff on such issues as advice on promotion and mentoring were slight, with neither gender receiving much mentoring. Women tended to participate more in campus organizations (41% vs. 25% for men), but when women reported they didn't participate in campus organizations they were more likely to state that they didn't have time (46%) more often than men (25%), who more frequently reported they didn't participate because they were never asked (40% compared to 26% for women).

Neither staff men nor women served frequently on NU committees. Nonetheless a significant gender difference was observed in committee service, with 33% of staff men reporting they had served on committees, but only 17% of women responding affirmatively. This was not a function of choice; women and men responded at about the same rate (63 and 61 % respectively) when asked if they wanted to serve on an NU committee.

Faculty promotion advice also seemed about uniform for women and men, with the major difference being that men were more likely to serve as mentors (61%) than were women (52%). Women were more likely to know about campus organizations (35.4% compared to 7.7% men) and also were more likely (52.9%) to participate in them than men (33.3%) according to phone survey responses.

Dependents and Childcare

Staff were much more likely to have zero dependents (53%) than faculty (29%), and about the same percentages in the phone survey of staff (36%) and faculty (58%) said they had at least one dependent. But significant numbers of both staff and faculty thought benefits should be increased, particularly in the phone survey, where 79% of both groups thought benefits should increase. About half of both staff (53%) and faculty (43%) thought the University should increase elder-care benefits, although few of either staff (5%) or faculty (3%) were likely to have daily elder care needs. About one in three of both groups said they may possibly have elder care needs in the next five years.

Faculty were more likely to have a child in child care (16%) than staff (15%). Faculty were slightly less likely than staff (26% to 35%) to definitely expect to need child care in the next five years. Of those expecting to need child care in the next five year, staff ranked using a service near work or at work or someone near their home for child care as a higher preference than faculty. Faculty ranked using someone in their home higher than staff. Those faculty that used child care were much more likely than staff to have someone come to their home (54% vs. 21%) rather than take their child to a

service or someone else's home near their own home. Perhaps not surprisingly, then, faculty typically paid more for child care (\$150 per child per week median cost) than staff (\$100).

About a third of both staff (39%) and faculty (30%) were willing to substitute child care benefits for other benefits, though the phone survey showed a much higher percentage of staff (59%) than the mail survey results. Of those willing to substitute benefits, staff were slightly more likely than faculty to be willing to substitute child care benefits for retirement benefits (12% vs. 8%), tuition benefits (26% vs. 20%) and salary increases (20% vs. 14%). Both staff (86%) and faculty (76%) in the phone survey favored using a sliding-scale child-care payment program, and about three in four of both staff and faculty thought the University should try an on-site child-care program.

Staff were more likely to assign a higher ranking than faculty to health insurance, dental insurance, life insurance, child care, elder care, tuition benefits, and disability benefits. Both groups ranked retirement benefits about equal.

Faculty were more likely to need a parenting leave while at the University (15%) than staff (10%). Of those who have taken a leave, the median time was five to 12 weeks for both groups, but faculty were more likely to take a paid leave. About 20% of both groups said it was not easy to arrange a leave. There is some gender difference here. Among the faculty, of the ten men who reported having taken a paid leave, 9 (90%) said it was easy to arrange, compared to only 53 (78%) of the 68 women who had taken such a leave. Of the 30 men and 24 women who had needed but not taken a leave, 3 men and 6 women were subtly discouraged, 3 men and 2 women were actively discouraged, and no men and 2 women were denied. Among the staff, of the 18 men who reported having taken a paid leave, 14 (88%) said it had been easy to arrange, compared to 97 (79%) of the 122 women who had taken a leave. Of the 30 men and 24 women who had needed but not taken a leave, 4 men and 3 women had been subtly discouraged, 1 man and 2 women had been actively discouraged, and 2 men and 2 women had been denied.

