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(\text{Page continued})
SUMMARY

TASK FORCE STUDY OF THE STATUS OF WOMEN ON CAMPUS

February 17, 1998

The Task Force on the Status of Women at Western (initiated by then-president Thomas Meredith) first convened on January 29, 1997, at which time the Task Force members clarified our mission. We determined that our concerns should focus on WKU women employees, including student workers and graduate students, but not women students generally.

We agreed first to review similar task force reports from the University of Kentucky, the University of Louisville, and the Arizona State System. In subsequent meetings, we discussed those reports and developed a plan we hoped to follow.

We determined to send out a Memorandum (see Part II B1) to all WKU employees soliciting information regarding concerns they had in a variety of areas. We also planned to develop Focus Groups/Individual Interviews with campus employees, but this part of our original plan never materialized. Our efforts in this direction failed to meet the criteria established by WKU's Human Subject Review Board. (See Part II B2) Consequently, we substituted a Critical Incident Questionnaire, * a qualitative instrument that allows researchers to gather examples or "incidents" that are meaningful to respondents, in a short span of time, while protecting the anonymity of respondents. (See Part II B2) One other source of information involved a survey mailed to every WKU employee.

In order to examine areas of interest/concern, the Task Force created three subcommittees: (1) Employment and Advancement, (2) Compensation, and (3) Climate and Culture. These subcommittees gathered information, both objective (through data collection and data analysis) and subjective (by gathering perceptions), and wrote reports, each of which was read and discussed in meetings with the whole Task Force. Copies of each subcommittee report with complete Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations are found in the appendices.

Although some women expressed complete satisfaction with their worklife at Western, the Task Force discovered some particularly troubling perceptions and concerns, especially in the area of sexual harassment. Members of the Task Force realize that the information we gathered was anonymous and therefore not subject to specific verification--certainly not by the Task Force. It is our opinion, however, that the University should take immediate action to verify or disprove these particular perceptions and reports. If the perceptions prove to be true, we recommend the University act immediately to correct the problem.

The Task Force makes the following general recommendations:

The University should establish goals for each of the following recommendation areas and develop specific plans, including strategies, timetables, and measurable objectives, through which to reach the goals.

This document should be public knowledge and distributed widely.

The University should create a mechanism to examine its success or failure in meeting the recommended goals.

A report on the University's success and/or failure in meeting those goals should be published and distributed by February 2000.

Following are references to findings and a summary of the conclusions and recommendations for five specific areas of concern identified by the three subcommittees: (1) compensation, (2) sexual harassment, (3) advancement, (4) work environment, (5) safety.

COMPENSATION

Findings

See “A Quantitative Assessment of Gender Gaps in WKU Salaries,” Part II B3a, pages 54-81.

Conclusions

Despite WKU’s efforts in recent years, Survey and Critical Incidents respondents report a perception that there is disparity in pay between males and females performing comparable work.

The conclusions of the Compensation Subcommittee, based on statistical data, include several items. First, the subcommittee believes that “the data do not support a finding of systematic discrimination against women among WKU’s faculty and administrators....”

The Subcommittee also concludes, however, that its findings “do not rule out the possibility of gender bias in faculty or administrative pay.” The Subcommittee suggests that such discrimination “would seemingly be limited to isolated cases....” The Subcommittee did find that among the staff there are “gender-based salary differences in favor of males of $320 in the category of staff making around $13,000 to $22,000 annually.”
In addition, the Subcommittee reported questions regarding WKU’s approach to maternity leave and commented “that as the faculty grows younger, interest will grow in having more convenient and reliable day-care services, including a drop-in sick-child center.”

**Recommendations**

The Compensation Subcommittee recommends that gender-based salary problems among staff personnel be addressed and that individual problems found in any category of employees (“outliers”) regarding compensation “be examined and any cases of bias eliminated.” Two concluding recommendations were that a salary study should be conducted at three-year intervals and that “a directory of non-salary benefits and services of particular interest to women should be prepared and distributed among female faculty and staff.”

The University should address inequities in compensation and actively engage in educating the University community about compensation issues.

**SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

**Findings**


**Conclusions**

Despite recent efforts to educate the University community, Survey and Critical Incidents respondents indicate that sexual harassment does exist on Western’s campus; indeed, it appears that the WKU Sexual Harassment Policy is not being followed in some units.

