



Committee on Women in Science, Engineering, and Medicine
POLICY AND GLOBAL AFFAIRS

**FROM DOCTORATE TO DEAN OR DIRECTOR:
SUSTAINING WOMEN THROUGH CRITICAL TRANSITION
POINTS IN SCIENCE, ENGINEERING, AND MEDICINE**

A WORKSHOP

**September 18-19, 2008
The National Academies
Keck Center, Room 100
500 Fifth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001**

This workshop was made possible by the generous support of the following sponsors:



Office of Research on Women's Health, National Institutes of Health

The Office of Research on Women's Health (ORWH), Office of the Director, National Institutes of Health (NIH), serves as the focal point for women's health research at the NIH. The ORWH advises the NIH Director and staff on matters relating to research on women's health; strengthens, enhances, and supports research related to diseases, disorders, and conditions that affect women and studies of sex/gender factors; ensures that research conducted and supported by NIH adequately addresses issues regarding women's health; ensures that women are appropriately represented in biomedical and biobehavioral research studies supported by NIH; and develops opportunities for and supports the recruitment, retention, reentry, and advancement of women in biomedical careers.

The ORWH facilitates, and co-chairs with the NIH Director, a NIH Working Group on Women in Biomedical Careers that was established by the NIH Director to examine issues raised in the National Academies report, *Beyond Bias and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering*, and to respond to the challenges issued to government funding agencies to maximize the potential of women scientists and engineers. This Working Group is currently considering the recommendations in the National Academies report as well as the findings of the NIH Second Task Force on the Status of Intramural Women Scientists, reflecting on the broader context of girls and women in science, and providing special attention to issues of barriers, minority women scientists, and mentoring needs. The Working Group is seeking to develop innovative strategies and tangible actions that can be implemented to promote the advancement of women in research careers both within the NIH intramural community and throughout the extramural research community.

The Kauffman Foundation



The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation works with partners to encourage entrepreneurship around the world. The Kauffman Foundation is working to further understand the phenomenon of entrepreneurship, to advance entrepreneurship education and training efforts, to promote entrepreneurship-friendly policies, and to better facilitate the commercialization of new technologies by entrepreneurs and others that have great promise for improving the economic welfare of the world.

The Foundation works with leading educators and researchers nationwide to create awareness of the powerful economic impact of entrepreneurship, to develop and disseminate proven programs that enhance entrepreneurial skills and abilities, and to improve the environment in which entrepreneurs start and grow businesses.

Astellas Pharma US, Inc.



Astellas is a global pharmaceutical company contributing toward improving the health of people around the world through the provision of innovative and reliable pharmaceutical products. The company's aim is to contribute to better health for everyone by developing innovative and useful pharmaceuticals and delivering them to patients around the world with outstanding levels of quality and reliability. It's mission is to go beyond all others in exploring and tapping the potential of the life sciences, continue tackling new challenges and creating innovative pharmaceutical products, deliver quality products along with accurate information and retain solid credibility among customers, support healthy living for people around the world, and continue shining on the global pharmaceutical field

CONTENTS

Agenda	3
Committee Mandate and Membership	5
Biographies	6
Professional Society Statements	14
Gender Differences Project Summary	46
List of Registrants	48
Additional Resources	57

**FROM DOCTORATE TO DEAN OR DIRECTOR: SUSTAINING WOMEN
THROUGH CRITICAL TRANSITION POINTS IN SCIENCE, ENGINEERING, AND MEDICINE**

AGENDA

September 18: Framing Issues and Strategies: Where We Stand

- 8:00 am** **Welcome and Introductions**
Lilian Wu, Ph.D., IBM
Judith Salerno, M.D., M.S., Institute of Medicine
- 8:30 am** **National Research Council's Study on Assessing Gender Differences
in the Careers of Science, Engineering, and Mathematics Faculty**
Speaker: *Claude Canizares, Ph.D., MIT*
Discussant: *Joan Girgus, Ph.D., Princeton University*
- 9:30 am** **Macy Foundation's Report on Women and Medicine**
Speaker: *June Osborn, M.D., Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation*
Discussant: *Phoebe Leboy, Ph.D., Association for Women in Science*
- 10:30 am** **Break**
- 11:00 am** **Discussion**
- 11:30 am** **Panel I: Critical Transition Points in an Academic Career**
Chair: *Allan Fisher, Ph.D., Laureate Higher Education Group*
1. Ph.D./postdoc to first job (i.e. Assistant Professor)
Pardis Sabeti, M.D., Ph.D., Harvard University
 2. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor to Professor
Susan Wessler, Ph.D., University of Georgia
 3. Promotion to Upper Administration
Florence Bonner, Ph.D., Howard University
- 12:30 pm** **Discussion**
- 1:00 pm** **Lunch**
- 2:00 pm** **Backwards and in High Heels: Women Achieving in Science,
Engineering and Medicine**
*Shirley Malcom, Ph.D., American Association for the Advancement of
Science*

- 2:45 pm** **Panel II: Careers in Industry**
Chair: *Lesa Mitchell, Kauffman Foundation*
Panelists: *Elizabeth Donley, JD, MBA, MS, Stemina Biomarker
Discovery, Inc.
Andrea Vergara-Silva, M.D., Astellas Pharma US, Inc.
Lydia Villa-Komaroff, Ph.D., Cytonome, Inc.*
- 3:45 pm Break
- 4:15 pm** **Invited Remarks (oral testimony) by Professional Societies**
- 5:30 pm** **Reception – Keck Center, Third Floor Atrium**

September 19: Moving Forward

- 8:00 am** **Brief Summary of Day 1**
Rich Bissell, Ph.D., The National Academies
- 8:15 am** **Improving the Fit between Family and Career for Academic Women**
Kathleen Christensen, Ph.D., Alfred P. Sloan Foundation
- 9:00 am** **Panel III: A look into the future and the increasing complexity of interdisciplinary careers**
Chair: *Vivian Pinn, M.D., Office of Research on Women's Health,
NIH*
Panelists: *Alice Agogino, Ph.D., UC Berkeley
Stacey Gabriel, Ph.D., Broad Institute
Eugene Orringer, M.D., UNC-Chapel Hill*
- 10:15 am Break
- 10:45 am** **Q&A and Discussion**
- 11:30 am** **Summary of the workshop: Findings and Themes**
- 12:00 pm Adjournment

Committee Mandate and Current Members

The Committee on Women in Science, Engineering and Medicine (CWSEM) was established in 1990 as a standing committee of the National Research Council (NRC). CWSEM's mandate is to coordinate, monitor, and advocate action to increase the participation of women in science, engineering, and medicine. The committee collects and disseminates information on the education and employment of women scientists and engineers, and recommends ways to enhance women's advancement. CWSEM activities include an agenda of study projects; disseminating data on the Internet and at professional meetings; serving as an information resource for the national media; and as a liaison to other national organizations. Since its inception, CWSEM has published several reports and convened national conferences on women in science and engineering academic programs; women scientists and engineers in industry; and minority women in science, engineering, and the healthcare professions.

The committee will increase the participation of women in the scientific and engineering (S&E) labor force by:

- 1) Serving as a resource for organizations and individuals seeking information and analysis about the status of women in science, engineering, and medical employment and education;
- 2) Formulating strategies to collect, analyze, and disseminate information on the needs and status of opportunities for women in science engineering, and medical fields;
- 3) Reviewing relevant policies of agencies, universities, and industry designed to enhance the role of women;
- 4) Initiating and overseeing ad hoc committees to hold workshops and issue consensus reports with findings and recommendations for effective policies and programs to remove barriers to the participation of women in sciences, engineering and medicine;
- 5) Serving as an institutional focal point in support of complementary activities across the NAS, NAE, IOM and the NRC.

Current Committee Members:

Lilian Wu, *Chair*, Program Executive, University Relations and Innovation, IBM

Alice Agogino (NAE),* Professor, Mechanical Engineering, University of California, Berkeley

Florence Bonner, Associate Vice President for Research & Compliance, Howard University

Allan Fisher, Vice President, Product Strategy & Development, Laureate Higher Education Group

Lydia Villa-Komaroff, CEO, Cytonone, Inc.

June Osborn (IOM), President Emerita, Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation

Vivian Pinn (IOM), Director, Office of Research on Women's Health, National Institutes of Health

Pardis Sabeti, Assistant Professor, Harvard University

Warren Washington (NAE), Senior Scientist, Section Head, National Center for Atmospheric Research

Susan Wessler (NAS), Professor, Plant Biology, University of Georgia

Staff:

Catherine Didion, Director

Jessica Buono, Research Associate

Amber Carrier, Christine Mirzayan Science & Technology Policy Fellow

* Denotes membership in the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, or the Institute of Medicine.

Speaker Biographies

Alice Agogino, Ph.D.

Alice Agogino is the Roscoe and Elizabeth Hughes Professor of Mechanical Engineering and an affiliated faculty at the University of California, Berkeley (UCB) Haas School of Business. She also directs the Berkeley Expert Systems Technology Laboratory and the Berkeley Instructional Technology Studio. She has served in a number of administrative positions at UCB including associate dean of engineering and faculty assistant to the executive vice chancellor and provost in educational development and technology. Dr. Agogino continues as principal investigator for the National Engineering Education Delivery System and the digital libraries of courseware in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology. Dr. Agogino received a BS in mechanical engineering from the University of New Mexico (1975), an MS in mechanical engineering (1978) from the UCB, and Ph.D. from the Department of Engineering-Economic Systems at Stanford University (1984). She is a member of the Association of Women in Science and was awarded the NSF Director's Award for Distinguished Teaching Scholars in 2004. She formally served as member of the COSEPUP Committee on Women in Academic Science and Engineering. Dr. Agogino is a member of the National Academy of Engineering.

Florence Bonner, Ph.D.

Florence Bonner is Associate Vice President for Research & Compliance at Howard University. Previously, she was professor and chairperson of the Sociology and Anthropology Department at Howard. She is also the founder of the African American Women's Institute and a Senior Fellow at the National Science Foundation. Dr. Bonner has held positions in professional organizations such as Secretary/Treasurer of the American Sociological Association, Chair of Finance and Budget Committee Society for the Study of Social Problems, Associate Editor of *National Journal on Race*, Associate Editor of *Race and Society* (Journal of the Association of Black Sociologists), President of Association of Black Sociologists, Vice President of Sociologist for Women in Society, and Co-chair of the Program Committee for the Eastern Sociological Association. Dr. Bonner's professional degrees include a Master and a Doctorate in Behavioral Science from Rice University in 1978. Her research interests are in ethnic and race relations, urban sociology, sociology of the family, and sociology of deviance.

Claude Canizares, Ph.D.

Claude Canizares is the Vice President for Research and Associate Provost at MIT and the Bruno Rossi Professor of Physics. He has overall responsibility for research activity and policy at the Institute, overseeing more than a dozen interdisciplinary research laboratories and centers, including the MIT Lincoln Laboratory, the Broad Institute, the Plasma Science and Fusion Center, the Research Laboratory of Electronics, the Institute for Soldier Nanotechnology, the Francis Bitter Magnet Laboratory, Haystack Observatory and the Division of Health Sciences and Technology. Canizares also chairs the Research Policy Committee and serves on the Academic Council and the Academic Appointments committee, among others. His service outside MIT includes appointments on the Council of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Research Council (NRC) committees on Science Engineering and Public Policy, Science Communication and National Security, as well as the Board of Directors of the L-3 Communications, Inc. Canizares is a member of the National Academy of Sciences and the International Academy of Astronautics and is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Physical Society, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Dr. Canizares earned his BA, MA and PhD in physics from Harvard University. He has received several awards, including decoration for Meritorious Civilian Service to the United States Air Force, two NASA Public Service Medals, and the Goddard Medal of the American Astronautical Society.

Kathleen Christensen, Ph.D.

Kathleen Christensen founded and directs the Program on The Workplace, Work Force and Working Families at the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation in New York City. Under her leadership, the foundation has played a vital role in developing work-family scholarship and in supporting effective workplaces that meet the needs of working parents and older workers. To that end, in 2002, the Foundation launched the *National Workplace Flexibility Initiative*, a collaborative effort designed to make workplace flexibility a standard of the American workplace. She also led the partnership between the foundation and the American Council on Education (ACE) in designing and implementing the *Sloan Awards for Faculty Career Flexibility* to recognize universities and colleges for their innovative approaches in addressing work-family needs of faculty. Prior to joining the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, Dr. Christensen was a Professor of Psychology at the Graduate School and University Center of City University of New York and before that served as a policy analyst at the Urban Institute in Washington, D.C.

Dr. Christensen has published extensively on the changing nature of work and its relationship to the family. Her books include *Contingent Work: American Employment Relations in Transition* (Cornell University Press, 1998); *Turbulence in the American Workplace* (Oxford University Press, 1991); *Women and Home-based Work: The Unspoken Contract* (Henry Holt, 1988) and *The New Era of Home-based Work: Directions and Policies* (Westview Press, 1988). Her editorials have appeared on the national Op Ed pages of the *Washington Post*, *USA Today*, *Chicago Tribune*, *Philadelphia Inquirer* and *Atlanta Constitution*. Dr. Christensen is a member of the Conference Board's Work-Life Leadership Council and has served on a number of national work-life advisory boards. She received her doctorate from the Pennsylvania State University, where she was a Danforth Fellow, as well as a National Endowment for the Humanities Fellow. She has also been a Mellon Fellow and Rockefeller Fellow. In 2004, she was awarded the Work-Life Legacy Award by the Families and Work Institute for her role in founding the field of work-life.

Elizabeth L. R. Donley, J.D., M.B.A., M.S.

Elizabeth Donley is Chief Executive Officer of Stemina Biomarker Discovery. Ms. Donley is a patent attorney who served as General Counsel and Director of Business Development for the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation for more than eight years. During her tenure at WARF, Ms. Donley also served as Managing Director of both WARF subsidiaries: WiSys Technology Foundation (WiSys) and WiCell Research Institute (WiCell). WiSys provides patenting and licensing services to all of the UW System. WiCell distributes Human Embryonic Stem (HES) cells, trains researchers worldwide and conducts important research involving many aspects of HES cell research.

Prior to joining WARF in 1998, Ms. Donley practiced law with the law firm of Quarles & Brady in the areas of intellectual property law, business transactions, securities and corporate law. Ms. Donley has a law degree from the University of Wisconsin Law School, an M.B.A. in finance from the UW-Whitewater and an M.S. in bacteriology from the UW-Madison.

Allan Fisher, Ph.D.

Allan Fisher is Vice President for Product Strategy and Development at the Laureate Higher Education Group. He previously was co-founder, President and CEO of iCarnegie Inc., an online higher education subsidiary of Carnegie Mellon University, and before that served until 1999 as faculty member and Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education in the School of Computer Science at Carnegie Mellon University. During that time, he worked in high performance computing and networking research and also led the creation of Carnegie Mellon's B.S. program in Computer Science. In the late 1990s, he and Dr. Jane Margolis carried out a program of research and intervention that helped to increase the

proportion of women entering the computer science program from 7% in 1995 to 42% in 2000. This work is described in their book, *Unlocking the Clubhouse: Women in Computing*, published in 2002 by MIT Press.

Dr. Fisher received a bachelor's degree in chemistry from Princeton University, studied at the University of Cambridge, and received the Ph.D. in computer science from Carnegie Mellon University. He serves on a number of advisory committees for projects and organizations working toward diversity in technology fields, including the Anita Borg Institute and the National Research Council Committee on Women in Science, Engineering and Medicine.

Stacey Gabriel, Ph.D.

Stacey Gabriel is director of the Genetic Analysis platform and director of the NCCR-funded National Center for Genotyping and Analysis at the Broad. She oversees all genotyping, SNP discovery and production activities related to human genetics. In addition, Stacey is the scientific director of the Broad's contribution to the International HapMap Project and member of the HapMap Project steering committee. In this capacity, she has contributed to the design of protocols for genotyping, methods of quality assessment and quality control, data sharing and transfer protocols, human studies approvals and all production genotyping. While at the Whitehead Institute/MIT Center for Genome Research, now part of the Broad Institute, Stacey successfully led the center's contribution to the SNP Consortium Allele Frequency project. Stacey received her B.S. in molecular biology from Carnegie Mellon University (1993) and Ph.D. in human genetics from Case Western Reserve University (1998). She trained in human genetics under Dr. Aravinda Chakravarti.

Joan Girgus, Ph.D.

In the course of her 30-year career at Princeton, Joan Girgus has served as Dean of the College, Chair of the Psychology Department, and Professor of Psychology. She is currently Professor of Psychology and Special Assistant to the Dean of the Faculty for issues concerning faculty diversity. Prior to coming to Princeton, she served as a faculty member and dean at the City College of CUNY. Girgus has done research and published books and articles on perception and perceptual development, personality development, the transition from childhood to adolescence, and the psychosocial basis of depression. She has also written papers on undergraduate science education and on women in science. Girgus is one of the principals of The Learning Alliance, the first just-in-time provider of strategic expertise to college and university leaders. She is currently a trustee of Adelphi University, the Wenner-Gren Foundation, and McCarter Theatre, and she has served as a trustee of the American Association on Higher Education (AAHE) and Sarah Lawrence College. Girgus received her B.A. from Sarah Lawrence College and both her M.A. and Ph.D. from the Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research in New York City.

Phoebe Leboy, Ph.D.