Faculty were about three times more likely than staff (23% vs. 8%) to be very satisfied with their salary, but staff were slightly more likely to be satisfied with work appreciation they experienced (75%) than faculty (70%). A significant disparity was found in advancement opportunities, with faculty almost twice as likely to be satisfied with their opportunities than staff (62% vs. 34%). Staff were more likely (13%) than faculty (6%) to "not care" about the University's prestige, but staff were more likely to be very satisfied with the University's family-related atmosphere (34%) than faculty (20%).

Staff were much more likely (62%) than faculty (23%) to be satisfied with their own tuition benefits. Staff were also more likely to be very satisfied with family tuition benefits (21%) than faculty (11%), and insurance benefits (39% vs. 21%).

Satisfied with Working Conditions and Safety

Staff were much more likely to be very satisfied with their immediate superior (31%) than faculty (26%). But faculty were more likely to be very satisfied with job security (44%) than staff (35%). Staff were more likely to be very satisfied with the management of multicultural issues (17%) than faculty (11%), but staff were more likely to say they "don't care" about the issue (18%) than faculty (11%), according to the telephone survey.

The satisfaction with physical surroundings and apparent safety generally did not differ between faculty and staff. Faculty were more likely to be very satisfied with work safety (42%) than staff (36%), which was also reflected by the staff who said they were very dissatisfied with the physical environment (11% vs. 6% for faculty).

Staff were more likely than faculty to report feeling unsafe inside or outside buildings both in Evanston and Chicago. But about one in three in both groups reported feeling unsafe outside in the evening in Chicago. The situation was particularly bad for women staff and faculty. Thirty-five percent of the women staff who worked in Evanston felt unsafe inside on the Evanston campus at night, compared to only 4% of the men staff. Thirty-one percent of the women faculty who worked in Evanston felt unsafe inside on the Evanston campus at night, compared to 7% of the men. Fifty-three

percent of the Evanston women staff felt unsafe outside at night on the Evanston campus compared to 11% of the men, and 54% of the women faculty compared to 10% of the men. On the Chicago campus, 37% of the women staff who worked on that campus felt unsafe inside at night, compared to 15% of the men; 23% of the women faculty on that campus felt unsafe inside at night compared to 9% of the men; 45% of the women staff felt unsafe outside at night compared to 27% of the men; and 53% of the women faculty felt unsafe outside at night compared to 23% of the men. About one in four among both staff and faculty reported occasionally calling Chicago Public Safety. That did not mean members of either group took a proportional advantage of the escort service in Chicago (5% for faculty and 1% for staff) or Evanston (about 1% for both groups). That may be related to the fact that about one in three members of both groups said that the escort service was not convenient. About the same number of staff (41%) and faculty (36%) reported calling Evanston Public Safety at least occasionally. About one in ten of those who called either public safety organization said their call was not treated seriously.

Harassment and Discrimination

About a third (32%) of the faculty women who were single parents and just under half of the staff women who were single parents (44%) felt isolated at Northwestern because their perspectives as single parents were not accorded proper attention. Similarly, most women staff (63%) and women faculty (54%) felt isolated as women at Northwestern, with the nonexempt staff having the strongest feelings of isolation. Finally, 40% of the minority staff (no gender difference) and 30% of the minority faculty (26% of the men and 35% of the women), felt isolated as minorities at Northwestern, with the nonexempt staff again reporting the strongest feelings of isolation.

There were some decided differences between staff and faculty on the issue of sexual harassment. Staff were more likely to be familiar with sexual harassment procedures (62%) than faculty (54%), and more likely to report their own sexual harassment to a supervisor (49% vs. 42% for faculty), the EEO officer (36% vs. 26% for faculty). Faculty were more likely to report their case to a dean (56% vs. 23% for staff) an advocate (23% vs. 18% for staff), a colleague/mediator (61% vs. 37% for staff), and an ombudsperson (39% vs. 15% for staff). Staff were more likely to perceive a need for a women's center on the Chicago campus (64%) than faculty (51%).