**Recommendations**

The Climate and Culture Subcommittee research suggests that workshops and seminars have not eradicated the problem of sexual harassment, so other efforts must be made. Posters should be distributed to all floors in all buildings with a strongly worded statement that sexual harassment will not be tolerated. The WKU Sexual Harassment
Policy should be rewritten and clarified, especially with regard to informal versus formal procedures for reporting occurrences.

In order to deal with specific instances, the University should designate an ombudsperson to whom staff, students, and faculty could present their cases and seek advice and/or action. That person would be responsible for investigating the situation.

ADVANCEMENT

Findings

In its history, Western has hired or advanced few women in executive positions. The one individual who has served as Interim President was singled out in the Critical Incidents Questionnaire process as the only meaningful sign that women have opportunities for advancement. That same individual is the only female to have served as Academic Vice President. No women have served at the vice presidential level in Student Affairs or Business Affairs. Few have served at the rank of associate or assistant vice president. No women have served as college deans, associate deans, or assistant deans. Female heads of academic departments have been rare.


Conclusions

The University tends not to select women for positions in upper administration.

Survey and Critical Incidents respondents report that women do not have the same opportunities for appointment or advancement that men enjoy at Western.

The Advancement and Employment Subcommittee reached several conclusions based on statistical analysis of data collected. They include: (1) the majority of interviewees and applicants for faculty positions has been female, for administrative staff positions, the majority of new hires has been male; (2) the University appears to award tenure and to promote faculty without regard to gender; since 1993, the University has tended to have approximately 67 percent male faculty (higher in some colleges, Business, for example), but the latest (1996-97) faculty hires tended to be balanced; (3) the persons hired for non-exempt (hourly) positions continue to be primarily female, while those
hired for exempt (salaried) positions have tended toward balance (currently 45 percent female) but has not changed in two years.

**Recommendations**

The University should develop, promote, and adhere to a rigid policy designed to increase the number of women at all levels of upper administration in non-academic as well as academic areas, including department headships, deanships, vice presidencies, and presidencies.

Other recommendations include: to continue to track and monitor the hiring process; to monitor and track faculty promotions; to continue to track faculty vacancies (to include retirements/optional retirements) and recruitment data; for appropriate offices to review the current system(s) associated with employee turnover, job advertising, interviewing, recruitment, and hiring.

**WORK ENVIRONMENT**

**Findings**

See “Climate and Culture Subcommittee Study,” Part II B6, page 137.

**Conclusions**

Responses to the Survey and to the Critical Incidents reports indicate that many women at Western continue to have problems in achieving job satisfaction, respect, opportunities to participate in decision-making activities, and equity in employee evaluation.

**Recommendations**

The University should investigate the conditions of Western’s interpersonal and intra- and interdepartmental work environment and develop programs for eliminating any problems.
SAFETY

Findings

See "Climate and Culture Subcommittee Study," Part II B6, pages 136-137.

Conclusions

The numerous safety problems/areas mentioned in these Survey and Critical Incidents responses warrant action.

Recommendations

The University should add more lighting and emergency call boxes in specific areas and reallocate more foot and bicycle police patrols to the interior of the campus instead of so many automobile patrols along the periphery. The University should also review the campus in light of specific spots of danger that are mentioned in the responses. (See Critical Incidents Report.)

* * *

The work of this Task Force has been seriously impeded by the actions of the WKU Human Subjects Review Board, from which we would have welcomed assistance during several critical stages of our work. Although we had received the HSRB's approval to proceed with administering the Critical Incidents Questionnaire, on February 20, 1998 that board forbade our use of any quoted material from responses to the questionnaire. Because all such quotations now have been marked out of our report, the richness that comes from women and men writing from personal experience has been lost.

We have completed our in-depth study of the issues affecting women employees at Western Kentucky University. The recommendations of this Task Force highlight the problems and perceptions concerning women on this campus. Implementation of these recommendations will provide the needed mechanisms for monitoring and measuring the University's progress toward ensuring that women employees attain equality with their male colleagues in all areas of the University.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Dawn Bolton, Department of Marketing
    Dr. Charles Bussey, Department of History
    Mr. Robert Cobb, Budget and Management Information
    Dr. Cecile Garmon, Planning
    Ms. Rose Davis, Library Auto. and Technical Services
    Ms. Nancy Davis, Student Health Service
    Dr. Carol Graham, Department of Management
    Dr. Steve Groce, Department of Sociology
    Dr. John Hardin, Department of History
    Dr. Judith Hoover, Department of Communication and Broadcasting
    Ms. Mary Ellen Miller, Department of English
    Dr. John Moore, School of Integrative Studies
    Ms. Pamela Napier, Sponsored Programs
    Dr. Elizabeth Oakes, Department of English
    Ms. Judith Owen, Career Services Center
    Ms. Linda Puisinelli, Department of Mathematics
    Dr. Dan Roenker, Department of Psychology
    Ms. Eugenia Scott, Student Activities and Organizations
    Dr. Sally Ann Strickler, Library Public Services