Phoebe Starfield Leboy is currently the President of the Association for Women in Science (AWIS). She started her career as a postdoc at the Medical School of University of Pennsylvania. She then moved to Penn's School of Dental Medicine to help establish its new Biochemistry Department, becoming Professor of Biochemistry in 1976. A long-time member of the Penn's Cell and Molecular Biology Graduate Group, she was also a member of the Bioengineering Graduate Group in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. Dr. Leboy chaired the Graduate Group in Molecular Biology, the Department of Biochemistry in the School of Dental Medicine, and the University of Pennsylvania Faculty Senate, and she recently completed a term as chair of the NIH Skeletal Biology Development and Disease (SBDD) Study Section. During 2000-2001 she co-chaired Penn's Task Force on Gender Equity, and in subsequent years served as a liaison from Penn to the MIT/9 University consortium on gender

equity in science. Dr Leboy has received a NATO Postdoctoral Fellowship, an NIH Research Career Development Award; a Fogarty Senior International Fellowship, and a Lindback Award for Distinguished Teaching, as well as several mentoring awards. Dr Leboy received a BS degree from Swarthmore College, a PhD from Bryn Mawr College, and postdoctoral training at the Weizmann Institute of Science in Israel.

Shirley Malcom, Ph.D.

Shirley Malcom is Head of the Directorate for Education and Human Resources Programs of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). The directorate includes AAAS programs in education, activities for underrepresented groups, and public understanding of science and technology. Dr. Malcom serves on several boards—including the Heinz Endowments and the H. John Heinz III Center for Science, Economics and the Environment—and is an honorary trustee of the American Museum of Natural History. In 2006 she was named as co-chair (with Leon Lederman) of the National Science Board Commission on 21st Century Education in STEM. She serves as a Regent of Morgan State University and as a trustee of Caltech. In addition, she has chaired a number of national committees addressing education reform and access to scientific and technical education, careers and literacy. Dr. Malcom is a former trustee of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. She is a fellow of the AAAS and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. She served on the National Science Board, the policymaking body of the National Science Foundation, from 1994 to 1998, and from 1994-2001 served on the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology. Dr. Malcom received her doctorate in ecology from Pennsylvania State University; master's degree in zoology from the University of California, Los Angeles; and bachelor's degree with distinction in zoology from the University of Washington. She also holds 15 honorary degrees. In 2003 Dr. Malcom received the Public Welfare Medal of the National Academy of Sciences, the highest award given by the Academy.

Lesla Mitchell

Lesla Mitchell is a vice president with the Kauffman Foundation. She is responsible for leading the Foundation's initiatives to advance innovations. Mitchell joined the Foundation in 2003. She has been responsible for the Foundation's frontier work in understanding the policy levers that influence the advancement of innovation from universities into the commercial market. Under Mitchell's leadership, the Foundation is identifying critical research opportunities, defining and codifying alternative commercialization pathways, and identifying new models to foster innovation. Mitchell was instrumental in the founding of the Kauffman Innovation Network and the iBridge Network, a founding sponsor of the National Academies-based University-Industry Partnership, and leader in the replication of innovator-based mentor programs at universities across the country. In addition, Mitchell serves on the boards of Gazelle Growth in Denmark and the University of Kansas Research Institute.

Prior to joining Kauffman, Mitchell's professional background included consulting for global pharmaceutical clients such as Takeda, Eli Lilly and Clinical Data Interchange Standards Consortium. She spent twenty years of her career in global executive roles at Aventis, Quintiles, and Marion Laboratories. She holds an undergraduate degree from the University of Kansas.

Eugene P. Orringer, M.D.

Eugene P. Orringer received an A.B. (Zoology) in 1965 from the University of Michigan and an M.D. in 1969 from the School of Medicine at the University of Pittsburgh. He then moved to Chapel Hill, NC where, in 1975, after training in both Internal Medicine and Hematology, he joined the faculty as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Medicine. In 1999, he was named to his present position as Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development in the UNC School of Medicine.

Dr. Orringer's research activities have focused primarily on the membrane transport properties of the normal human erythrocyte and on its disordered physiology in a variety of pathological states, especially sickle cell disease. In addition to his own research activities, Dr. Orringer has consistently been involved in the training of young people. He has for years been a participant in numerous NIH-funded pre- and post-doctoral training programs. In 1995, Dr. Orringer assumed the Directorship of the UNC MD-PhD Program that, under 11 years of his leadership, has grown from 12 to almost 70 students. Dr. Orringer is the Principal Investigator on numerous other grants and contracts from the NIH and has been the PI on three separate K12 grants. In addition, Dr. Orringer developed and currently directs two state-funded junior faculty development programs.

In addition to these training programs, Dr. Orringer and Dr. Marilyn Telen, his counterpart from Duke University, forged the institutional collaboration that led to the combined Duke-UNC Comprehensive Sickle Cell Center. Dr. Orringer has served as a member (and Chairperson) of the NIH Sickle Cell Disease Advisory Committee, as a member of the NIH GCRC Study Section, and as the President of the National GCRC Program Directors' Association. He also served for 20 years on the North Carolina Governor's Council on Sickle Cell Disease, chairing the Medical Care & Research Committee. He is a member of the Steering Committee and the Treasurer of the Academic Health Center's Clinical Research Forum. Finally, he is currently a member of two senior level NIH Committees: the Advisory Committee for the Sickle Cell Disease Branch of the NHLBI and the Advisory Committee for the Office of Research on Women's Health. Dr. Orringer was the 2006 recipient of the Philip Hench Award and is a member of the Editorial Boards of the *American Journal of Medicine*, the *American Journal of Medical Sciences*, and the *American Journal of Hematology*.

June Osborn, M.D.

June Osborn is president emerita of the Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation in New York City. Previously a professor of epidemiology at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, Dr. Osborn is now involved in research in HIV/AIDS prevention and epidemiology and AIDS and public policy. She is currently a member of the boards of the Corporation for Supportive Housing in New York, and the Legal Action Center in New York, and the Center for Health Care Strategies in Princeton, New Jersey. She also chairs the Physician Leadership on National Drug Policy, an organization based at Brown University that brings a medical perspective to the United States substance abuse policy. Dr. Osborn earned her M.D. from Case Western Reserve University in 1961. She spent three years in training as a pediatric resident at Boston Children's and Massachusetts General Hospitals and then two years as a postdoctoral fellow in virology and infectious diseases at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine and at the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. Osborn has held numerous senior positions including chair of the National Institutes of Health National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute advisory committee on AIDS, the National Advisory Committee for the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's AIDS Health Services Project, and the U.S. National Commission on AIDS. She was also a member of the Global Commission on AIDS of the World Health Organization, and has served on the boards of the PEW/Rockefeller Health of the Public Program, and the Kaiser Family Foundation. Dr. Osborn is a member of the Institute of Medicine.

Vivian W. Pinn, M.D.

Vivian W. Pinn is the first full-time Director of the Office of Research on Women's Health in the Office of the Director of NIH, an appointment she has held since 1991. She is also the NIH Associate Director for Research on Women's Health. Dr. Pinn came to NIH from Howard University College of Medicine in Washington, DC, where she had been Professor and Chair of the Department of Pathology, and she has previously held appointments at Tufts University School of Medicine and Harvard Medical School. One of her major efforts has been to raise the perception of the scientific community about the importance of sex and gender factors in basic science, clinical research, health care and public policy. She also is

currently co-chair, along with the Director of NIH, of The NIH Working Group on Women in Biomedical Careers.

Dr. Pinn earned her B.A. from Wellesley College and received her M.D. from the University of Virginia (UVA) School of Medicine in 1967, where she was the only woman and minority in her class. She returned to Massachusetts to complete her postgraduate training as a Research Fellow in pathology at Massachusetts General Hospital, during which time she also served as Teaching Fellow at Harvard Medical School. Dr. Pinn then joined the faculty of Tufts University School of Medicine and Tufts-New England Medical Center Hospital in 1970. In 1982, when she moved to Howard University, she became the third woman to chair an academic department of pathology in the United States. She is a member of many professional and scientific organizations, in which she held many positions of leadership. She also served as the 88th President (and second woman president) of the National Medical Association during 1989–1990. Dr. Pinn has received numerous honors, awards, and recognitions and has been granted ten honorary degrees of laws and science since 1992. She is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and was elected to the Institute of Medicine of the NAS in 1995.

Pardis Sabeti, M.D., Ph.D.

Pardis Sabeti is an Assistant Professor of Systems Biology at Harvard University. She currently serves as a co-investigator on a project studying the malaria genome. She and her team received a \$2 million Gates Foundation Grant for their work. Dr. Sabeti earned an M.D., Ph.D., and graduate degree from MIT, Oxford and Harvard where she studied human evolution. She is a Rhodes Scholar and was only the third woman ever to graduate Harvard Medical School with highest honors, *summa cum laude*. Her groundbreaking research on human evolution with advisor Eric Lander has been in the world's top journals, including *Nature* and *Science*. With already over 20 publications to her name, she is an expert in the study of recent human evolution and infectious disease. She has also received a Soros Fellowship, a L'Oreal for Women in Science Fellowship, a Burroughs Wellcome Career Award in Biomedical Sciences, a Damon Runyan Cancer Research Fellowship, and was named a *Science Spectrum Magazine* Trailblazer. She has also served on the MIT Board of Trustees and is a member of the Senior Common Room of Harvard University's Winthrop House.

Judith A. Salerno, M.D., M.S.

Judith A. Salerno, M.D., M.S., was appointed Executive Officer of the Institute of Medicine of The National Academies in January 2008. From 2001 – 2007, Dr. Salerno served as Deputy Director of the National Institute on Aging (NIA) at the National Institutes of Health. In this capacity, Dr. Salerno had oversight of more than \$1 billion in aging research conducted and supported annually by the Institute, including research on Alzheimer's and other neurodegenerative diseases, frailty and function in late life, and the social, behavioral and demographic aspects of aging. Dr. Salerno also serves on numerous boards and national committees concerned with health care issues ranging from the quality of care in long-term care to the future of the geriatric workforce. Before joining the NIA in 2001, Dr. Salerno directed the continuum of Geriatrics and Extended Care programs across the country for the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). Dr. Salerno has also served as Associate Chief of Staff at the VA Medical Center in Washington, D.C and as a co-founder of the Washington D.C. Area Geriatric Education Center Consortium, a collaboration of more than 160 educational and community organizations within the Baltimore-Washington region. Earlier in her career, Dr. Salerno conducted research as a Senior Clinical Investigator at the NIA, implementing clinical research protocols for patients with Alzheimer's disease and hypertension.

Dr. Salerno earned her M.D. degree from Harvard Medical School in 1985 and a Master of Science degree in Health Policy from the Harvard School of Public Health in 1976. She also holds a Certificate of

Added Qualifications in Geriatric Medicine, and was Associate Clinical Professor of Health Care Sciences and of Medicine at the George Washington University until 2001.

Andrea Vergara-Silva, M.D.

Andrea L. Vergara-Silva is the Senior Scientific Liaison at Astellas Pharma US, Inc. Dr. Vergara-Silva received her M.D. from Escuela Colombiana de Medicina in 1990. Following an appointment at the Hospital San Vicente de Paul in Palmira, Columbia, she held positions as a post-doctoral research fellow at the Universidad del Valle Cali in Columbia, Harvard University, the University of Massachusetts, and Tufts University. Her research has focused on thymic development and T cell signaling, specifically in the expression patterns of a family of receptor tyrosine kinases called Eph receptors. She worked as a scientist at Abbott Laboratories in Worcester, MA and as Principal Scientist for Cytonome, Inc. in Boston before accepting her position at Astellas Pharma in 2007. Dr. Vergara-Silva is a member of the American Association of Immunologists.

Lydia Villa-Komaroff, Ph.D.

Lydia Villa-Komaroff is the Chief Executive Officer at Cytonome. During her 20 year research career, Dr. Villa-Komaroff held positions at MIT, Harvard University, University of Massachusetts Medical School and Harvard Medical School. As a science administrator, she has been VP for Research at Northwestern University in Illinois and the Vice President for Research and Chief Operating Officer of Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research in Cambridge, MA. She also served as the non-executive Chair of the Board of Directors of Transkaryotic Therapies. She is a founding member of the Society for the Advancement of Chicanos and Native Americans in Science and has served as both a board member and vice president of the organization. Dr. Villa-Komaroff received her AB from Goucher College and her Ph.D. from MIT.

Susan Wessler, Ph.D.

Susan Wessler received her bachelor's degree in biology, with honors, from the State University of New York at Stony Brook in 1974. She received her Ph.D. in Biochemistry from Cornell University in 1980 and was a postdoctoral fellow of the American Cancer Society at the Carnegie Institution from 1980-1982. She began her career at the University of Georgia in 1983 as an assistant professor of botany, rising through the ranks to full professor of botany and genetics in 1992. In 1994 she was awarded the title of Distinguished Research Professor which she held until 2004 when she was named a Regents Professor. In 2008 she was named the first University of Georgia Foundation Chair in the Biological Sciences. Her scientific interest focuses on the subject of plant transposable elements and the evolution of plant genomes.

She is co-author of *The Mutants of Maize* (Cold Spring Harbor Press) and of over 120 research articles. She is one of the principal authors of *Introduction to Genetic Analysis*, a leading textbook used in introductory genetics courses in colleges and universities throughout the world. In addition, she is an Associate Editor of the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences and is on the Editorial Board of Current Opinions in Plant Biology. In 1998 she was elected to membership in the National Academy of Sciences and was elected in 2004 to the Council of the National Academy. In 2006 she was selected as a Howard Hughes Research Institute Professor. She is a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Lilian Wu, Ph.D.

Lilian Wu is Program Executive, University Relations and Innovation, IBM Technology Strategy and Innovation, and a research scientist. She chairs the National Research Council's Committee on Women in Science, Engineering, and Medicine, is a member of the S&E Workforce Committee of the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable of the National Research Council, and is a member of National Science Foundation's Advisory Committee on International Science and Engineering and the NSF's Corporate Alliance.

She received her PhD in Applied Mathematics from Cornell University. Her major research interests are analysis and modeling of technology enabled and people intensive complex systems, particularly in the services sector. She is also a member of the Board of trustees of the New School University, the President's Council of Olin College, and the Global Advisory Board of Fordham University School of Business. She was a member of President Clinton's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST), NSF's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Science and Engineering and served on the Advisory Committee of NSF's Engineering Directorate. Among her other professional services, she served on AAAS's Committee on Public Understanding of Science and Technology and DOE's Secretary of Energy's Laboratory Operations Advisory Board.

Professional Society Statements Addressing Critical Transition Points in Science, Engineering, and Medicine

Association of American Medical Colleges	15
American Institute for Medical and Biological Engineering	18
American Institute of Physics	19
American Physical Society	20
American Society for Cell Biology	22
American Society for Microbiology	24
Association of Environmental Engineering & Science Professors	25
Association of Biomolecular Resource Facilities	27
American Association of Engineering Societies	29
Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine	31
Federation of Pediatric Organizations	33
Female Association for Clinicians, Educators, and Scientists	35
Society of Developmental Biology	37
Society for Women's Health Research	39
Society of Women Engineers	41
American Astronomical Society	43
Association for Women in Science	44

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN MEDICAL COLLEGES

With the establishment of a formal Women in Medicine (WIM) program in 1987, the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) made a major commitment to supporting the growing numbers of women applying to medical schools in the 1980's and to first supporting and then later enhancing professional development for women faculty in medicine and the biomedical sciences. The current profile of support includes the following:

- 1) A national steering committee of women physician and science faculty from medical schools in the United States and Canada;
- 2) Two career development programs that enhance career planning, mentoring systems, and skill-building in management and leadership;
- 3) A network of Women Liaison Officers in nearly every medical school and teaching hospital in the U.S. and Canada, and a national meeting that addresses issues of equity and supportive work environments;
- 4) An annual survey of faculty and medical school leadership positions, including benchmarking data for academic rank and executive positions.

Thus, through the WIM programs, the Association offers a comprehensive portfolio of measures, programming, and communications that directly support women in the biomedical sciences.