Faculty were more likely to report being exposed to both sexually offensive conversation (53% vs. 46% for staff) and sexist language (64% vs. 42% for staff). But staff (15% and 17% respectively) were more likely than faculty (7% and 10% respectively) to report that the incidents in both cases happened habitually. And in both cases, staff were more likely to report that the offender(s) were of higher status (46% and 58% respectively) than were faculty (39% and 44% respectively). Only about one in 10 of the employees reported the incidents of sexually offensive conversation, and few (12% for staff and 3% for faculty) reported the incidents of sexist language.

About one in ten employees reported being exposed to unwelcome seductive behavior, and, as with the previous section, it was staff more likely to report that this happens habitually (15%) than faculty (5%), and to report that the offender(s) were of higher status (59%) than faculty (45%). Staff was also more likely to report the incident(s) (15%) than faculty (5%).

About one in 11 employees reported receiving preferential treatment because of their gender, and most of those favored (about 75%) said this happened occasionally. Faculty were more than four times more likely (22%) than staff (5%) to report that the offender(s) were of lower status. Only about one in 20 employees said they had reported the incidents.

About one in five employees said they had been discriminated against because of their gender, and about two in three who were discriminated against said it happens occasionally. About eight of 10 of the offender(s) were of higher status. Only about one in 10 said they had reported the incidents.

About one in 25 employees said someone had attempted to establish an unwanted sexual relationship, and about half of those who reported this said it happens occasionally. Faculty were far more likely to report that the offender(s) were of lower status (68%) than staff (29%).

Staff were more than twice as likely to report being exposed to attempts at physical contact (8%) than faculty (3%). Of those exposed, about 60% of employees said it happens occasionally. More than half of employees reported that the offender(s) were of higher status. Only one in eight said they had reported the incidents.

Less than one percent of employees reported being subtly or overtly pressured for sexual favors, or having someone try forcefully to have intercourse.

Results in the mail survey showed a larger percentage of staff (12%) and faculty (16%) that were uncertain if they had sexually harassed anyone else, compared to those in the telephone survey (4% for faculty, and 2% for staff). About 6% of faculty, and 4% of staff thought they might have done this.

Staff were more likely to perceive their sexual harassment as also being racial harassment (33%) than faculty (17%). Staff was also more likely to report being discriminated against due to gender (20% vs. 16% for faculty), sexual orientation (5% vs. 2% for faculty), race (13% vs. 6% for faculty), age (24% vs. 11% for faculty), or job status/rank (25% vs. 23% for faculty).

Faculty were more likely to report being discriminated against because of being foreign born (6%) than staff (3%). Few members of all employees reported being discriminated against because of religion (about 7%), veteran status (less than 1%), or any other reason (about 7%).

About 40 percent of employees said their complaints were looked into by the University, and about 40 percent said they were satisfied with the University's response to their complaint.

Appendix VIII

Separate statement of Marshall S. Shapo

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF MARSHALL S. SHAPO

TASK FORCE CONCERNING WOMEN IN THE ACADEMIC WORKPLACE

INTRODUCTION

I share many of the ideas and beliefs that inform the Report of the Task Force, although I am unable to concur fully in its recommendations. Rather than venturing a full length expression of my opinions, I shall try to highlight some rather general views on a few important points.

I wish to express my admiration for the work of the other members of the Task Force. The University is deeply in debt to all of these persons.

I am particularly grateful to those colleagues who, although they wished for a completely unanimous Report, proved generous in their acceptance of this Statement. Some of my colleagues have expressed concern that readers of the Report--and perhaps more, non-readers and rumor mongers--will seize upon this Statement as somehow representing a "dissenting opinion." Let it be understood that any fair reading of this Statement will make it clear that this is untrue, either as a matter of labeling or of content. My agreement with my colleagues is much more substantive than my differences with them.