FROM: Thomas C. Meredith, President

SUBJECT: Task Force on the Status of Women on Campus

As you know, Western Kentucky University has made frequent and continuing efforts to ensure that women employees maintain equality with their male colleagues in all areas of the University life. As a continuation of that policy, in January 1997, the University will initiate a major study on the "Status of Women on Campus." The Task Force, which will direct this study, will be chaired by Dr. Judith Hoover, professor in the Department of Communication and Broadcasting. We want to develop membership on this Task Force to reflect all areas of the University community. Your name has been brought to my attention as an excellent choice for membership. I am asking you if you would agree to serve as a member of this group.
The study will begin in January, and we are asking the Task Force to complete its work within one year. Listed below is the Charge which I will give to the Task Force. I have confidence that you would make a significant contribution to the work of this activity, and I hope you will feel strongly that you wish to participate.

Please contact my office with your response to this appointment. You may wish to contact Dr. Hoover with questions or items of information. Since the Task Force will begin its work in January, I would appreciate hearing from you as soon as you feel comfortable with a decision. I look forward to the results of this work and assure you that the study has my full support.

Charge to Task Force for Study of Status of Women on Campus:
"To review the status of women faculty and staff employees at Western Kentucky University and to make recommendations for specific actions which might be taken to resolve any problems identified by the Task Force."

Happy holidays!

TCM:If

xc: Vice Presidents
University Counsel
THE MEMORANDUM

a. Memo to Faculty and Staff

b. Memo to Student Workers

c. Memorandum Analysis

Please circle: I am Male Female

Please take a few minutes to respond to this question and return this page through campus mail to the address on the reverse by February 20.
MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty and Staff Employees of Western Kentucky University

From: Task Force on the Status of Women on Campus

Charlotte Baker, Dawn Bolton, Charles Bussey, Bob Cobb, Rose Davis, Marie Embry, Cecile Garmon, Nancy Givens, Carol Graham, Steve Groce, John Hardin, Judith Hoover (Chair), Mary Ellen Miller, John Moore, Pamela Napier, Elizabeth Oakes, Judy Owen, Linda Pulsinelli, Dan Roenker, Eugenia Scott, Sally Ann Strickler

Regarding: Your concerns

In December, 1996, President Thomas Meredith appointed a Task Force on the Status of Women on Campus and gave us the following charge:

"To review the status of women faculty and staff employees at Western Kentucky University and to make recommendations for specific actions which might be taken to resolve any problems identified by the Task Force."

1. Regarding women faculty, staff, and student workers, what do you think are the most important concerns?

Please circle: I am Male Female.

Please take a few minutes to respond to this question and return this page through campus mail to the address on the reverse by February 25.
MEMORANDUM

To: Student Employees of Western Kentucky University

From: Task Force on the Status of Women on Campus

Charlotte Baker, Dawn Bolton, Charles Bussey, Bob Cobb, Rose Davis, Marie Embry, Cecile Garmon, Nancy Givens, Carol Graham, Steve Groce, John Hardin, Judith Hoover (Chair), Mary Ellen Miller, John Moore, Pamela Napier, Elizabeth Oakes, Judy Owen, Linda Pulsinelli, Dan Roenker, Eugenia Scott, Sally Ann Strickler

Regarding: Your concerns

In December, 1996, President Thomas Meredith appointed a Task Force on the Status of Women on Campus and gave us the following charge:

"To review the status of women faculty and staff employees at Western Kentucky University and to make recommendations for specific actions which might be taken to resolve any problems identified by the Task Force."