In addition, the AAMC- Group on Faculty Affairs (GFA) supports the advancement of women faculty through initiatives to enhance medical school and teaching hospital policies for all faculty, paying special attention to areas of inequity. This occurs through formal professional development group activities and staff initiatives. The mission of the AAMC is comprehensive and addresses critical transition points for women faculty in the following ways:

Transition	AAMC Activity
Entry into academic research	GFA and WIM meeting presentations showcase Orientation programs, often drawing attention to generational differences in entering faculty. The July 2005 Analysis in Brief (AIB) shows approximately equal numbers of women and men entering academic medicine; other AIB's (March 2002, June 2008) suggest higher turnover and lower retention for women compared to men faculty.
Retention in the faculty workforce	A new initiative, Faculty Forward, will present a "dashboard" of faculty satisfaction data relative to the work environment; data are presented by gender (and pilot data suggest important differences in men's and women's perceptions). The initiative proposes to bring institutional leaders together to compare benchmarking information and make improvements. The impact of these actions can then be measured over time and compared within schools and across peer schools. AAMC faculty roster database, which has been maintained since

	<p>1965, allows medical schools to identify retention rates and to benchmark against comparable schools. The June 2008 AIB reports rates of retention of assistant professors, with PhD's having a higher retention rate than MD's.</p> <p>A variety of resources are offered to support faculty—programs and monographs to inform research practices; an online publication (Faculty Vitae) to bring professional development information directly to faculty. (Note the issue on community based research addresses some simple tools of organizing grants; the issue on mentoring highlights research intensive institutions.)</p>
First promotion	<p>The Early Career Women Faculty Professional Development program specifically addresses academic career paths and tracks. Participants are all assistant professors between 2 and 6 years from first appointment; approximately 20% are PhDs and about 60% are actively engaged in funded research. The purpose of this program is to inspire women to continue in their academic paths and to provide guidance in accessing resources and mentors to accomplish their goals.</p>
Opportunities for institutional leadership	<p>The Mid Career Women Faculty Professional Development program accepts women associate and early full professors for four days of management and leadership training with the purpose of recognizing their potential and strengthening their institutional leadership contributions.</p> <p>The Executive Development Seminar for Associate Deans and Department Chairs includes in its curriculum sessions on successful funding of research programs and strategic thinking about departmental and institutional actions as well as sessions on individual effectiveness.</p> <p>In addition, the association works to maintain diverse membership in programs and committees, thus bringing more women into national leadership activities.</p>

In considering the critical transitions that face women in science, engineering, and medicine, academic institutions have historically considered career development and achievement in terms of moving from dependence to independent research with status awarded by academic appointment, and little attention paid to preparation for leadership. And yet, it is well known that research success requires active networks of colleagues and establishment of personal relationships with colleagues and staff. Increasingly, the academy is recognizing the need to pay special attention to policies and practices that impose small but cumulative advantages to majority men. The following table presents a perspective that might shape a discussion of a new generation of connected scientists and their pathways to leadership.

Markers of Achievement	Historically	Future-oriented
Professional development	Focused on recruiting a “pipeline” of qualified women who would “rise to the top” and be individually mentored by top scholars	Create an environment of support for work-family balance; provide career guidance and management/ leadership skills in the course of training; more use of peer and small group mentoring
Recognition of achievement	Individual “independence” from mentor with sustained RO-1 awards; excellence within a focused area	Collaborative design and shared achievements; team development that includes staff and a range of research skills and foci
Professional participation	Full-time/ “overtime” demonstrating dedication to career	Full-time/ “balanced time” with interruptions of part-time with paths for continuing engagement and re-entry (and re-direction); flexible and adaptable careers
Dissemination of findings	High status journals and peer review by select few	Rapid release and wide dissemination over Internet; broadened definitions of scholarship to include community engagement
Visibility (opportunity)	Largely related to status in field (you “earn” your opportunities for leadership by first earning your credibility in the field)	Communities of contributors with different experiences and different skills; opportunity for leadership contributions all along the career path

The AAMC considers these discussions of generational change in biomedical faculty and staff, cultural change in academic medicine, and diversity of our workforce to be critical to the ability of science, clinical medicine, and higher education to be able to serve the nation.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL AND BIOLOGICAL ENGINEERING, WOMEN IN MEDICAL AND BIOLOGICAL ENGINEERING COMMITTEE

The Need to Study Advancement of Women in Medical and Biological Engineering

Introduction

Among engineering fields, biomedical engineering (BME) has one of the greatest proportions of female students. While progress has been made towards improving female entry into biomedical engineering studies and professions, more remains to be done, particularly in the higher echelons. Therefore, additional study and outreach are needed to attain gender parity in the biomedical engineering field.

Trends in Female BME Representation

From 1998 to 2005, females pursuing B.S. and M.S. degrees in BME made the largest relative gains, with increases of 36% to 42%. More recently, more than 38% of BME B.S. degrees were awarded to females during the 2006-07 period, making BME second only to environmental engineering in fields most equally representing women. M.S. degrees also had impressive gains from 1998-2005, rising from 31% to 44% female involvement. Improvements in the percentage of women in Ph.D. programs were less impressive, only increasing from 22% to 29%, with most of the gains occurring by 2000. Nonetheless, BME M.S. and Doctorate degrees both have the third highest percentage of females, with 39.5% and 34.5% female involvement, respectively.

This trend does not continue at higher levels of experience. From 2001-2005, the proportion of female Assistant Professors actually shrank from 28% to 22%. Minimal growth occurred among Associate Professors, where the proportion of females rose from 16% to 20%. Among Full Professors, the women's share of positions grew from 4% to 7%. In 2005, only about 22% of Assistant Professors, 20% of Associate Professors, and less than 10% of Full Professors of BME were female.

Why understanding female preference for BME is important

In spite of continued male domination of the BME discipline, it still has one of the highest proportions of women of any engineering subfield. Understanding why women prefer BME might provide valuable insights on how to broaden engineering curricula or other factors to attract more females to engineering as a whole. AIMBE plans to spearhead this effort through focus groups with key constituencies, workshops, seminars, and mentoring programs and the activities of its Women in Medical and Biological Engineering Committee.

The American Institute of Medical and Biological Engineering (AIMBE) represents the top minds serving both public and private interests working to advance medical and biological engineering. AIMBE's Women in Medical and Biological Engineering Committee, consisting of members from corporate, academic, and government institutions, celebrates women's contributions to both the field and to the health and well-being of our society.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PHYSICS

Stressors in Careers for Women in Physics

Aggregated data from physics faculty members and department chairs show that women are represented on physics faculties at rates consistent with PhD production in the past (Ivie and Ray, 2005). Once women have earned a PhD in physics, a small, but representative, number of them are able to advance up the academic ladder.

However, this does not mean that women in physics do not encounter barriers to advancement in their careers. One area of inequality is salary. Controlling for years of experience and sector of employment, women physicists in academe earned 5% less on average than men. The salary gap exists not only in academe, but also in other sectors of employment for physicists, including industry and government labs (Ivie and Ray, 2005).

In addition to receiving lower salaries, women often work in hostile environments. Since 1990, the Committee on the Status of Women in Physics of the American Physical Society has conducted site visits at the request of physics departments to assess the climate for women. These site visits and surveys of other groups (Ivie and Guo, 2006; Ivie, Czujko, and Stowe, 2002) continue to document hostile environments for women physicists. Women physicists often report that they have encountered behaviors ranging from being ignored to blatant sexual harassment and that these behaviors affect them deeply.

Physics is a relatively small field, so why should the committee be concerned with these trends? First, compared to other scientific disciplines, physics is last in terms of representation of women. During the last several years, for example, between 13% and 18% of PhDs in physics have been earned by women. These are significantly lower rates than mathematics, chemistry, and the life sciences. Secondly, physics has detailed data that are not available to other disciplines. For example, we have data on the average time since doctorate for academic physicists by rank. These data can be used to gain a better understanding of the situation in physics and as a model of data that should be collected for other disciplines. Most importantly, physics offers a wide range of career options. Women should be encouraged to pursue physics, not turned away by salary differences and the bad behavior of a few. Finally, evidence and logic suggest women are treated differently in physics than they are in other sciences. Perhaps some of these differences are to women's benefit (such as advancement into faculty positions), but many are not. Our understanding has advanced beyond the point of studying women in science as if it is homogenous. Rather, we should look at differences among scientific disciplines for a more thorough understanding of the problem.

References

- Ivie, R., R. Czujko, and K. Stowe. 2002. "Women Physicists Speak." <http://www.aip.org/statistics/trends/reports/iupap.pdf>
- Ivie, R. and S. Guo. 2006. "Women Physicists Speak Again." <http://www.aip.org/statistics/trends/reports/iupap05.pdf>
- Ivie, R. and K. N. Ray. 2005. "Women in Physics and Astronomy, 2005." <http://www.aip.org/statistics/trends/reports/iupap05.pdf>

AMERICAN PHYSICAL SOCIETY, COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN PHYSICS

The participation of women in the sciences is increasing, but not in a uniform way across all disciplines. The recent advances of women in the biological sciences have not been matched in the physical sciences. Even among the physical sciences, the inclusion rates are not equal. From 1991 to 2000, the percentage of Ph.D. degrees awarded to women in all science and engineering fields increased from 28.9% to 36.2%. In physics the increase was from 11.0% to 13.5%. Yet the percentage of women in physics faculty positions at doctoral institutions is still only 7%. When compared to some other disciplines [1] physics has a pipeline that is not only leaky but also tiny [2, 3]. The Committee on the Status of Women in Physics (CSWP) of the American Physical Society (APS) works to address this under-representation of women in physics at all levels from undergraduate students to full professors and on into prominent leadership roles in the field. The goals of CSWP address diversity throughout the entire career path to give tools to women physicists that will best allow them to succeed and advance in the current environment.

Currently, women are severely underrepresented in the physical sciences and engineering [4]. As of 2003, women receive 22% of the BS/BA degrees in physics, but only 18% of the PhDs, and only 5% of full professors in physics were women in 2002 [5]. In addition, women are less likely than their male peers to be nominated for prestigious prizes and awards [6, 7, 8].

CSWP works to increase the inclusion of women in physics. Recently (May 2007), they held a workshop on Gender Equity (www.aps.org/programs/women/workshops/gender-equity.cfm) that involved the chairs of 50 top physics departments and 14 unit leaders from national laboratories. This highly successful workshop was the first stage in an overall effort to instigate institutional transformation in the field of physics by creating change agents. The Gender Equity Workshop produced a set of “best practices” guidelines to help any department improve its climate. The committee has numerous other programs (e.g., travel grants, job registry, listserv) and publications (CSWP Gazette) to aid and support women physicists in their career development as well as improve the climate in general. A follow-up conference will be held in May 2009 to assess the progress made by the departments and national labs resulting from the original workshop.

Other committee activities include the speaker program, which exposes more students to female scientists and gives these women some exposure [9]. Site visits by representatives of the committee to university physics departments and national laboratories help improve the climate for women in these settings. The new website for departments to enter information about their family friendly policies for graduate students (www.aps.org/programs/women/female-friendly) allows individual departments to showcase their efforts; to date, more than 160 departments have responded.

In 2005, with the support of the NSF, APS launched a series of three successful career development workshops held in conjunction with national APS meetings. These were modeled on a successful outline developed by the Committee for the Advancement of Women in Chemistry (COACH). The workshops focused first on strengthening communication skills of the participants and second on negotiating strategies for career advancement. Each workshop was

aimed at a different population: tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty, and those in non-academic physics research.

NSF has provided funding for additional workshops (2008-2010) which target postdoctoral associates as well as women physicists in academia and research and has made special efforts to recruit women of color as participants (see <http://www.aps.org/programs/women/workshops/skills/index.cfm>). Two international conferences on women in physics sponsored by IUPAP (International Union of Pure and Applied Physics, 2002 and 2005) identified the postdoctoral associate career stage as the point when women are most likely to leave physics [10].

CSWP maintains a presence at the two major annual meetings of the APS by sponsoring an invited session at each. It also hosts receptions at both. This year it provided modest childcare grants to early career attendees at these meetings.

References

1. V. Kuck “*Refuting the leaky pipeline hypothesis*”, C&EN November (2001). <http://pubs.ace.org/cen>
2. Science and Engineering Doctorate Awards (2000). NSF 02-305.
3. Howard Georgi “*Is there an unconscious discrimination against women in science?*” APS News, Jan (2000). <http://www.aps.org/apsnews/0100/010016.html>
4. National Science Foundation (NSF). *Women, Minorities and Persons with Disabilities in Science and Engineering: 2007*. NSF 07-315. Washington, DC. Table H-5, Employed scientists and engineers, by occupation, highest degree level, and sex: 2003. <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/wmpd/employ.htm>
5. R. Ivie, S. Guo, & A. Carr, *2004 Physics & Astronomy Academic Workforce*. American Institute of Physics Statistical Research Center, College Park, MD (2004). <http://www.aip.org/statistics/trends/reports/awf.pdf>
6. G. Sonnert and G. Holton. “*Gender differences in science careers: the Project Access Study*”, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, NJ (1995).
7. V. Valian, “*Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women.*” MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, (2000) 233-234.
8. M. Urry, *Speeding up the long slow path to change*, American Physical Society News, February 2003. <http://www.aps.org/apsnews/0203/020306.html>
9. APS Women Speakers Program <http://www.aps.org/programs/women/speakers/index.cfm>
10. Meg Urry “*The Status of Women in Physics – An international meeting on what why and how to change*” (2002). <http://units.aps.org/units/fps/newsletters/2002/july/urry.pdf>

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR CELL BIOLOGY

Proposal for Enhancing the Number of Women Scientists and Physicians in Leadership Positions

The Women in Cell Biology Committee (WICB) of the American Society for Cell Biology (ASCB) has multiple mentoring programs that address critical early transitions from doctorate to post-doc to jobs. These include a mentored Career Lunch at the annual ASCB meeting, a monthly career advice column in the ASCB newsletter, and downloadable publications including *Life Sciences Research & Teaching: Strategies for the Successful Job Hunt* and *Career Advice for Life Scientists* (CALs), Volumes I and II. New this year, with funding from the Elsevier Foundation, are competitive grants to help pay for childcare so that the primary care-giving parent can attend the ASCB Annual Meeting. The Office of Research on Women's Health at NIH is funding a third CALs volume. Thus, we have experience with effective approaches to help advance women from their graduate training into their first professional positions.

However, little energy or innovation has been applied to the opposite end of the professional spectrum – dealing with the dearth of women in leadership positions like deans and directors. Although it may be assumed that this problem will self-correct when enough women are in the pipeline, it is also likely that it will not. Two converging patterns currently work against institutions in finding a woman scientist/physician candidate pool for these positions: 1) Institutions that seek chairs, directors, and deans screen candidates who are typically in their early 50's, 2) Among the many successful women scientists/physicians in this age group, there are few with institutional administrative experience, since most have focused almost exclusively on their research and therefore have eschewed administrative responsibilities.

Why would 50-year-old women (as opposed to men) not have administrative experience?

It is widely acknowledged that being a successful scientist/physician requires maximal efforts and is highly competitive. Thus, whatever distracts from this effort places a scientist at risk of failing in her or his chosen career. This includes administration. It is not surprising that many early- and mid-career scientists/physicians currently choose not to divide their attention further or decrease research/teaching/clinical responsibilities. Taking on leadership responsibilities often incurs a risk to one's success as a scientist/academic. The scholar's life is, after all, the career for which one trained, the embodiment of one's emotional investment, and the challenge that drives one forward daily.

Many women scientists/physicians are routinely balancing management of home/family and management of research, and therefore are, in fact, developing their "administrative skills." However, this administrative experience will not show up as lines on a resume or CV, nor will these scientists appear on a radar screen or on a list of optimal candidates for dean/director positions. We hypothesize that women under age 50, specifically those with children, obtain their "management fix" at home, and have no need to seek management opportunities at work. However, once the children leave home, these women now need an outlet for these skills, and are primed for taking on leadership roles at work.

We propose a two-pronged approach:

First, we propose that the time clock imposed by our institutions for advancement to leadership, which traditionally begins for candidates in their mid-40's, could be re-set to 10-15 years later for women than men. This is not to exclude younger women ready to take on leadership roles earlier. However, this means that "older women" should be intentionally screened in a candidate pool. Recruiting them for these positions would also reflect the reality of our current potential individual life spans and the corresponding duration of an effective career.

Second, we propose the institution of management training courses that promote administrative skills, where the emphasis for early- and mid-career women scientists/physicians would be on the balancing of career and family pressures. Such training will give women the tools for "conventional" administrative positions at such time that these positions seem appealing. Such training would also be offered to senior scientists/physicians. Thus, we would give women the tools for administration at a high level (and a credential testifying to this), whether early in their career when they are doing a balancing act, or later when they are ready to take on a different emphasis. The long-term benefit is that participants' management skills will be sharpened and available for application to leadership positions after the primary parenting responsibilities have lessened or passed.

We predict that institutions choosing leaders from the mature-scientist/physician group of women will find outstanding, analytic, well-balanced leaders. Women in their 50's and 60's often describe feeling liberated, with boundless energy to apply to their careers. If they are armed with both management skills and a successful scientific career, they would be in an excellent position to successfully take on positions of dean or director.

Any discussion of the "glass ceiling" in leadership positions needs to focus on understanding that the current pattern of advancement fits the career pattern of a male scientist who is not a primary caregiver, not the pattern of many of our most talented women scientists. The challenges that women scientists/physicians face – in particular the role of being both mentors *and* role models, the limitations imposed by inflexible schedules and unrealistic time frames, and the dichotomy between how recruitment currently works and how it should work – have evolved in a previously male-dominated field.

To take advantage of the outstanding women requires attention at early-, mid-, and late-career stages. Efforts are needed at the department and institution level, as well as through leadership by NIH, NSF, AAMC, and other federal entities and professional societies. This proposal adds to what has already been implemented for early career mentoring by the ASCB.

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR MICROBIOLOGY, COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN MICROBIOLOGY

The Committee on the Status of Women in Microbiology (CSWM) of the American Society for Microbiology has discovered that women leave science at critical transition points in their careers. Women leave the field of Microbiology between two-year undergraduate college and four-year undergraduate college, between undergraduate college and graduate school, between graduate school and potential post-doctoral positions, between post-doctoral positions and higher, permanent career positions. Women also leave the field if they have spent any amount of considerable time away from the field, for example to raise children; in attempting to return to the field, they feel that they have lost considerable experience time and can no longer be competitive.

The CSWM has recently identified that women microbiologists who are at the post-doctoral level are a group that have their own specific problems, and that the "leave rate" at this juncture is especially pronounced. The CSWM conducted a survey of women attending the annual general meeting of the society in 2007-2008. This survey was geared specifically toward the post-doctoral career level.