I. PREMISES

There are several basic ideas, with attached factual foundations or assumptions, on which I rest my views:

- 1) The most desirable kinds of reforms in the area to which the Task Force addresses itself are those that achieve a marriage between enhancements of personal dignity and increases in productivity. This is so because a University in particular

should respect the dignitary interests of its members but also because the maximization of productivity will benefit all members of the community.

2) All persons should be treated in the workplace according to merit, and a significant number of women at Northwestern sometimes do not receive that sort of treatment.

3) Women as a class are in a relatively vulnerable position with respect to sexual overreaching, and there appears to be substantial evidence at Northwestern that men in various positions of authority and trust abuse their power in this regard with some statistical regularity.

4) Information is an important disinfectant in situations in which persons are not treated according to merit, and in situations in which they are abused by those in positions of power; there has been insufficient information available at Northwestern with respect to the special disadvantages experienced by women.

5) Institutions at the cutting edge of society should make available to their members ways to express grievances that protect both complainants and the targets of complaints, and Northwestern requires more mechanisms of this kind.

6) Although the secular faith on which our economy rests assumes that persons and institutions can be relied upon to act for their own good, persons and institutions intermittently act against their own long-range best interests. Where the position of women is concerned, Northwestern is no exception to these occasional aberrations from personal and institutional self-interest. Again, strong anecdotal evidence indicates that in a way that is difficult to explain on the merits, some units of the University discriminate in the opportunities available to women as contrasted with those available to men.

II. GENERAL AREAS OF AGREEMENT WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TASK FORCE

My agreement with many of the recommendations of the Task Force flows from the premises I have stated:

1) Constrained only by considerations of feasibility, the University should provide:

- ◆ More information than it does now about opportunities for advancement available to its employees,
- ◆ More encouragement to employees to satisfy their ambitions to better themselves in the workplace,
- ◆ Increased amounts of understandable data about financial compensation,
- ◆ More information, regularly presented, about the numbers of women in positions of trust and authority.

With respect to the provision of information, I note for the record that, as perhaps is the case with most endeavors of this kind, the Report embodies a mass of data which only the specialist can master. Moreover, some data which appeared potentially to be of crucial importance, sought many months ago, had not been produced by the time the recommendations moved toward final draft. The operational point here is that information becomes meaningful to individuals in small units, and that those who provide information should break it down so that ordinary people may analyze its relevance to their own cases.

2) Although the University employs a diverse group of mechanisms of for handling employee grievances, it might be wise to consider the institution of a centralized, spare process for all complainants unsatisfied with the resolution of their grievances, not limited to complaints arising because of the gender of the complainant. This process might center on one person, or an office, with "ombuds" functions.

3) With particular reference to the cluster of behaviors that go under the heading of sexual harassment, the University should communicate to the community not only its revulsion at such behavior, but evidence of its decisions that punish this kind of conduct. At the same time, the University must be meticulous about protecting both the due process rights and the reputations of those charged, but not found guilty, of such behavior.

4) One relatively specific area of agreement with the recommendations deserves particular mention. This is the recommendation that the University develop a plan on day care availability. All would agree that, in general, the heaviest part of the burden of child care in this society, and within this University, falls on women. Ordinarily, one might expect that institutions could rely on the general marketplace to provide surrogates who would carry some of that burden. For that reason, one might ordinarily be concerned about the University expending resources on behalf of its members to arrange services that they could secure for themselves.

However, the market does not appear to be meeting this need. More importantly, it appears that the University's own market position suffers because of this fact. It therefore seems proper, and even necessary, for the University to take some action to implement a day care plan for its own good: to improve its competitive position in hiring and to promote efficiency in its work force. One should note that these bonuses would arise from two sources: (1) An enhancement of the day-to-day performance of employees because they have fewer worries about who is taking care of their children (2) A probable decrease in staff turnover that seriously compromises the effectiveness of employees at all levels.

I have deliberately cast this argument in economic terms because they are many things that the University could, and arguably should, do for its employees because those things are right. But the University can only afford some of these things. On reflection, it seems to be that this is a primary case where by doing good for its employees, the University will do well for itself.