1. Regarding women faculty, staff, and student workers, what do you think are the most important concerns?

Please circle: I am Male Female

Please take a few minutes to respond to this question, and return this page through campus mail to the address on the reverse by February 25.
MEMORANDUM ANALYSIS

March 1997

Two analyses were completed for the 239 faculty/staff responses to the memorandum to all employees regarding their concerns about the status of women at Western. The first resulted from a categorization of first items mentioned. A total of 17 themes or issues emerged. For a second step, all other items were considered. Through that process some items were recoded and others were added. The results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1st Response</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pay/salary/compensation</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Equality/respect/treatment</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Child care/maternity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Too few women in admin. positions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WKU policies/practices, not necessarily related to women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Staff women’s special problems</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Women behaving badly/ reverse discrimination</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Warnings/denials (study divisive, poorly done or no problems to study)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Problems same for men and women</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “I don’t know.”/“no comment”</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Representation/voice/ committee service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Part-time faculty special problems</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Promotion/advancement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. “Old boy network”</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Harassment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Safety/security</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Heighten awareness of Women's issues/problems
18. Support for WKU Women’s Studies Program

The same analysis method was used with student employee responses and the results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pay/salary/compensation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Equality/respect/treatment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Child care/maternity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Too few women in admin positions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Warnings/denials (study divisive, poorly done or no problems to study)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Problems same for men and women (Or not problems or concerns)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;I don’t know.&quot;/“no comment”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Promotion/advancement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Safety/security</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Recognition of women’s intelligence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Need for female role models/other classroom issues</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Conservatism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lifting heavy objects as part of job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sick leave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL INCIDENTS QUESTIONNAIRE

a. Critical Incidents Report

b. Human Subjects Review Board Approval Documentation


--In May, the Board concluded that "the focus group technique did not ensure anonymity or confidentiality of subjects. There are many possible opportunities for breach of confidentiality."
(Memorandum to Judith Hoover, dated May 20, 1997, see Part II B2i).

--In June, still without letting a representative of the Task Force appear, the Board concluded that "[the HSRE does not think the focus group approach is reasonable. The focus group topics lead to potential legal liability because in the telling the stories, etc. do things that might cause further liability]" (HSRE Minutes, June 20, 1997, see Part II B2i). In regard to interviews, the Board noted that in "had concerns about individual interviews, should that technique be adopted, for all of the above reasons, particularly Number 6." Item 16 states, "HRU will be required to report any rapes that might emerge during the focus groups as required by law. This point is not made in the application" (Minutes, June 20, 1997).

--In July, the Board "continue[d] to decline approval of the use of focus groups," but agreed to "review an application based upon the proposed alternative "critical incident report methodology but only after the Task Force had consulted with an individual Board member, the University Attorney, and the Interim
CRITICAL INCIDENTS REPORT

December 1997

PROCESSES:

In order to determine women's status as it relates to organizational climate, the Task Force planned to utilize both focus groups and individual interviews. Although these research methodologies have been long recognized as valuable qualitative tools for understanding cultures, such as Western's organizational culture, we were prevented from conducting such activities by the Human Subjects Review Board's denial of our research proposal.

An early misunderstanding occurred, perhaps because of the inadvertent inclusion of draft-stage interview questions that were never intended to be used in focus group settings. Still, after numerous messages had been sent by means of telephone and email, and in spite of face-to-face meetings held, the Board rejected a second proposal without allowing the researchers to appear, putting off the research for first one month, then two.

--In May, the Board concluded that "the focus group technique did not ensure anonymity or confidentiality of subjects. There are many possible opportunities for breach of confidentiality" (Memorandum to Judith Hoover, dated May 20, 1997, see Part II B2b).

--In June, still without letting a representative of the Task Force appear, the Board concluded that "[t]he HSRB does not think the focus group approach is resolvable. The focus group topics lead to potential legal liability because in the telling WKU must do things that might cause further liability" (HSRB Minutes, June 20, 1997, see Part II B2b). In regard to interviews, the Board noted that it "has concerns about individual interviews, should that technique be adopted, for all of the above reasons, particularly Number 6." Item #6 states, "WKU will be required to report any abuses that might emerge during the focus groups as required by law. This point is not made in the application" (Minutes, June 20, 1997).

--In July, the Board "continue[d] to decline approval of the use of focus groups," but agreed to "review an application based upon the proposed alternative 'critical incident report' methodology" but only after the Task Force had consulted with an individual Board member, the University Attorney, and the Interim
President (for her signature) (Memorandum to Judith Hoover, July 2, 1997, see Part II B2b). Finally, on July 22, the Board approved the use of the critical incident questionnaire. We were required to have the otherwise anonymous participants sign a complex disclaimer, that, in itself, identified them. These disclaimers are, as required, stored in a locked filing cabinet in the faculty office of the chair of the Task Force.