While there can be many reasons that women will leave the field of Microbiology, the CSWM has identified two significant potential causes. One perceived cause is the lack of mentoring. Women, and men for that matter, are mentored during their undergraduate college years by their professors. This mentoring again occurs during the graduate years by their appropriate discipline mentors. However, once women are in a post-doctoral position in academia or in industry, the mentoring slowly ceases. Post-doctoral-level scientists are expected to perform independently. Men often have other male colleagues on whom to rely; a woman may be the only woman in that facility. Without sufficient networking support, a woman might be impeded from moving into a higher career position.

Another potential cause is salary. A microbiologist with a bachelor's degree is severely limited in salary and in upward mobility because of the lack of education. The obvious choices are to leave the field or go to graduate school. Unfortunately, the science fields almost demand that further education be sought. If graduate school is chosen, the scenario does not always significantly improve. Often, in academia, it is expected that a doctoral-level microbiologist will then follow with a post-doctoral position; post-doctoral positions do not generally pay well. A doctoral-level scientist has a professional graduate degree. However, in comparison to other professional graduate degrees, such as attorneys or physicians, the post-doctoral scientist in academia is paid very little for the equivalent time that was spent obtaining the degree. If the post-doctoral scientist is unable to locate a self-sustaining, tenure-track academic appointment, the obvious choices are, very disappointingly, to remain as a post-doc or leave the field.

ASSOCIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING & SCIENCE PROFESSORS

Critical Transition Points in Environmental Engineering

Current Status of Environmental Engineering

Environmental engineering is a recognized specialty on professional engineering licensing exams. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics counts over 54,000 environmental engineers employed in the U.S. and Jones et al. (2005) reported the upper range may be as high as 100,000. As a profession, environmental engineering is significantly larger than biomedical, materials, and chemical engineering (which only employed 14,000, 22,000, and 30,000 engineers respectively in the U.S. in 2006). Environmental engineering is 1 of 2 engineering disciplines the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts will have "much faster than average growth" over the next 10 years. In addition, the projected 25% growth in the number of environmental engineers to 68,000 by 2016 is the largest of any engineering discipline. In contrast, overall engineering growth will be 11%.

Gender Diversity in Environmental Engineering

The Association of Environmental Engineering and Science Professors (AEESP) completed a study of the diversity of students and faculty of named environmental engineering degree programs (2005). AEESP's survey concluded that the environmental engineering student body has better gender diversity than the field of engineering as a whole. Women received 42, 42, and 31% of environmental engineering BS, MS, and Ph.D. degrees, respectively, in 2003–2004 compared with 20, 22, and 17% of BS, MS, and Ph.D. degrees from all of engineering (ASEE 2004). Gender diversity was lower among environmental engineering faculty (14.9% women), but higher than all engineering faculty (9.9% women). Women appeared to be better represented in the environmental engineering workforce (22% female) than in all engineering (11% female) (Bhandari et al., 2006). Unfortunately, we have no data on the transition of female environmental engineering faculty members to administrative positions (e.g., chair, dean, provost).

Transition Points and Methods to Increase Diversity

The data suggest that environmental engineering still has room to add additional female representation between pre-college and undergraduate years. In addition, because environmental engineering degrees are not keeping up pace with the demands of engineering workforce demand, there is still a large pool of positions at universities and in practice that could be filled by females. For example, environmental engineering practitioners (Selna et al., 2006) have documented a steady decline in enrollment in MS Environmental Engineering programs (up to 50% at some institutions) in the past 10 years, while issues such as population trends, changing regulatory requirements, and decaying infrastructure have created an even larger demand.

The decrease in percent female involvement in environmental engineering is much larger during the transition from MS to PhD and even greater during the transition from PhD to academic

positions. Thus, in environmental engineering, efforts need to be made to recruit (and retain) more women into doctoral and academic environmental engineering positions.

Many of our members have collected data that supports the work of others that suggests underrepresented groups in engineering, particularly women, are attracted to careers where they feel that they can have a positive impact on society. A review of enrollment in some sustainability initiatives supports our belief that educational and research experiences related to the environment and sustainability, with their focus on societal impact and interconnectedness, hold broad appeal to students, especially to young women (Bielefeldt, 2006; Mihelcic et al., 2006; Hokanson et al., 2007; Zimmerman and Vengas, 2007). For example, interviews of incoming male and female Master's International environmental engineering students (a graduate program that combines the MS environmental engineering degree with service in the U.S. Peace Corps) that have a first degree in engineering other than civil or environmental, clearly indicate they look for connections between engineering and society. In fact, female Master's International environmental engineering students with first degrees in Mechanical, Chemical, and Electrical Engineering have joined the program for reasons that include: merging personal convictions with career; wanting to learn how to apply technology that is culturally, economically, and socially suitable; and, seeking a change so they can apply their engineering skills for the protection of ecosystems and natural resources (Mihelcic, 2004). This message may also resonate with other underrepresented groups who may be attracted into these types of programs to improve the living conditions in their cultural origins (Mihelcic et al., 2006).

References

1. American Society of Engineering Education _ASEE (2004). "Engineering College Profiles and Statistics for 2004," <http://www.asee.org/about/publications/profiles/index.cfm>, accessed, Jan.2006.
2. Bielefeldt, A. "Attracting Women to Engineering that Services Developing Communities," *Proceedings of the Conference of the American Society for Engineering Education*, 2006.
3. Hokanson, D.R., J.R. Mihelcic, L.D. Phillips, "Educating Engineers in the Sustainable Futures Model with a Global Perspective: Education, Research & Diversity Initiatives," *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 23(2): 254-265, 2007.
4. Jones, S. et al., An Initial Effort to Count Environmental Engineers in the USA, *Environmental Engineering Science*, 22(6):772-787, 2005.
5. Bhandari, A., Jones, S., Clapp, L., Fennell, D., LaPara, T. "Diversity in environmental engineering—Successes and Challenges." *Journal of Environmental Engineering*, pg. 701-702, July, 2006.
6. Mihelcic, J.R. "Educating Tomorrow's Global Engineer through a Unique Partnership with the U.S. Peace Corps," *Woman Engineer*, 30-33, Fall, 2004.
7. Mihelcic, J.R., L.D. Phillips, D.W. Watkins, Jr., "Integrating a Global Perspective into Engineering Education & Research: Engineering International Sustainable Development," *Environmental Engineering Science*, 23(3): 426-438, 2006.
8. Selna, M.W., H.T. Glaser, R.R. Trussell, G.R. Chan, M. Sullivan, "Declining Enrollment has Water and Wastewater Professionals Concerned," *Proceedings of the 79th Annual Water Environment Federation Conference & Exposition*, 2006.
9. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, <http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos027.htm>
10. Zimmerman, J.B. and J.A. Vanegas, "Using Sustainability Education to Enable the Increase of Diversity in Science, Engineering, and Technology Related Disciplines," *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 23(2):242-253, 2007.

ASSOCIATION OF BIOMOLECULAR RESOURCE FACILITIES

Approximately 50% of the membership in the Association of Biomolecular Resource Facilities (ABRF) is comprised of scientists working in core facilities, i.e., a biological resource facility. A core facility, whether it resides in an academic, government or industrial sector, provides affordable access to technologies and expertise that would otherwise be too expensive for most individual labs to acquire, such as proteomics-related techniques, mass spectrometry, DNA sequencing and analysis, bioinformatics and N-terminal protein sequence analysis.

The critical transition point in a core facility career is from bench scientist to core facility director. The role of the bench scientist is to maintain a high working level of technological proficiency in the techniques currently offered as a service by the laboratory while continuing to expand their skill set to incorporate the latest technological advances. In an ABRF survey study published in *Nature* in 2000 [1], across all core facility sectors, the percentage of male employees holding MDs or PhDs was significantly greater than the percentage of female employees (24% to 9% respectively). The government core facilities showed the highest level of disparity – 39% male MD or PhD vs. 7% female MD or PhD among all employees (N=42 government employee respondents). Of all the male employees hired by government-run core facilities, 54.6% hold MDs or PhDs. Among all the female employees hired by government-run core facilities, 19.4% hold MDs or PhDs.

In contrast to national trends, there is no significant difference in salaries for men and women at the same degree level at core facilities [1] in all sectors. Since compensation for men and women holding PhDs in core facilities is equal, why do the numbers of men and women at the PhD level working in core facilities differ significantly? These discrepancies raise the important question as to whether women with PhDs are represented in the job applicant pool in the expected ratio and whether women are selected for core facility director positions in numbers that are reflective of their overall numbers within the field. If the former do not contribute to the skewed ratios, one potential reason for the disparity could be gender hiring biases.

Alternatively, the number of years on the job could have also skewed the results if more female PhDs were newer hires (data not reported), as newer employees feeling increased job stresses might be less likely to respond to such a survey. The critical question remaining is whether these skews translate into fewer female core facility scientists entering director positions, as most facility directors hold advanced degrees. As this study is somewhat dated, it is important to readdress, perhaps with a new comprehensive survey, whether these disparities still exist in core facilities, especially now when women and men in the sciences are earning their PhDs at nearly equal rates [2].

There is no tenure system in most core facilities. The lack of a tenure system sets a core facility career and other traditional academic careers apart. The ABRF as an organization could potentially provide the resources, such as a mentoring program, to help women scientists along a career track from bench scientist to core facility director in the absence of other institutional support such as tenure reviews and departmental support. Currently, there are no such programs established. The paucity of such mentoring programs is not uniquely felt by core facility scientists, as the current cohort of women chemists in academia reported mentoring gaps and

gender biases at some point during their careers [3]. It is not clear whether the lack of such programs indicates that there is limited interest in mentoring female scientists who wish to become core directors or if few female scientists are on such a track and seeking assistance. With the growing need for proteomics, bioinformatics and genome sequencing services, core facilities are in high demand and now found at almost every major research university and medical center. This growth translates into more job opportunities for women scientists. Given the rapid growth of this relatively young career path, the absence of mentorship support and the unequal numbers of male and female employees holding advanced degrees in core facilities, the ABRF and its members believe it would be desirable to learn about and implement proven strategies to help female members rise from the ranks of scientist to core facility director.

The ABRF requests that this statement be considered at the upcoming workshop so as to highlight a distinct new career path for women scientists and some of the unique barriers they may have to overcome while pursuing the career as core director. During the transition from scientist to director, a woman faces professional challenges similar to those faced by faculty members as well as by university administrators and personal challenges faced by all working female scientists [2]. Therefore, they are entitled to the same training and mentoring programs available to these other professionals.

References

1. McMillen, D.A., et al., *Job compensation in the biotechnology core laboratory*. Nat Biotechnol, 2000. **18**(6): p. 686-9.
2. Byko, M., *Challenges and opportunities for women in science and engineering*. Journal of Materials, 2005. **57**(4): p. 12-17.
3. Nolan, S.A., et al., *Training and mentoring of chemists: a study of gender disparity* Sex Roles, 2008. **58**: p. 235-50.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF ENGINEERING SOCIETIES ENGINEERING WORKFORCE COMMISSION

Percentage of Women Earning PhD's in Engineering Continues to Climb

Introduction

While more women than men pursue college degrees, more than five times as many men earn engineering bachelors degrees. The numbers are similar at the PhD level and the data does not promise statistical parity any time soon: women are now earning 20 percent of the Ph.D.'s in engineering—way up from the 4 percent of the 1960s, but still far behind the rate they are winning doctorates in other fields.


EWC Background

For more than 50 years the Engineering Workforce Commission has been committed to assessing America's technical and engineering workforce. The EWC tracks the entire engineering student population in U.S. colleges and universities. In a series of annual surveys, the EWC collects data that is used to predict the ebb and flow of new engineering professionals, including the participation rates of women and minorities.

Statistical Data

Women earning PhD degrees in engineering continue to grow at a rapid pace. The 2007 class grew by 498 students and stands at 8,614 according to the Engineering Workforce Commission's survey report *Engineering & Technology Degrees, 2007*. This marks a 6 percent increase over 2006, not as dramatic as the 11.5 percent increase from last year, but still exhibiting strong growth.

Starting in 1999, the number of PhD's in engineering began to grow, although the number dipped down in 2002. These rising numbers suggested a subsequent increase in women earning PhD's in engineering, which indeed began to happen in 2000.



For the last ten years, women have been increasing as a percentage of PhD degrees in engineering. From 1998 to 2007, the percentage has risen from 12.3 percent to 19.6 percent . There is no doubt that women have come a long way from the sub 5 percent days in the 1960's and 1970's but 20 percent is still much further below most other fields of study.

While the high participation rate of foreign nationals in graduate engineering is nothing new, it has been growing in the past few years. American women account for 14 percent and 8 percent of the master's and doctoral totals. Foreign national women earned nearly as many degrees: At the master's level, American women earned 5,226 degrees; foreign national women 3,505. At the doctoral level, American women earned 669 and foreign national women 923.

Bottom Lines

Recent undergraduate engineering enrollment trends seem to indicate that long-term gains in numbers of women awarded engineering bachelor degrees are in serious jeopardy. Enrollment data shows that the percentage of women earning bachelor's degrees may be decreasing in the near future. The percentage of female freshman engineering students reached an all-time high of 19.9 percent in 1995. In 1996, that percentage remained unchanged, but since then it has been decreasing. In 2006, it stood at 17 percent. At the graduate level, the numbers tell a different story, but only short term if the undergraduate decrease is not turned around.

There needs to be a study to explore the various factors that lead women to enroll in some PhD programs and not others. Perhaps part of the issue lies in the dearth of women engineering faculty, particularly the number of women engineering Deans, Directors or Chairs currently set at 11.3%.

EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP IN ACADEMIC MEDICINE (ELAM)[®]

Ensuring Success of Women Scientists in Senior Leadership Positions: Continuum of Education and Support

The number of women scientists, physicians and dentists advancing into leadership positions in academic health centers (AHCs) has progressed very slowly during the past 25 years. There is a need for a critical mass—a stable cohort of senior women leaders—if we are to change the organizational culture which remains woefully inadequate to fit the needs of the increasingly diverse workforce, students and patients of the 21st century. Further, we are losing some of our best talent and role models, as senior women leaders disappear from our institutions. Our thesis is that: (a) the situation will not alter without explicit interventions, (b) increased attention needs to be given to ensuring that women leaders have *sustained success in their leadership roles* so that; (c) *a critical mass of experienced women leaders* is available to bring about essential organizational culture change.

The ELAM program, now in its 14th year, has educated over 500 senior women faculty for leadership in academic health centers (see www.drexelmed.edu/elam). The curriculum of this year-long part-time program focuses on three main areas – mini-MBA with emphasis on finance, strategic planning, and organizational design and dynamics; personal professional assessment and development; and emerging issues facing our institutions – together with building a close community of practice among the participants, alumnae, faculty, and AHC leaders. As of March 2008, 27% of all the women deans of the 274 U.S. and Canadian allopathic and osteopathic medical, dental and public health schools were ELAM alumnae. The success of the program is additionally shown by research that demonstrates that the curriculum increases self-efficacy of participants,¹ increases knowledge and readiness for leadership as compared with women who did not participate in ELAM,² and that deans view ELAM as having a positive impact on their schools as well as on the participants and their promotability to leadership roles.³

The **Leadership Continuum Project** sponsored by ELAM has the goal to increase understanding about the ways in which women obtain and are sustained in senior level leadership.⁴ Through conversation with senior level women faculty leaders in universities and schools of medicine and dentistry, the continuum construct has been developed to conceptualize the process women traverse as they seek leadership positions and effect organizational change. This continuum is envisioned as:

¹ Sloma-Williams, L, SA McDade, RC Richman, PS Morahan. The role of self-efficacy in developing women leaders: a case of women leaders in academic medicine and dentistry. In: Diane Dean et al. (ed.). Chap. 3. Women and academic leadership. Arlington, VA: Stylus Publications, in press 2008.

² Dannels, SA., H Yamagata, SA McDade, Y-C Chuang, KA Gleason, JM McLaughlin, RC Richman, PS Morahan. Evaluating a leadership program : a comparative longitudinal study to evaluate the impact of the Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine (ELAM) program for women. *Academic Medicine* 2008;83:488-495.

³ Dannels SA, McLaughlin J, Gleason KA, McDade SA, Richman R, Morahan PS. Medical school deans' perceptions of organizational climate: useful indicators for advancement of women faculty and program evaluation of a leadership program's impact. *Academic Medicine*. In press 2009.

⁴ Morahan, PS, SE Rosen, KA Gleason, and RC Richman. A continuum of women's leadership development – a model for sustained success in academic medicine. *AAMC Faculty Vitae*. In press 2009.

- *preparing for* leadership;
- *transitioning into* leadership;
- *ensuring sustained success during* a leadership position; and
- *transitioning again into* another leadership position.

A basic tenet that we believe merits consideration by the NAS CWSEM is that, unlike the tenure of a full professor academic role, leadership positions are not forever. More attention needs to be directed at the last two elements of the continuum to reach a critical mass of seasoned women leaders. Better strategies and support need to be developed to ensure that women leaders: (a) have sustained successful terms as leaders despite the extra hurdles of being the ‘only,’ ‘first,’ or ‘one of only a few’ and (b) learn resilience and how to transition from one leadership role into another once they have accomplished their agenda. Only then will we have the stable critical mass of women leaders for the vital changes in organizational culture, policies and procedures that are necessary to address issues such as: increasingly diverse student and workforce; changing expectations for work and life balance; change from emphasis on individual to team science and healthcare; and new forms of participative research and scholarship needed to address the complex challenges of the 21st century.