III. SOME GENERAL REMARKS ABOUT DISCRIMINATION

It is important to note that there exists a substantial body of federal and state law that condemns discriminatory treatment of women, and provides remedies against such behavior. The strategy that I have advocated above would provide information to individuals who have suffered discrimination, as well as to the larger community, that would be useful in assessing the existence of violations of the law.

Yet the boundaries of right and wrong, of socially desirable and undesirable behavior, do not stop with the strictures of the law. Indeed, we must recognize that in the University as in the larger community, many women face special problems, in the way they are treated by men--and indeed in some cases by other women. I personally have witnessed the latter phenomenon.

One may sum up these problems in the concept of attitude. A few illustrations of how unproductive attitudes manifest themselves are these:

- ◆ The failure by units of the University to provide opportunities for advancement based on the talent and promise demonstrated by particular individuals.
- ◆ A demeaning day to day tone in which those in a supervisory capacity provide assessments and give directions.
- ◆ Subtle manifestations of the view that women do not possess the abilities relevant to employment that men possess.

A particularly interesting illustration of some of these problems on the faculty side arises with reference to the definition of academic productivity. In some cases, departments tend to consign women to positions that involve heavy student contact and what sometimes are called "nurturing" responsibilities. The natural outcome of this sort of assignment is a judgment that such female faculty members are "unproductive," under a calculus that equates productivity with scholarly publication.

The most destructive aspect of such behavior is that it embodies a self-fulfilling prophecy: The able person, perceived as less able than colleagues in the group that is not the target of discrimination, does not get a chance to demonstrate relevant abilities, and is compensated at a lower level than other colleagues.

The sentence just above is "gender neutral." I have written it that way to highlight the fact that one might substitute for the word "person" in that sentence the words "women," "African-Americans," or "Jews." These groups, all offered for the

sake of illustration, have all allegedly (or demonstrably) suffered discrimination in universities, as well as in the broader society.

I should add that a potential symbol of issues likely to confront the University with the "greying of America" is a federal court decision so current that I encountered it in the hour before attending the final full-dress meeting of the Task Force. This decision permits a former Northwestern employee to proceed against the University on several counts of a complaint for age as well as sex discrimination and associated tort claims.¹

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

I do not comment in detail on the recommendations of the Task Force. However, I do express a general concern that those recommendations may tend to rely too much on the creation of a bureaucracies within a bureaucracy, and to foster a regulatory approach rather than to develop an environment that enhances personal opportunity and decentralizes decisionmaking.

I think that the most feasible solutions to gender discrimination at Northwestern lie principally in the provision of well-publicized, relevant information. Thus, I believe that the University has a moral, as well as as legal, obligation to collect and make available information about the employment and treatment of women in its many departments and job classifications, particularly with reference to salaries and other compensation. I express my strong support for the idea that the University should give effective publicity to opportunities for advancement for both faculty and staff.

The implementation of these ideas will remove barriers to achievement on merit, which arguably is the essence of fairness where discrimination is concerned. A necessary corollary to this is the provision of information bearing on the existence of legal rights in the larger world as well as grievance mechanisms within the University. This would ensure both appropriate opportunity for employees to

¹ Otterbacher v. Northwestern University, 838 F. Supp. 1256 (N.D. Ill. 1993). The plaintiff is a male.

evaluate their legal relationship to the University and for the wider community to assess the University's performance in an important area of social behavior.

The simple provision of information in these categories would go a long way to assure that the University maintains an environment that is a positive one for all its employees, women and men together.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I must emphasize that the fact that I cannot subscribe totally to the Report does not diminish my admiration for the work of my colleagues. They have started a process of institutional self-examination in which the University must engage for the foreseeable future. In their tolerance for diverse opinions, they also have confirmed that the idea of a University begins with a concern with ideas. While I have focused in large part here on practical applications, it is ideas that undergird proposals for action.