FEDERATION OF PEDIATRIC ORGANIZATIONS

The field of pediatrics is undergoing a major shift in gender makeup. Nearly 75% of incoming pediatric residents are women. The issues that affect women at critical transition points are not exclusive to women. However, since significant gender disparities still exist throughout medicine, the Federation of Pediatric Organizations (FOPO) created a Task Force on Women in Pediatrics to provide a forum where the issues affecting women in pediatrics are discussed. Recommendations and actions are proposed and disseminated throughout the pediatric community. We envision this Task Force serving the entire pediatric community as it calls upon all of us, men and women, to identify ways to improve our institutions, practices, and policies that will contribute to higher levels of professional satisfaction and achievement.

A brief background about FOPO provides a context for the work of the Task Force: FOPO is an umbrella organization made up of seven major pediatric organizations including the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), the American Board of Pediatrics (ABP), the Association of Medical School Pediatric Department Chairs (AMSPDC), the Academic Pediatric Association (APA), the American Pediatric Society (APS), the Association of Pediatric Program Directors (APPD), and the Society for Pediatric Research (SPR). Its purpose is to promote high standards of health care for infants, children, and adolescents through education and training, foster child health research, promote high quality care, and educate the public, government and other organizations in matters related to child health. The strategies to achieve this purpose are embraced through the strategic initiatives of FOPO:

- 1) Develop a Leadership Academy to provide a focus for leadership training
- 2) Develop a strategy to position pediatricians as leaders within organized medicine
- 3) Promote an increase in GME funding and understand best practices of funding GME
- 4) Enhance the entire child health research agenda with increased support for research
- 5) Establish the global health priorities of academic pediatrics
- 6) Disseminate a position statement regarding health insurance for all US children and youth

The Task Force on Women in Pediatrics aims to identify barriers and bring about organizational changes to address these barriers that will permit women in pediatrics to maximize the contributions that they can bring to the field. The Task Force selected four issues on which to focus its attention over the subsequent two years: (a) to routinely provide the option to train and work part-time at specific career stages; (b) to allow flexibility in the career paths of physician/scientists; (c) to draw more women into leadership positions; and (d) to address child care issues. At the 2008 Pediatric Academic Societies (PAS) Meeting, the Task Force hosted a Symposium focusing on the second issue: to provide flexibility in the career paths of physician/scientists. We believe that this issue is especially relevant to the considerations of the National Academy of Science. The percent of women in medicine quadrupled in past 30 years, but women represent only 14% of tenured faculty and 12% of full professors. This is not a “pipeline issue” as women represent nearly 75% of pediatricians in training, and 50% of all practicing pediatricians; rather the problem is that academic institutions require women faculty to adjust to their organizational structures, policies and procedures that were established at a time when the majority of faculty were males, whose spouses have fulltime (or nearly so) commitment to the household.

Despite the vast changes in the demographic make-up of our nation's medical schools, institutional requirements for physician/scientists have remained rigid. In most universities, the physician/scientist path is a tenure track position with the traditional restrictions and requirements to attain tenure, including typically a restricted time frame, explicit requirements for obtaining grant funding and producing publications, prohibitions (generally formal) against part-time appointments, and inflexibility of the tenure clock (or flexibility on a case-by-case basis). These requirements are not realistic for women faculty given their multiple roles, such as responsibilities to their families and for childbearing/rearing, forcing parents to choose between needs of their families and the demands of their profession in lieu of career advancement. More importantly, there is no evidence that these requirements are necessary for the advancement of science. To the contrary, the experiments presented at the PAS symposium noted conducted by two of the nation's leading institutes in pediatric basic science research (Stanford and Cincinnati Children's Hospital) suggest that women will flourish if these barriers are reduced. Currently the Task Force is analyzing data obtained from over 400 of the nation's elite physician (pediatric) scientists regarding their experiences in establishing their scientific careers and the extent to which institutional requirements facilitated or impeded this progress.

The National Academy of Science is unique in its position as it is able to examine and, as appropriate, challenge and persuade the existing structure and standards, beginning with national funding requirements for training physician scientists and extending through criteria for promotion and tenure of physician scientists. The Federation of Pediatric Organizations and its Task Force on Women in Pediatrics stand ready to work collaboratively with the National Academy of Science to forge a path to sustain the next generations of physician-scientists as they traverse through these critical transition points in their personal and professional lives.

FEMALE ASSOCIATION FOR CLINICIANS, EDUCATORS, AND SCIENTISTS

The Female Association for Clinicians, Educators, and Scientists (FACES) is an organization established to provide mentoring, networking and advocacy for women MD/PhD students in the Tri-institutional Medical Scientist Training Program (MSTP) of Weill Cornell Medical College, Sloan-Kettering Institute and Rockefeller University. FACES was founded in 2003 by a group of first-year MD/PhD students working with Debra Leonard, MD, PhD, Professor of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine at Weill Cornell Medical College, with the support of Olaf Andersen MD, Program Director and Ruth Gotian, Administrative Director of the Tri-institutional Program. Since its inception, FACES has rapidly become an invaluable forum where students in all levels of training and faculty members in all stages of their careers can connect and share advice on topics relevant to women in academia. The goal of FACES is to support career development of Tri-I women MD/PhD students through initiatives in four areas: networking, mentorship, skill-building, and life issues that affect women's careers.

Mentorship is fostered by career talks from female faculty that enable female MD/PhD students to gain insight and perspective from the personal experiences of women physician-scientists. The content of these talks varies with the speaker, and may include discussion of the speaker's career path, suggestions for how to achieve specific work-related goals, and work/life balance. We also have panel discussions, often including alumnae from the program.

FACES provides many networking opportunities for the women students. We participate annually in the international Pearl Meister Greengard Award, established by Paul Greengard PhD with his Nobel Prize winnings to honor women scientists. In 2008, Gail Martin PhD, Beatrice Mintz PhD, and Elizabeth Robertson PhD were honored for their pioneering work with embryonic stem cells. FACES hosts a discussion with the award recipients for women of the Tri-Institutional community prior to the awards ceremony. We also host a keynote speaker each year, chosen for her ability to inform us about the larger picture of women in academic medicine and policy developments affecting women in science and medicine. Our 2008 speaker was Joan Steitz PhD, a member of the committee that generated the National Academies *Beyond Bias* Report. We also participate in specific events organized by the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center (MSKCC) Program for Women Faculty Affairs, including Athena meetings, an informal group for women faculty that meets monthly, and facilitates networking of the women MD/PhD students with faculty from MSKCC.

We have developed skill-building sessions for women MD/PhD students that have received outstanding reviews. Prior sessions have addressed critical skills such as grant-writing, personal financial management, and negotiation, as well as understanding the male and female cultures in which women work. For the 2008-2009 academic year, FACES has planned a series of panel discussions focused on the major transition points in the life of an MD-PhD student, specifically choosing a thesis laboratory, selecting a residency/post-doc, attaining a first job and getting promoted. In organizing these seminars, we tap into the resources of each of the three institutions in the MSTP Program as well as our own excellent alumni network.

In addition to fostering a community of networking and mentoring among its members, FACES also serves as a catalyst of change in the Tri-Institutional area on life issues relevant to the

success of women students. Through efforts of FACES in conjunction with our program Director, we were the first MD/PhD program to define a maternity and family leave policy for MD/PhD students. Currently, FACES is lobbying to improve access to child care for MD/PhD students with children. The infrastructure of FACES facilitates our role as a change agent for these life issues recognized by the NAS *Beyond Bias and Barriers* report as critically important for the career success of women in science.

The FACES leadership found the CWSEM workshop *From Doctorate to Dean or Director: Sustaining Women through Critical Transition Points in Science, Engineering, and Medicine* particularly relevant in light of our own series on the path of women MD/PhD students, looking further down our career path. We are grateful for the opportunity to participate in the workshop and discussions, and bring back lessons learned from the meeting to the entire FACES community.

SOCIETY FOR DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY

Approaches the Society for Developmental Biology has taken to address critical transition points in the career development of women scientists and unresolved issues facing women scientists that the Society considers of greatest need.

The Society for Developmental Biology (SDB) has been in existence for almost seventy years, providing resources and services to scientists studying plant or animal development. Approximately half the current SDB members are women; the same is true for the elected Board of Directors and the members of SDB committees. (It is traditional for the Society's presidency to alternate between a man and a woman, a practice that is maintained by nominating two women candidates one year and two men the following year.) Service as an officer or on the board of directors provides members with increased national visibility and networking opportunities. Moreover, the annual national meeting and each of the five to eight regional meetings include career development sessions for the broader membership. Given the gender diversity of the society's membership, it has not seemed necessary or appropriate to target these sessions solely to women. Along with disseminating recent, exciting scientific discoveries, SDB seeks to advance its members in their professional careers. Most of these efforts have been coordinated by the SDB Professional Development and Education Committee. Participant evaluations and follow-up surveys are used to assess the effectiveness of the programs. Here we highlight recent successful SDB activities that have helped women (and men) scientists transition through their postdoctoral training and early career, and describe a new program the Society is contemplating, aimed at advancing mid-career scientists.

The SDB national and regional meetings are important venues for career advancement. The regional meetings are particularly important for early career scientists and the organizers ensure that most of the speakers are undergraduates, graduate students, postdocs and new faculty. At national SDB meetings, one scientific session is run by postdoctoral fellows, with all the platform presentations given by postdocs whose abstracts have been chosen by their peers. In addition, all postdoctoral trainees and students are invited to meet the SDB Board at an exclusive social hour. To promote successful transitions beyond the PhD, SDB has hosted workshops on scientific writing skills, international postdoctoral training, exploring career choices in industry, scientific journalism and law, interviewing skills, and on successful grant writing. Opportunities have also been provided to meet with the editors of prominent journals, including *Science*, *Nature*, *Development* and *Developmental Biology*, and each year the annual meeting includes a session where NSF and NIH program officers outline available granting mechanisms. Each SDB meeting includes an education session aimed at pedagogical innovations, and SDB's Library of Educational Annotated Developmental Biology Resources (LEADER) is a partner of the NSF-funded digital library BEN (BiosciEdNet) which provides peer-reviewed on-line resources for teaching and learning in the biological sciences.

At national meetings about half of the session leaders and speakers are women; and special effort is made to feature young investigators. To facilitate the transition to independent investigator, SDB has hosted two-day Boot Camps just prior to the national meeting. Under this program a group of senior scientists act as instructors to 20-25 new faculty. The "recruits" enjoy hands-on lab work with several model organisms while getting advice on curriculum development, finding

and becoming great mentors, and the tenure process. Having taken a Myers/Briggs Type Indicator assay beforehand, the participants also receive counseling on how personality may affect their laboratory management style. Given the success of this program for new faculty, SDB is currently considering developing a parallel program for mid-career scientists. This “Re-Boot” Camp would be centered around “-CTRL” (work-life balance), “-ALT” (alternate paths for research use of administrative skills and risk taking) “-DEL” (prioritizing/time management). One of the goals of this program would be to advance mid-career members toward full professor, dean or director positions, as well as updating their research and teaching techniques.

SDB wishes to encourage the upcoming NAS workshop to emphasize the importance of creating a family-friendly work environment as a means of addressing the unresolved needs of women scientists. Problems related to trying to balance home and work life are not new and have been considered at several previous workshops, including Achieving XXcellence in Science (AXXS) 2002, at which these same issues were prominent. As Dr. Carola Eisenberg stated in that meeting’s opening address “We are now engaged in a battle for academic norms that acknowledge the importance of family life as a legitimate value.”, and Dr. Ruth Kirschstein reiterated “We need to do something about the major problem, as you have heard all through this workshop, of what we are going to do about child care in the US.” Efforts by CWSEM to lobby Congress to appropriate funds for NIH and NSF training grants (and for the prestigious Ruth Kirschstein postdoctoral awards) in order to provide modest stipends to help with childcare for trainees with small children would be a significant step. Graduate students and postdocs frequently cannot afford childcare on their modest stipends, yet these career stages are coincident with a woman’s child-bearing years. Colleges and universities should be encouraged to expand their menu of benefits to provide students and employees access to affordable child care/elder care help, in addition to college tuition remission for the children and spouses of faculty. Childcare benefits enhance recruitment and retention of faculty, and particularly of women faculty, and therefore should be an important priority for these institutions. Because women today remain the primary caregivers in two-career families, they are more likely to settle for convenient, rather than desired, jobs. Universally available and affordable child care will almost certainly open up options to women seeking careers in academic teaching, medical or research environments. There also is a tremendous need for flex-time and part-time positions that offer opportunities for future advancement, as well as more flexible tenure clocks for faculty raising children. Creation of an academic environment that values and supports work-life balance will eliminate a major roadblock on the “Road to the Professorate” that often arises *after* the PhD and which stalls many more women than men.

<http://www.sdbonline.org>

SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S HEALTH RESEARCH

The RAISE Project: A Program of the Society for Women's Health Research

Sustaining women in STEMM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics, and Medicine) through critical transitions requires both discipline-specific organizational efforts and inclusive cross-disciplinary efforts to appreciate and reward the contributions of women. That there is much work to be done is emphasized by high attrition rates of skilled women in these fields. Recognized contributing factors include a hostile work environment, a sense of isolation and limited rewards.

The RAISE (Recognition of the Achievements of Women In Science, Engineering, Mathematics and Medicine) Project seeks to sustain women in STEMM across critical transitions by increasing the recognition of the achievements of women. Increased recognition may help neutralize the hostile environment, provide role models for women who feel isolated and supply women with concrete means for schedule and salary negotiations and promotions.

The question of disparities between scientific awards to men and women was raised by the announcement in 2005 of the winners of the 2003 National Medal of Science. There were no women among the recipients. Similarly, there were no women recipients of the 2004 and 2005 Medals of Science. This observation suggested a broader problem in recognition of the achievements of women in science, technology, engineering, mathematics and medicine, which culminated in the establishment of the RAISE Project, a national awards website and clearinghouse dedicated to recognizing the achievements of women in these fields, sponsored by the Society for Women's Health Research.

The first priority of The RAISE Project was to collect objective data to test the hypothesis that there are gender disparities in scientific awards and prizes. Over 1,000 scientific and medical awards with over 20,000 recipients since 1981 were cataloged and analyzed. The data (which can be found at www.raiseproject.org) confirms the hypothesis that there is a substantive discrepancy between awards and prizes given to men and women. A striking finding was a concomitant increase in awards restricted to women recipients.

The gender distribution of awards was our initial focus of analysis. Analyses were performed initially including all awards regardless of whether the award was restricted by gender to women only. Including all awards, 321 of 1,000 (32%) had never been given to a woman and five hundred ten of 1,000 (51%) of the awards in the database had been given to a woman less than 10% of the time. As expected, awards restricted to women or for mentoring of women were almost always presented to women.

The changing distribution of awards over time was analyzed and compared with the changing number of women in respective fields. The number of women holding PhDs in science, mathematics, engineering and technology has increased significantly since 1981, such that in 2004 women comprise 37.4% of STEM PhDs and 51.2% of MDs. However, the upward trend evident in the percentage of women entering STEMM fields is not reflected in the number of women receiving STEMM awards. When awards restricted to women are excluded; women still

only received 16.76% of STEMM awards in 2004, a 20% lag behind the number of women entering the field.

The RAISE project data clearly establishes that women receive a disproportionately small share of awards and prizes when compared with the number of women in these fields as measured by the women PhD and MD recipients. A common explanation for the discrepancy between men and women is that there are a small number of women in the pool of those eligible for awards. If this were the case, then the expectation would be that as more women enter these fields, the number of women receiving awards should increase, approximating the percentage in the field. However our data suggests that the disparity is not purely a "pipeline effect" since 25 years after women entered the fields in larger numbers there continues to be a substantive disparity. For instance, in the social sciences (including psychology) where 47% of academic faculty is female, only 27% of awards are presented to women. Overall, despite the gains in educational achievement and entry into the scientific, medical, and technical professions awards to women increased only modestly in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

Rewards and recognition are both critical markers of approval and inclusion. The observations of the Swiss economist Bruno Frey suggest that as salary and benefits between men and women become more equal, awards and prizes are becoming increasingly important in distinguishing achievement. Thus, almost paradoxically the achievement of parity in salary benefits makes the need to achieve unbiased evaluation of award nominations increasingly important. Sustaining women through critical transitions in their professional development will greatly benefit women by renewed attention on broadly recognizing the accomplishments of them as part of the requisite admission of the particular professional club.

SOCIETY OF WOMEN ENGINEERS

To respond to your Committee's request for input on these critical transition points, I would like to draw your attention to the 2007 SWE retention study, a comprehensive analysis we conducted on the attitudes and experiences of engineering alumni to understand, address and quantify retention issues surrounding women in the engineering workforce. As you discuss what can help women through critical transition points, we think it important to recognize that these transition points are both professional and personal in nature.

In 2005, SWE partnered with Harris Interactive and university alumni organizations to conduct this study, which was commissioned by SWE's Corporate Partnership Council (CPC). Comprised of a diverse cross-section of 55 industry leaders, the CPC is SWE's partner on tackling emerging issues impacting women in engineering. For a complete list of CPC members, please visit: www.swe.org/cpc.

With only 20% of bachelor's degrees in engineering and technology being awarded to women, retention of those women in the profession is crucial to building and maintaining a diverse workforce. The corporate community's understanding of retention issues has been largely anecdotal, thus hindering effective, proactive solutions. Thus, the study focused on identifying:

- The current retention and advancement rates of women in engineering and benchmark those against the rates of men;
- The reasons women and men leave the engineering profession; and
- The reasons why women and men do not advance in the engineering profession.

Some of the major findings include:

A. Women have lower retention rates in engineering than men

Despite similar levels of job satisfaction and education backgrounds among women and men engineering alumni, fewer women than men report staying in the engineering field.

B. Women and men express job "satisfaction" in similar terms

Women who continue to work in the engineering field report high levels of satisfaction with their jobs. The majority of engineering alumni, both women and men, view their career path in a positive light and express satisfaction with many aspects of their jobs. The job satisfaction of women and men who are employed in engineering or related fields are similar. Women are most satisfied with the content and personal challenge of their engineering jobs. Fundamentally, though, job satisfaction levels are significantly higher for those who think that their engineering skills are being well-utilized as compared to those who do not.

C. Women and men express job "dissatisfaction" in different terms

Engineering alumni who are not currently employed in engineering or a related field cite work/life balance issues, career-advancement and compensation discrepancies, and better or

more interesting work opportunities in other professions as reasons for leaving engineering. However, women are more likely than men to cite a more family-friendly work environment and more interesting work as a motivation for leaving engineering. As compared to women, men place more emphasis on salary and advancement.

Across all age groups, women are much less likely than men to be earning \$100K+ and much more likely to be earning less than \$50K. Women who earn \$100K+ are twice as likely to be satisfied with their jobs as women who earn less money.

Women and men tend to seek employment in different non-engineering professions. While women gravitate toward teaching, men are about twice as likely to choose a career in finance.

“Better job prospects” are the top motivation to return to engineering for both men and women. However, in defining what makes a job “better,” women want a more convenient work location and more flexible work arrangements, while men want the opportunity to move into management.

D. Whether and why women and men do not advance in engineering

Women express lower levels of satisfaction with management and advancement opportunities than men, and gender differences are also apparent in perceptions of career obstacles and inequities, and success in terms of advancement and compensation. Of employed engineering alumni, work/family balance is at the top of the list of career obstacles, with women feeling that this obstacle is more of a career hindrance than men. Women are also more likely to believe that, to some extent, work place inequities exist.

While women and men report equal levels of satisfaction with their advancement opportunities, women are less likely to hold management positions. Men aged 45+ are nearly twice as likely as women of the same age to be at or directly below the CEO level. Whereas, women aged 45+ are more likely than their male counterparts to be one management level below that. Similarly, senior level engineering positions are more likely to be held by men than women.

AMERICAN ASTRONOMICAL SOCIETY COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN ASTRONOMY

According to the AIP (American Institute of Physics), in 2005, 21% of physics bachelor's degrees and 14% of physics PhDs went to women. That same year, 40% of astronomy bachelor's degrees and 33% of astronomy PhDs were awarded to women. The exact reasons for why astronomy boasts a larger percentage of women are unclear. However, it may be a result of a better climate for women in this field. Going from assistant professor to associate professor to full professor, the percentage of women in both astronomy and physics as a whole drops even further. (Postdocs were not included in this study.)

Anecdotally, both women and men leave academia for a variety of reasons. The drop in representation of women with seniority is often called "the leaky pipeline," inferring women experience greater attrition than men from academia, whether due to work-life balance issues, a hostile climate, or discrimination.

However, a 2005 AIP Report on Women in Physics and Astronomy by Rachel Ivie and Kim Nies Ray (AIP Publication Number R-430.02) demonstrated that the percentage of PhD recipients who are women is roughly consistent with the numbers of female entering graduate school, after taking the average time to PhD into account. In fact, the percentage of women among those hired into tenure-track and tenured positions is roughly consistent with the percentage of PhDs earned by women in the past. This is true for both physics as a whole, and astronomy by itself. In other words, the decrease in the percentage of women with seniority might be explained by an ever increasing percentage in women receiving PhDs with time. In fact, the biggest leak in the pipeline appears to be at a very early stage, between high school and bachelor's degree. Nearly half of high school physics students are girls.

This is not to say that all hiring is gender-blind. The same AIP report also noted women faculty are more highly represented in physics departments that grant only bachelor's or master's degrees. Women are also disproportionately represented among non-tenure track faculty: i.e. adjunct, temporary, or part-time positions. AIP surveys also indicate that after controlling for employment sector and years since degree, women earn significantly less than men.

In early 2007, the American Astronomical Society Council and the AIP Statistical Research Center began a longitudinal study of a cohort of current astronomy graduate students to better understand the reasons why both men and women leave astronomy and determine where they go. More than 800 graduate students have volunteered to participate in this study, which will track the career paths of these students for at least ten years. We anticipate this study will help separate anecdote from data and uncover the real reasons for attrition in the pipeline.

ASSOCIATION FOR WOMEN IN SCIENCE

The Association for Women in Science (AWIS) is a national advocacy organization championing the interests of women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) across all disciplines and employment sectors. By breaking down barriers and creating opportunities, AWIS strives to ensure that women in these fields can achieve their full potential. Although we have made great strides in achieving equality for women in many fields of science, there is still a dearth of women in the upper echelons and leadership positions within the scientific community. AWIS strongly supports policies and practices that recognize and facilitate the important contributions women make in the scientific workplace.

Policy Changes to Solve the “Leaky Pipeline” in Academia

Significant progress has been made in improving the status of women within the scientific workforce, particularly in regards to training. In many STEM fields, women have achieved or exceeded parity in the number of doctoral degrees received and are well represented in the ranks of postdoctoral researchers. However, as detailed in the recent report of the National Academies, *Beyond Bias and Barriers, Fulfilling the Potential of Academic Science and Engineering*,⁵ at each stage of advancement, from postdoctoral training to first position to tenure and beyond, the proportion of women represented drops off substantially. Moreover, studies have shown that gender bias is still a significant barrier for the success of women in science and engineering, particularly in academic research institutions.⁶ *AWIS affirms the need for national and local policy changes aimed at retaining and creating opportunities for the best and brightest women in the highest ranks of the scientific community and recommends the following solutions:*

- Enforcement of Title IX policies by federal agencies and academic institutions;
- Expansion of federally-funded programs to facilitate reentry into the workforce of scientists who have taken time off to care for a child or dependent family member; and
- Support and promotion for the development of federal programs, such as ADVANCE, that seek to cultivate a broadly inclusive science and engineering workforce.

Institutional Approaches and Family Friendly Policies

Many of the factors discouraging women from entering the higher academic faculty ranks and leadership positions in STEM fields are related to institutional climate and the balance between work and home responsibilities.^{7,8} In particular, because the academic tenure clock typically coincides with the biologically-constrained childbearing and rearing years of women, female faculty are especially vulnerable to obstacles related to work-life balance. Universities and academic departments have a primary responsibility to ensure that all faculty have the opportunity to be successful and productive throughout their careers through promotion of

⁵ National Academies. (2007) *Beyond Bias and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Academic Science and Engineering*. http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11741

⁶ Clayman Institute for Gender Research. (2006) “Top Issues and Solutions for Women Faculty in Science and Engineering.” <http://www.stanford.edu/group/gender/ResearchPrograms/TitleXTopIssues.pdf>

⁷ *ibid*

⁸ University of California. (2007) Creating a family friendly department: chairs and deans toolkit. <http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/ChairsandDeansToolkitFinal7-07.pdf>

policies, development of resources, and fostering a climate and culture that includes zero tolerance for discriminatory comments or behavior. *AWIS strongly supports institutional and departmental policies to support the career advancement of female scientists and recommends as preliminary, albeit significant, steps:*

- Adoption of comprehensive policies designed to foster and promote the development of faculty careers concomitant with major life circumstances or transitions. These might include, but are not limited to, policies related to: provision of child or senior care; tenure clock stoppage or modified duties for advancing faculty who have significant responsibility for the care of young children; funds for faculty with dependent children with who must travel for research or conference purposes; and family-friendly scheduling of departmental or university meetings and events;
- Use of dual career assistance, child or senior care support, and relocation expenses as a standard part of recruitment practices for new faculty;
- Regular evaluation by department chairs and administrators of the current practices and climate of the department or institution in regards to gender bias and family-friendly issues;
- Transparency in the promotion and tenure process, with clear guidelines to eliminate negative consequences for faculty who have taken advantage of family accommodation policies; and
- Establishment of mentoring programs for junior faculty.

Gender Differences Project Summary

ASSESSING GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE CAREERS OF SCIENCE, ENGINEERING, AND MATHEMATICS FACULTY

This Congressionally-mandated study will present new findings about career differences between female and male faculty in science, engineering, and mathematics. Building on previous work, the purpose of the project is to update earlier analyses, identify and assess any gender differences, and recommend methods for further clarifying assumptions about gender and academic careers.

Academic hiring, promotion, tenure, and the allocation of institutional resources are being examined, based on the findings from two 2004 to 2005 surveys of faculty and departments at major U.S. research universities in six fields: biology, chemistry, civil engineering, electrical engineering, mathematics and physics. One survey focused on departmental characteristics, tenure and promotion, and hiring practices in almost 500 departments during 2002 to 2004. The other survey gathered information from a stratified, random sample of 1,800 faculty on demographic characteristics, employment experiences, and types of institutional support received, including laboratory space. Only full-time, tenure-eligible or tenured faculty were included; instructors, lecturers, postdocs, adjunct faculty, or research faculty were not surveyed. In addition to survey results, the committee is drawing on scholarly studies and existing data from federal agencies and professional societies.

The resulting report will paint a timely picture of the status of female faculty at top universities, clarifying to what extent male and female faculty have similar opportunities to advance and succeed in academia, and potentially challenging some commonly held views. This report will be of special interest to university administrators and faculty, graduate students, policy makers, professional and academic societies, federal funding agencies, and others concerned with the vitality of the U.S. research base and economy.

It is anticipated that *Assessing Gender Differences in the Careers of Science, Engineering, and Mathematics Faculty* will be released in pre-publication form in the Fall of 2008.

COMMITTEE ON GENDER DIFFERENCES IN CAREERS OF SCIENCE, ENGINEERING, AND MATHEMATICS FACULTY

CLAUDE CANIZARES, (NAS)^{*} *Co-Chair*, Associate Provost and Bruno Rossi Professor of Experimental Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

SALLY SHAYWITZ, (IOM) *Co-Chair*, Professor of Pediatrics, Yale University School of Medicine

LINDA ABRIOLO, (NAE) Dean of Engineering and Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Tufts University

JANE BUIKSTRA, (NAS) Professor of Bioarchaeology, Director, Center for Bioarchaeological Research, Arizona State University School of Human Evolution and Social Change

ALICIA CARRIQUIRY, Professor of Statistics, Iowa State University

RONALD EHRENBERG, Director, Cornell Higher Education Research Institute and Irving M. Ives Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations and Economics, Cornell University

JOAN GIRGUS, Professor of Psychology and Special Assistant to the Dean of the Faculty for matters concerning gender equity, Princeton University

ARLEEN LEIBOWITZ, Professor of Public Policy, School of Public Affairs, University of California at Los Angeles

THOMAS N. TAYLOR, (NAS) Roy A. Roberts Distinguished Professor, and Senior Curator of the Natural History Museum and Biodiversity Research Center, University of Kansas

LILIAN WU, Director of University Relations, International Business Machines

* Denotes membership in the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, or the Institute of Medicine.

List of Registrants (as of 9/16/08)

Laura Adolfie

STEM Workforce Development Manager
Department of Defense
Office of the Director
Defense Research and Engineering
laura.adolfie@osd.mil

Alice Agogino

Professor of Mechanical Engineering
University of California, Berkeley
agogino@berkeley.edu

Rebecca Ahrens-Nicklas

MD/PhD Student
Weill Cornell Medical College
rca2004@med.cornell.edu

Catherine Alfano

Program Director and Behavioral Scientist
NCI Office of Cancer Survivorship
Alfanoc@mail.nih.gov

Richelle Allen-King

Professor and Chair
Department of Geology
SUNY Buffalo
richelle@buffalo.edu

Carol Auer

Associate Professor
University of Connecticut
carol.auer@uconn.edu

Eleanor Babco

Senior Consultant
Council of Graduate Schools
ebabco@cgs.nche.edu

Beth Babecki

Deputy Training Coordinator
Division of Basic Neuroscience and Behavioral
Research
National Institute on Drug Abuse
mb128t@nih.gov

Tiffani Bailey Lash

AAAS Science & Technology Fellow
National Institutes of Health
baileylasht@mail.nih.gov

Richard Baird

Director
Division of Interdisciplinary Training
National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and
Bioengineering
National Institutes of Health
bairdri@mail.nih.gov

Rachel Ballard-Barbash

Associate Director
Applied Research Program
National Cancer Institute
barbashr@mail.nih.gov

Janet Bandows Koster

Executive Director
Association for Women in Science
koster@awis.org

Kristin Bigos

Postdoctoral Fellow
National Institute of Mental Health
bigosk@mail.nih.gov

Brianna Blaser

Project Director
Outreach
American Association for the Advancement of
Science
bblaser@aaas.org

Barbara Bogue

Associate Professor
ESM & Women in Engineering
Pennsylvania State University
bbogue@psu.edu

Rochelle Bohaty

Assistant Editor
Chemical & Engineering News
r_bohaty@acs.org

Rob Boisseau

Government Relations Program Representative
American Institute of Physics
rboissea@aip.org

Florence Bonner

Associate Vice President for Research & Compliance
Howard University
fbonner@howard.edu

Ericka Boone

Health Scientist Administrator
National Institute on Drug Abuse
National Institutes of Health
boonee@nida.nih.gov

Amanda Boyce

Health Science Administrator
National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal
and Skin Diseases
National Institutes of Health
boycea@mail.nih.gov

Kimberly Brinkley

Legal Secretary
Board on Professional Responsibility
kbrinkley@dcpr.org

Jessica Buono

Research Associate
The National Academies
jbuono@nas.edu

Joan Burrelli

Senior Analyst
National Science Foundation
jburrell@nsf.gov

Claude Canizares

Professor of Experimental Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
crc@mit.edu

Melissa Carl

Washington Representative
Society of Women Engineers
melissa.carl@swe.org

Maria Paz Carlos

Chief of Virology and Immunology
Maryland Department of Health Laboratories
Administration
mpcarlos@gmail.com

Lynda Carlson

Director
Division of Science Resources Statistics
National Science Foundation
lcarlson@nsf.gov

Amber Carrier

Christine Mirzayan Science & Technology Policy
Fellow
The National Academies
acarrier@nas.edu

Eun-Joo Chang

Senior Director
Education & Member Development
Society for Neuroscience
eun-joo@sfn.org

Yi-Wen Chen

Associate Professor of Pediatrics
George Washington University
ychen@cnmcresearch.org

Ana Chepelinsky

NEI Intramural Career Development Advisor
National Eye Institute
National Institutes of Health
abc@helix.nih.gov

Deirdra Chester

Research Nutritionist
USDA-Beltsville Human Nutrition Research Center
Deirdra.Chester@ars.usda.gov

Ida Chow

Executive Officer
Society for Developmental Biology
ichow@sdbonline.org

Kathleen Christensen

Program Director
Workplace, Work Force and Working Families
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation
christensen@sloan.org

Ines Cifuentes

Education and Careers Manager
American Geophysical Union
icifuentes@agu.org

Michelle Cilia

Research Molecular Biologist
USDA-Agricultural Research Service
mlc68@cornell.edu

Valarie Clark

Director
Association of American Medical Colleges
vclark@aamc.org

Janine Clayton

Deputy Director
Office of Research on Women's Health
National Institutes of Health
smithja2@od.nih.gov

Mary Clutter

Consultant
Retired, National Science Foundation
mclutter611@comcast.net

Jay Cole

Interim Chief of Staff
West Virginia University
jay.cole@mail.wvu.edu

Pam Cook

Professor of Math and Associate Dean of
Engineering
University of Delaware
cook@math.udel.edu

Christianne Corbett

Research Associate
American Association of University Women
corbettc@aauw.org

Keith Crank

Assistant Director for Research and Graduate
Education
American Statistical Association
keith@amstat.org

Jessie DeAro

Program Director
ADVANCE
National Science Foundation
jdearo@nsf.gov

Claude Desjardins

Professor and Director of Clinical Scholars Project
University of Illinois Medical Center
clauded@uic.edu

Leyla Diaz

Scientist
Functional Genetics, Inc
ldiaz@functional-genetics.com

Catherine Didion

Director
Committee on Women in Science, Engineering, and
Medicine
The National Academies
cdidion@nas.edu

Francesca Dominici

Professor
Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of
Public Health
fdominic@jhsph.edu

Elizabeth Donley

Chief Executive Officer
Stemina Biomarker Discovery, Inc.
BDonley@stemina.com

Zeynep Erim

Program Director
Division of Interdisciplinary Training
National Institutes of Health
erimz@mail.nih.gov

Temitope Erinoso

Postdoctoral Fellow
National Cancer Institute
terinosho@hotmail.com

Jaqui Falkenheim

Senior Analyst
National Science Foundation
jfalkenh@nsf.gov

Francine Federman

Acting Associate Dean
School of Business
Farmindale State College
Francine.Federman@farmingdale.edu

Annie Xuemei Feng

Behavioral Scientist
National Cancer Institute
fengx3@mail.nih.gov

Kristin Field

Assistant to the Directors
Penn Genome Frontiers Institute
University of Pennsylvania
kfield@sas.upenn.edu

Anne Fischer

AAAS Science & Technology Policy Fellow
National Science Foundation
afischer@nsf.gov

Allan Fisher

Vice President for Product Strategy and Development
Lauerate Higher Education Group
alf@cs.cmu.edu

Mary Foulkes

Research Professor
Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics
George Washington University
mfoulkes@jhsph.edu

Lisa Frehill
Executive Director
Commissions on Professionals in Science and
Technology
lfrehill@cpst.org

Andrea Frydl
Health Communication Fellow
National Cancer Institute
frydlal@mail.nih.gov

Cathy Furlong
Statistical Consultant
cathy.furlong@cox.net

Stacey Gabriel
Director
Genetic Analysis Platform
The Broad Institute
stacey@broad.mit.edu

Ying Gao
Postdoctoral fellow
Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics
National Cancer Institute
gaoying@mail.nih.gov

Linda Garverick
Principal
Coactive Consultants
Linda@CoactiveConsultants.com

Barbara Gault
Acting President
Institute for Women's Policy Research
gault@iwpr.org

Nuria Gavara
Postdoctoral Visiting Fellow
National Institute on Deafness and other
Communication Disorders
National Institutes of Health
gavaran@nidcd.nih.gov

Joan Girgus
Professor of Psychology and Special Assistant to the
Dean of the Faculty
Princeton University
girgus@princeton.edu

Joan Goldberg
Executive Director
The American Society for Cell Biology
jgoldberg@ascb.org

Leila Gonzales
Geoscience Workforce Analyst
American Geological Institute
lmg@agiweb.org

Miryam Granthon
Office of Minority Health
Department of Health and Human Services
miryam.granthon@hhs.gov

Marcia Gumpertz
Assistant Vice Provost for Faculty and Staff
Diversity
North Carolina State University
gumpertz@ncsu.edu

Kara Hall
Health Scientist
National Cancer Institute
hallka@mail.nih.gov

Deb Hamernik
National Program Leader
USDA-Cooperative State Research, Education, and
Extension Service
dhamernik@csrees.usda.gov

Patrick Hardigan
Executive Director for Health Professions Division
Research
Nova Southeastern University
patrick@nova.edu

Ellen Harris
Assistant Director
Beltsville Human Nutrition Research Center
ellen.harris@ars.usda.gov

Selina Heppell
Associate Professor
Department of Fisheries and Wildlife
Oregon State University
selina.heppell@oregonstate.edu

Emorcia Hill
Director of Research and Evaluation for the Office
for Diversity and Community Partnership
Harvard Medical School
emorcia_hill@hms.harvard.edu

Susan Hill
Visiting Researcher from the National Science
Foundation
Commission on Professionals in Science and
Technology
shill@cpst.org

An-Tsun Huang
Postdoctoral Fellow
National Cancer Institute
myumemail@yahoo.com

Rachel Ivie
Research Manager
American Institute of Physics
rivie@aip.org

Hannah Jan-Condell
Postdoctoral Student
University of Maryland
NASA- Goddard Space Flight Center
hannah@astro.umd.edu

Jolene Jesse
Program Director
National Science Foundation
jjesse@nsf.gov

Cathee Johnson Phillips
Executive Director
National Postdoctoral Association
cjphillips@nationalpostdoc.org

Mary Juhas
Program Director for Diversity and Outreach
National Science Foundation
Directorate for Engineering
mjuhas@nsf.gov

David Kamens
Research Professor
George Mason University
dkamens@verizon.net

Hannah Katch
Volunteer
Office of Research on Women's Health
National Institutes of Health
hannah.katch@gmail.com

Evelyn Kelly
Public Health Consultant
evelyn.b.kelly@gmail.com

Leanna Kelly
Legislative Assistant
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
kellyl2@niehs.nih.gov

Henry Khachaturian
Extramural Program Policy Officer
Acting NIH Research Training Officer
Office of Extramural Research
National Institutes of Health
hk11b@nih.gov

Sooja Kim
Chief
Endocrinology, Metabolism, Nutrition &
Reproductive Sciences
Center for Scientific Review
National Institutes of Health
kims@csr.nih.gov

Melissa Kinnebrew
MD-PhD Student
Female Association of Clinicians, Scientists, and
Educators (FACES)
mec2012@med.cornell.edu

Joslyn Kravitz
AAAS Science & Technology Policy Fellow
Office of Research on Women's Health
National Institutes of Health
kravitzj@mail.nih.gov

Nicole Kresge
Editor
American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular
Biology
nkresge@asbmb.org

Alison Kris
Assistant Professor
Fairfield University
akris@mail.fairfield.edu

Danuta Krotoski
Special Assistant
Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child
Health and Human Development
krotoskd@mail.nih.gov

Charlotte Kuh
Deputy Executive Director
Policy and Global Affairs
The National Academies
ckuh@nas.edu

Joan Lakoski

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Career Development, University of Pittsburgh School of the Health Sciences
jlakoski@hs.pitt.edu

Cathy Lazarus

Senior Associate Dean for Student Affairs and Medical Education
Chicago Medical School at Rosalind Franklin University
cathy.lazarus@rosalindfranklin.edu

Phoebe Leboy

President
Association for Women in Science
phoebe@biochem.dental.upenn.edu

Xueying Liang

Postdoctoral Fellow
National Cancer Institute
liangx2@mail.nih.gov

Jennifer Loud

Nurse Specialist, Researcher
Clinical Genetics Branch
Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics
National Cancer Institute
LoudJ@mail.nih.gov

Germaine Louis

Acting Director
Division of Epidemiology, Statistics & Prevention Research
Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development
louisg@mail.nih.gov

Stella Lymberis

Assistant Professor
NYU Medical Center
lymbes01@ymed.nyu.edu

Carol Lynch

Senior Scholar and Director
Profession Master's Programs
Council of Graduate Schools
clynch@cgs.nche.edu

Heather Macdonald

Chancellor Professor
College of William and Mary
rhmacd@wm.edu

Anne MacLachlan

Senior Researcher
University of California, Berkeley
maclach@berkeley.edu

Lynnette Madsen

Program Director
National Science Foundation
lmadsen@nsf.gov

Diane Magrane

Director
Faculty Development and Leadership
Association of American Medical Colleges
Dmagrane@aamc.org

Kirti Magudia

MD/PhD Student
Weill Cornell, Rockefeller, Sloan Kettering
kim2004@med.cornell.edu

Shirley Malcom

Director
Education and Human Resources Directorate
American Association for the Advancement of Science
smalcom@aaas.org

Cynthia Martinez

Geoscience Workforce Specialist
American Geological Institute
cmm@agiweb.org

Sherry Marts

Consultant
samarts@earthlink.net

Sandra Masur

Director, Office for Women's Careers
Professor of Ophthalmology
Mt. Sinai School of Medicine
sandra.masur@mssm.edu

Marsha Matyas

Director of Education Programs
American Physiological Society
mmatyas@the-aps.org

Shari Miles-Cohen

Senior Director
Women's Programs Office
American Psychological Association
smiles@apa.org

Lesa Mitchell
Vice President
Advancing Innovation
Kauffman Foundation
LMitchell@kauffman.org

Susan Molchan Whiteman
Former Program Director (retired)
National Institutes of Health
swhiteman2@verizon.net

Thabisile Ndlebe
Postdoctoral Fellow
National Institutes of Health
ndlebet@mail.nih.gov

April Oh
CRTA Fellow
National Cancer Institute
ohay@mail.nih.gov

Jessica O'Hara
Policy Assistant
Alliance for Academic Internal Medicine
johara@im.org

Richard Okita
Program Director
National Institutes of General Medical Sciences
National Institutes of Health
okitar@nigms.nih.gov

Eugene Orringer
Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs &
Faculty Development, School of Medicine
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
epo@med.unc.edu

June Osborn
President Emerita
Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation
jeosborn@aol.com

Mary Frances Picciano
Senior Nutrition Research Scientist
Office of Dietary Supplements
National Institutes of Health
piccianm@od.nih.gov

Vivian Pinn
Director
Office of Research on Women's Health
National Institutes of Health
Vivian.Pinn@nih.gov

Jennifer Pohlhaus
AAAS Science & Technology Fellow
National Institutes of Health
pohlhausj@mail.nih.gov

Clare Porac
Associate Executive Director
Graduate & Postgraduate Education
American Psychological Association
cporac@apa.org

Joyce Pressley
Associate Professor of Clinical Epidemiology and
Health Policy and Management Columbia University
jp376@columbia.edu

Earnestine Pсалmonds
Senior Program Officer
The National Academies
epsalmonds@nas.edu

Silvia Rabionet
Associate Professor
Nova Southeastern University College of Pharmacy
rabionet@nova.edu

Joan Reede
Dean for Diversity and Community Partnership
Harvard Medical School
joan_reede@hms.harvard.edu

Alissa Resch
Postdoctoral Fellow
National Center for Biotechnology Information
National Library of Medicine
National Institutes of Health
resch@ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

Jan Rinehart
Executive Director
NSF ADVANCE
Rice University
jan.rinehart@rice.edu

Carla Romero
Director of Programs
Computing Research Association
cromero@cra.org

Karla Shepard Rubinger
Executive Director
Rosalind Franklin Society
krubinger@liebertpub.com

Joyce Rudick

Director
Programs and Management
National Institutes of Health
rudickj@od.nih.gov

Gene Russo

Editor
Naturejobs
g.russo@naturedc.com

Pardis Sabeti

Assistant Professor
Harvard University
pardis@broad.mit.edu

Sean Sanders

Commercial Editor and Outreach Program Director
Science/AAAS
ssanders@aaas.org

Pamela Saunders

Assistant Research Professor
Georgetown University School of Medicine
saunderp@georgetown.edu

Walter Schaffer

Senior Scientific Advisor for Extramural Research
National Institutes of Health
wsl1q@nih.gov

Vanessa Schick

RAISE Project Coordinator
The Society for Women's Health Research
vanessa@womenshealthresearch.org

Belinda Seto

Deputy Director
National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and
Bioengineering
National Institutes of Health
setob@mail.nih.gov

Lana Shekim

Program Director
Voice & Speech Programs
National Institute for Deafness and other
Communication Disorders
National Institutes of Health
shekiml@nidcd.nih.gov

Cat Shrier

President
Watercat Consulting LLC
cat@watercatconsulting.com

Lydia Shrier

Director of Clinic-based Research
Division of Adolescent/Young Adult Medicine
Harvard University
lydia.shrier@childrens.harvard.edu

Belinda Sims

Health Scientist Administrator
National Institute on Drug Abuse
Division of Epidemiology, Services and Prevention
Research
Prevention Research Branch
bsims@nida.nih.gov

Laurel Smith-Doerr

Program Director
National Science Foundation
lsmithdo@nsf.gov

Patricia Sokolove

Deputy Director
Office of Intramural Training & Education
National Institutes of Health
sokolovp@mail.nih.gov

Marie-Adele Sorel

Medical Student
Harvard Medical School
Marie-Adele_Sorel@hms.harvard.edu

Cynthia St. Hilaire

Postdoctoral Fellow
National Cancer Institute
sthilairec@mail.nih.gov

Doug Stiner

Associate Dean
University of Delaware
doren@udel.edu

Karen Stiner

Albert Einstein Fellow
House Committee on Science and Technology
karen.stiner@mail.house.gov

Katie Stores

Grants Management Specialist
West Virginia University
Katie.Stores@mail.wvu.edu

Marilyn Suiter

Program Director
National Science Foundation
msuiter@nsf.gov

Catherine Croft Swanwick

PRAT Fellow
National Institutes of Health
swanwick@mail.nih.gov

Deanne Taylor

Director of Bioinformatics
RMA of New Jersey
Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
dtaylor@rmanj.com

Mary Thomas

Postdoctoral Research Associate
St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital
mary.thomas@stjude.org

Huei-Ting Tsai

Genetic Epidemiology Branch
Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics
National Cancer Institute
tsaih2@mail.nih.gov

Carol Van Hartesveldt

Program Director
IGERT
National Science Foundation
cvanhart@nsf.gov

Adeline Vanderver

Clinician Scientist
Children's National Medical Center
avanderv@cnmc.org

Andrea Vergara-Silva

Senior Scientific Liaison
Astellas Pharma US, Inc.
Andrea.Vergara-Silva@us.astellas.com

Lydia Villa-Komaroff

Chief Executive Officer
Cytonome, Inc.
lydia-villa-komaroff@cytonome.com

Judith Weber

Associate Professor
University of Arkansas School for Medical Sciences
WeberJudithL@uams.edu

Susan Wessler

Professor
University of Georgia
sue@plantbio.uga.edu

Carrie Wolinetz

Director of Scientific Affairs & Public Relations
Federation of American Societies for Experimental
Biology
cwolinetz@faseb.org

Hui-Lee Wong

Postdoctoral Fellow
National Institutes of Health
wongh@mail.nih.gov

Karen Woodrow-Lafield

Unaffiliated Researcher and Independent Consultant
KarenWLafield@cs.com

Lilian Wu

Program Executive
IBM
wulil@us.ibm.com

Chu-Ling Yu

Research Fellow
National Cancer Institute
yuchu@mail.nih.gov

Zabelle Zakarian

Freelance Writer and Editor
zabelle_zakarian@yahoo.com

Wu Zhang

Senior Research Engineer
Brookhaven National Laboratory
ARLING@BNL.GOV

Additional Resources



OCT. 22, 2007

Women, Science and Interdisciplinary Ways of Working

By Diana Rhoten and Stephanie Pfirman

For at least a decade, universities and federal agencies alike have been engaged in an interdisciplinary arms race, competing to expand interdisciplinary programs and opportunities at ever faster rates in the hopes of achieving that transformational breakthrough in research. At the same time, federal and local programs have been working against the clock, seeking to broaden participation of women and members of minority groups in science, mathematics, and engineering before the U.S. loses its competitive edge.

While research and policy have been concerned with each of these trends often in parallel, surprisingly few efforts have considered them together, to ask whether and how interdisciplinary science might at once not only stimulate discovery across but also attract diversity to the scientific enterprise.

Despite the lack of empirical evidence there seems to be a tacit expectation, if not widespread assumption, on the part of many policy reformers, administrators and researchers that women may have a stronger preference or predisposition for interdisciplinary over disciplinary work as compared to their male colleagues. For example, reform efforts designed to recruit and retain women to science courses and careers often direct universities to: rely more on integrative methods, provide cooperative learning and working environments, use less competitive models of teaching and more flexible models of tenure, frame science in its social context, present practical applications along with theoretical motivations from the outset, and undertake problems with a “holistic” or “global” scope.

Moreover, as researchers interested in interdisciplinarity as an object of study, we have both been asked repeatedly about gender as predictor of participation in or success with interdisciplinary practices. We have also been confronted by scientists telling us that we should not encourage junior women to conduct interdisciplinary research because “women have a hard enough time as it is, you need to keep them focused on rigorous science or they’ll never be taken seriously.” After a growing store of anecdotal data to the point, we started to ask ourselves why we weren’t looking at gender and began listening to our peers and readers.

Given we could find only two empirical analyses explicitly tackling the question of gender and interdisciplinarity, we began by recoding our data to see if we had any evidence to support these broader expectations and then proceeded with reviewing different schools of thought to see what theories might best explain the observations.

Of course, over-generalizing and over-essentializing differences between women and men is a common pitfall, and one we do not wish to stumble into here by arguing for simple generic categories. Using gender as a lens, the purpose is to develop an awareness of how intrapersonal, interpersonal, and socio-structural factors may contribute to decisions about interdisciplinary research and how such actions might then affect individual careers and institutional strategies. In fact, though we focus here on women in academic research, we believe that the arguments we propose may, in some cases, also resonate with men as well as with scholars in minority groups.

Admittedly, our approach is exploratory, and our data are sparse. But, even with these limitations, we see this as an important first step toward understanding the preferences women might have for interdisciplinarity and why. We also see this as a critical point in the policy process to identify what consequences — both intended and unintended — might come from twinning the goals of expanding interdisciplinary science with those of increasing scientific diversity, and what they could pose for the individuals, their institutions, and the larger enterprise. Our hope is to catalyze research science practice and policy discussions about the subject of diversity and interdisciplinarity; thus, we intentionally set out to raise more questions than we answer. We want to examine the proposition, not start with an assumption.

We found only one large-scale empirical study concerned with the connection between gender and interdisciplinarity. In 1998, Evaluation Associates Ltd, a consulting firm, conducted an assessment of interdisciplinary research in higher education institutions in Britain. The analysis of responses from 5,505 researchers in British higher education institutions indicates that greater percentages of women than men report participating in interdisciplinary research at almost every age and discipline. The differences in rates of participation for junior faculty are particularly significant as British women report spending approximately half of their time on interdisciplinary research and men spend only a third.

Another study, published in *Gender and Society* by Erin Leahey in 2006, used a sample of 196 sociology and 222 linguistics faculty members to examine a related issue of specialization. She found with statistical significance that those who specialize tend to produce more publications, and that women tend to specialize less than men. While researchers could theoretically specialize in an interdisciplinary area or interdiscipline, Alan Porter and colleagues found in their 2007 paper that interdisciplinary researchers also tend to be less specialized: single interdiscipline specialists are rare.

In order to examine what might be behind these differences, we broke down the concept of interdisciplinarity into four modes of practice. For each, we briefly consider theoretical arguments and empirical data related to gender-based participation in these different interdisciplinary ways of working. We start with a model of individual interdisciplinarity, and proceed through three different collaborative models which involve in step other individual researchers, other intellectual fields, and other institutional communities.

The first category of interdisciplinarity occurs when individuals make cognitive connections among disciplines, and thus “cross-fertilize.” Researchers who use this approach single-handedly knit together ideas, approaches and information from different fields and/or disciplines. In the UK study, women clearly pursue independent lines of interdisciplinary inquiry more readily than men: women who operate as lone scientists (as opposed to working in formal or ad hoc teams) reported spending 44 percent of their time on interdisciplinary research, while male lone scientists only reported spending 33 percent. Although these data do not indicate definitively why women would have a greater tendency to cross-fertilize, other research suggests possible avenues of explanation. Cross-fertilization requires the processing of the languages and epistemologies of other fields as well as establishing connections among them. Recent studies in cognitive psychology have shown that whereas males tend to look for abstract and theoretical arguments, dissociating it from any distracting information, females are more apt to make connections between language, ideas and the larger context.

The second category of interdisciplinary work — “team-collaboration” — occurs by virtue of several individuals working together. Here researchers collaborate in formal or informal teams or networks that span across fields and/or disciplines. Evaluation Associates found that most interdisciplinary research occurred in ad hoc teams (53 percent), with lower levels conducted by formal teams (29 percent) and by lone researchers (18 percent). Beyond some preliminary findings from research by one of us (Rhoten) that suggest that females — particularly younger females — may have on average slightly more interdisciplinary collaborators than men, we have not found any other empirical data relating to the role of gender in the composition of interdisciplinary research teams. Potential lines of reasoning for why women might be expected to have a proclivity for

teamwork come from the psychology of gender literature, which portrays females as being more inclined toward group work and males more likely to prefer independent work.

The third category — “field creation” — involves the bridging of existing research domains to form new disciplines, subdisciplines or “interdisciplines” at their intersections. Early data from a study by Rhoten and other colleagues of Integrative Graduate Education and Research Training (IGERT) programs indicate that enrollment rates of female students in new interdisciplines tend to be higher than the enrollment rates of female students in cognate disciplines. For example, in 2003, female students represented 45 percent of the total graduate enrollment across all earth, atmospheric, and ocean sciences; 55 percent across biological sciences; and, 22 percent across engineering. By comparison, the ratio of female students averages 57 percent and climbs as high as 80 percent for this sample of IGERT programs concentrating on emerging interdisciplines in the area of environmental systems (e.g., those focused on the intersection of earth systems, ecosystem management, and environmental science and engineering). Later stage career data from the University of California at Berkeley also suggest that a great proportion of female versus male faculty may be bridging fields to build new areas of research: 26 percent of female faculty in STEM fields as opposed to 15 percent of males hold joint appointments, according to the National Research Council. Some scholars of gender and science studies proffer that female scientists may be attracted to new fields because they are less established in their status, hierarchical and competitive structure than older disciplines, allowing for greater flexibility and opportunity for intellectual exploration and knowledge reevaluation.

The fourth category — “problem orientation” — entails interdisciplinary research that is oriented toward problem solving, especially “real world” questions that confront society. Researchers with an interdisciplinary problem-orientation engage in topics that not only draw on multiple fields but also serve multiple stakeholders and broader missions outside of academe. Literature from both psychology as well as women studies documents consistent differences in the concerns that appeal to males versus females, with the former generally tending to be more interested in things and theories one might associate with basic science and the latter in people and problems often aligned with applied research. Currently, beyond personal narratives, there is no real systematic evidence to test the relationship of gender to this category of interdisciplinarity. At best, we can glean from the aforementioned sample of IGERTs that only those programs self-classified as “problem-oriented” (versus “tool-oriented” or “vision-oriented”) are majority female enrolled. Likewise, and again at a later career stage, we know that the joint appointments that STEM women hold at Berkeley tend to be in “business, biology, law, city and regional planning, economics, and environmental science” — mostly fields that connect directly with society.

While more research is needed to reject or support the hypothesis, these preliminary observations and summary explanations point to the possibility that women might have a predilection for interdisciplinarity in each of these four categories of activity and for different reasons. However, even if the proposition were right and interdisciplinary research presents a promising angle by which to engage women and diversify the scientific enterprise, can it or will it be a rewarding career trajectory for women and other underrepresented minorities to follow in the current academic environment? Can and will interdisciplinary work lead those who choose it to find and retain productive and innovative positions? We are concerned by findings such as those reported by Leahey about the lower productivity of non-specialists, and by the University of Wisconsin at Madison, where faculty who described their research as “non-mainstream” responded more negatively to all questions about the quality of their workplace than their colleagues doing “mainstream” research.

On the one hand, National Academies reports like [“Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future”](#) emphasize the importance of interdisciplinary research to scientific development and national competitiveness. On the other hand, reports such as [“Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research,”](#) also coming out of the National Academies, identify “promotion criteria” as the top impediment to the future of interdisciplinarity research, pointing first and foremost to the problem that the

potentially unique contributions of a researcher's interdisciplinary work may not be sufficient enough to compensate for what is likely to be his/her lower output of disciplinary research. Good interdisciplinary work requires not only depth but also breadth of knowledge across different disciplines, the pursuit of which inevitably takes time away from the (re)production of the type of narrowly focused research in subdisciplines favored by the contemporary tenure system.

We recognize that tenure prospects can be uncertain for all young professors. Yet, we also believe that, far from fully restructuring the system, there are additional steps around scientific risk, review and reward that can be (and in a few cases, have been) taken so as to move beyond interdisciplinary revolution into interdisciplinary reform, and thereby not just attract but actually retain women in the interdisciplinary programs for which they seem to demonstrate preference and our institutions report to be invested. As an example of progress in this area, one might look to the Guidance for Interdisciplinary Hiring and Career Development recently released by the Council for Environmental Deans and Directors. Despite the hype and hope for interdisciplinary research, it cannot be considered ethical or even practical to draw women into science using interdisciplinary research as the lure, if simultaneously systems of work, evaluation and promotion are not reformed to reward them for taking up the challenge.

Diana Rhoten is founder and director of the Knowledge Institutions program at the Social Science Research Council. Her current research interests include the social and technical conditions as well as the individual and organizational implications of different approaches to knowledge production and dissemination. Rhoten is principal investigator of a National Science Foundation-sponsored study of Integrative Graduate Education and Research Training programs.

Stephanie Pfirman is Alena Wels Hirschorn '58 and Martin Hirschorn Professor in Environmental and Applied Sciences Professor and chair of environmental science at Barnard College, and co-principal investigator of the NSF-sponsored Advancing Women in the Sciences initiative of the Columbia Earth Institute.

Rhoten and Pfirman are co-chairs of a workshop at Columbia next month on ["Women, Minorities, and Interdisciplinarity: Transforming the Research Enterprise."](#)

The original story and user comments can be viewed online at <http://insidehighered.com/views/2007/10/22/rhoten>.

© Copyright 2008 *Inside Higher Ed*

The McKinsey Quarterly

A business case for women

The gender gap isn't just an image problem: our research suggests that it can have real implications for company performance. Some companies have taken effective steps to achieve greater parity.

Georges Desvoux, Sandrine Devillard-Hoellinger, and Mary C. Meaney

September 2008

Women in developed economies have made substantial gains in the workplace during recent decades. Nevertheless, it's still true that the higher up in a company you look, the lower the percentage of women.

But some companies have moved successfully to increase the hiring, retention, and promotion of female executives. Their initiatives have included efforts to ensure that HR policies aren't inadvertently biased against women or part-time workers, to encourage mentoring and networking, to establish (and consistently monitor at a senior level) targets for diversity, and to find ways of creating a better work-life balance. Changes like these have a price, but there are business advantages to making them—above and beyond the branding benefit that might accrue to companies viewed as socially progressive.

Research in Europe and the United States suggests, for example, that companies with several senior-level women tend to perform better financially. Hiring and retaining women at all levels also enlarges a company's pool of talent at a time when shortages are appearing throughout industries.

Why women matter

Few women become executives. Across the European Union, women account for only 11 percent of the membership of governing bodies such as boards of directors and supervisory boards, our research has found. In the United States, fewer than a third of the leading 1,500 companies had even a single woman among their top executives in 2006, according to research from Columbia University and the University of Maryland.¹ The numbers are even more discouraging elsewhere: in South Korea, for example, 74 percent of the companies surveyed in 2007 had no female senior executives.² We believe that such underrepresentation is untenable in the longer term—and not only because it's unfair.

More workers needed

Many countries and regions face talent shortages at all levels, and those gaps will worsen. By 2040, Europe³ will have a shortfall of 24 million workers aged 15 to 65; raising the proportion of women in the workplace to that of men would cut the gap to 3 million. In the United States, the upcoming retirement of the baby boomers will probably mean that companies are going to lose large numbers of senior-level employees in a short period of time; nearly one-fifth of the working-age population (16 and older) of the United States will be at least 65 by 2016.

Mismatches between training and employment can also cause shortages. In the United Kingdom, male-dominated sectors with a dearth of workers include engineering, IT, and skilled trades—yet 70 percent of women with science, engineering, or technology qualifications are not working in these fields.⁴

Besides helping companies to fill shortfalls of talent, gender diversity can allow them to attract and retain it and to meet other business goals. One European Commission study showed that 58 percent of the companies with diversity programs reported higher productivity as a result of improved employee motivation and efficiency, and 62 percent said that the programs helped attract and retain highly talented people.

Corporate performance

In recent years, McKinsey has done extensive work on the relationship between organizational and financial performance and on the number of women who are managers at the companies we've studied. Our research has shown, first, that the companies around the world with the highest scores on nine important dimensions of organization—from leadership and direction to accountability and motivation—are likely to have higher operating margins than their lower-ranked counterparts do (Exhibit 1).⁵ Second, among the companies for which information on the gender of senior managers was

available,⁶ those with three or more women on their senior-management teams scored higher on all nine organizational criteria than did companies with no senior-level women (Exhibit 2).⁷




¹Quartiles are based on arithmetic average of scores obtained by 231 institutions, rated on 9 criteria by 115,000 employees.

²Based on data for year of survey or averaged over 3 years; surveys were carried out at different times in different companies over last 5 years.

³Earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization.

⁴Ratio of enterprise value to book value.



¹Analysis conducted on sample of 58,240 persons employed by 101 companies around the world; given the sample size, a 1% difference is statistically significant.

These findings suggest that companies with higher numbers of women at senior levels are also companies with better organizational and financial performance. Although the analysis does not show a causal link, our research argues for greater gender diversity among corporate leaders.

Work by professors at the business schools of Columbia University and the University of Maryland lends support to this point. Using data on 1,500 US companies from 1992 to 2006, Cristian L. Deszö and David Gaddis Ross demonstrate the "strong positive association between Tobin's Q,⁸ return on assets, and return on equity on the one hand and the [female top-management] participation rate on the other." The authors add that they found "at least indicative evidence that greater female representation in senior-management positions leads to—and is not merely a result of—better firm quality and performance."⁹

What companies can do

Some companies have succeeded in hiring, retaining, and promoting more women. McKinsey and other research suggest some basic steps a business can take to enhance its opportunities.

Rethinking HR

HR policies can inadvertently hold women back. Internal processes for identifying high-potential employees, for example, often focus on managers between the ages of 28 and 35. Broadening the parameters to include years of employment at a company—thus taking into account time spent on maternity leave, which sometimes lasts as long as two years in Europe—can ensure that the evaluation processes don't overlook qualified women.

Some companies, such as JPMorgan Chase, have organized training for recruiters and operational managers on the importance of diversity and on identifying prejudices that might affect their decisions. Together with the top team's commitment to retaining and promoting women, this training has generated a strong pipeline: in 2008, women made up 48 percent of the company's managers—and 27 percent of its most senior ones, up from 19 percent in 1996.

Other approaches can work as well. At a European company in a technical, sales-oriented line of business, only 5 percent of the job applications that a specific ad generated were coming from women. By replacing the ad's stock photo of a man with one of the company's senior women and by focusing the text on enthusiasm and innovation instead of aggressiveness and competitiveness, the company raised the rate of applications from women to 40 percent.¹⁰

The role of mentors

Coaching, mentoring, and networking programs have proved quite successful in helping female executives succeed—for instance, by encouraging them to seek out new positions more aggressively. Internal research at HP showed that women apply for open jobs only if they think they meet 100 percent of the criteria listed, whereas men respond to the posting if they feel they meet 60 percent of the requirements.

Likewise, Lloyds TSB found that although female employees are 8 percent more likely than men to meet or exceed performance expectations, they tend not to apply for promotion. To address this issue, managers are specifically charged with encouraging talented women to move up, making sure that they receive the necessary training, and developing succession plans that include them. Thanks to this and other initiatives, as well as the CEO's personal focus on diversity, the percentage of Lloyds management positions held by women rose from 15 percent in 1998 to 39 percent in 2007; meanwhile, the percentage of senior-management positions they hold rose to 21 percent, from 9 percent. The company also has four women on its nine-member senior-executive committee.¹¹

Advancement has traditionally been difficult for women in Japanese corporations as well. In 2004, Nissan Motor began a program focusing on mentoring, networking, educating managers, and accountability. Its effort has helped increase the number of female senior managers to 101 (4 percent of the managers throughout the company), from 36—still low by Western standards, but a notable increase.

Mentoring efforts also take place outside individual companies. The FTSE 100 Cross-Company Mentoring Programme pairs chairmen and CEOs of the largest public companies in the United Kingdom and their public-sector counterparts, on the one hand, with female executives who hold positions just below the board level elsewhere, on the other. Thirty-three chairmen and CEOs act as mentors, helping the mentees to manage their careers, giving them advice and guidance, introducing them to other senior executives and to headhunters, and generally preparing them to be credible candidates for positions as executive or nonexecutive directors. Since the program began, in late 2004, a number of mentees have been appointed to public bodies and to the boards of national charities, and seven participants have been appointed to the boards of companies.¹²

Measurement and accountability

Explicit diversity indicators allow companies to monitor their progress and to define priorities for action. Frequently used indicators include the proportion of women in a company's business units at each level of employment, the pay levels and attrition rates of men and women in comparable positions, and the ratio of women promoted to women eligible for promotion. Companies seem to promote and retain women most successfully when senior executives monitor those indicators and incorporate them into regular reviews.

At Lloyds TSB, for example, the CEO reviews the progress of women with the managing directors of the business units, and the company regularly profiles its workforce at all levels to measure progress. ING links part of each business unit's

bonus pool specifically to diversity goals. Between 2003 and 2007, the company raised the proportion of its top-management positions around the world held by women to 10 percent, from 8 percent. In 2007, 30 percent of ING's senior managers, including those just below the top level, were women.

Having a life

What about retention rates? Companies can raise them by offering flexible hours, maternity and child-care leaves, and coaching to ease the return to the workforce. Such programs can have other benefits as well. Research that the Korea Labor Institute conducted in 2007 indicates that some family-friendly policies (such as allowances for child care and granting women permission to take nursing time out of their daily schedules) are correlated with higher revenues per employee: about \$1,000 a year.

None of these approaches comes without cost: whether the time needed to implement change or real monetary expenditures. Yet companies reap tangible benefits, such as retaining and promoting more women, by implementing suitable policies. The other benefits—for instance, a larger talent pool and stronger financial performance—also suggest that making gender diversity a significant goal is well worth the investment.

Notes

¹See Cristian L. Deszö and David Gaddis Ross, "Girl Power": Female participation in top management and firm performance," working paper, December 2007.

²See "Survey on women as human resource," conducted in 2007 by the Korean Women's Development Institute, commissioned by Korea's Ministry of Gender Equality.

³ Europe in this sense includes the EU-27, excluding Slovenia, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic, and including Albania, Iceland, Norway, and Switzerland.

⁴See Avivah Wittenberg-Cox and Alison Maitland, *Why Women Mean Business: Understanding the Emergence of Our Next Economic Revolution*, Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons, 2008.

⁵Our analysis is derived from a survey of 115,000 employees at 231 private and public companies around the world. The nine dimensions of organization are leadership, direction, accountability, coordination and control, innovation, external orientation, capability, motivation, and work environment and values.

⁶We had such information for 101 of the companies, which allowed us to analyze 58,240 employee evaluations.

⁷In addition to undertaking these analyses, we joined with the Amazone Euro Fund to conduct a study on the financial performance of the 89 European public companies with the greatest gender diversity in top posts. We found that, on average, these companies outperform their sectors in returns on equity, operating results, and stock price growth. The full study, *Women Matter* can be found [online](#).

⁸A standard measure of corporate value: the market value of a company divided by the replacement value of its assets.

⁹See Cristian L. Deszö and David Gaddis Ross, "Girl Power": Female participation in top management and firm performance," working paper, December 2007.

¹⁰See Avivah Wittenberg-Cox and Alison Maitland, *Why Women Mean Business: Understanding the Emergence of Our Next Economic Revolution*, Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons, 2008.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Personal communication from Peninah Thomson, a partner at Praesta, which sponsors the program.