--In September and October, a total of twelve critical incident questionnaire sessions were held at Downing University Center and Garrett Conference Center. Letters had been sent to homes or work locations for all employees of Western, including student workers and graduate assistants. Notification was also made by email. A total of 92 individuals responded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Topic</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. equal treatment</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. advancement opportunity</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. sexual harassment/policy</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. safe environment</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. working environment</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. respect</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. job satisfaction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. inclusion/exclusion</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. overall high/low status</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSES TO CRITICAL INCIDENTS QUESTIONNAIRE:

Women responded from 31 categories with segments for numbers of years at Western and employment areas. For example, under Administration, women responded who had been employed for the following time periods: 0 to 3 years, 4 to 7 years, 8-11, 12-15, 16-20, and over 20. The Administration category held the widest range of responses. Within that category, women employed over 20 years provided the most information. Men responded from 9 categories. Male faculty responded in 4 categories, the largest number, with male faculty at Western for 0 to 3 years providing the most information.

RESPONSES TO QUESTION SETS:

In each question set, the odd numbered question asked for positive incidents, while the even numbered question asked for negative incidents. A comparison of the number of female/male responses to the question set topics are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>equal treatment</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>advancement opportunity</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>sexual harassment/policy</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>safe environment</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>working environment</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>respect</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>job satisfaction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>inclusion/exclusion</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>overall high/low status</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
***Responses denied that exclusion occurs, thus claiming inclusion though responding in the space asking for incidents of exclusion.

****Five of these six responses gave the single example of Dr Burch as their evidence for the overall high status of women.

Summary: Bearing in mind that the odd numbers represent positive incidents and the even numbers represent negative incidents, it is clear that in 8 of 9 sets of paired questions, males provided more positive incidents than negative incidents; in the 9th set, the responses were equal. It is equally clear that in 7 of 9 sets, females provided more negative incidents than positive incidents. In the 8th set (questions 15 and 16) several positive responses indicated cynicism that women are included as "tokens," or are included in all-female activities rather than mixed gender activities. In the 9th set, (questions 5 and 6) women expressed willingness to accept the idea that sexual harassment as a concept and a policy is understood, as exemplified generally by presentations and pamphlets provided by the University. For both males and females, the presence of emergency phones has indicated "safety" to those responding. Actual examples of places and situations perceived as "unsafe" will be described further in this report.

Responses were narrowed initially to eliminate those which "named names" or named departments or those that were not expressed as examples or incidents. They were narrowed again by eliminating those that were unclear, unrelated to the question, or likely to reveal the identity of its source. Remaining items were then coded by the following categories: actual positive examples, actual negative examples, Dr Burch as example (since she was named often as a positive and singular example), items related to students, and overall conclusion examples. These responses were then coded into positive examples and negative examples from males and females for each question set, with categories of employees collapsed into faculty, staff, and student categories. Comments reported in this summary have been edited for clarity and to eliminate excessive wordiness. To eliminate further any potential for identifying respondents, all categories have been eliminated.

ANALYSIS:
Male Faculty Respondents:

Among male faculty members, positive responses to question set 1 & 2 (equal treatment) generally described incidents that showed men and women being provided with equal resources, such as information, salary, and awards, or that showed women in administrative positions. Women were described as being hired equally, and being treated equally in meetings and conversations. Negative responses generally came in two forms: one dealt with women being denied or absent from higher level positions, while the other expressed resentment that women were given "window offices" and other advantages that they do not deserve.

For question set 3 & 4 (advancement opportunity), male faculty mentioned tenure and promotion decisions being made without regard to gender most often as their examples. Although mention was made of a woman "as a very highly placed official" in question 3, under negative examples several noted that no women appeared as finalists in the presidential search, or, as one commented, "ever."

For question set 5 & 6 (sexual harassment), male faculty mentioned conversations they had heard or participated in that revealed understanding of both the concept and the policy as they relate to both co-workers and students. Under negative responses, one expressed disdain for women's "double standard" in that while women can joke about males, males cannot joke about females.

For question set 7 & 8 (safety), call boxes and lights were cited, along with a vague sense of safety. Under negative examples, however, respondents recognized a lack of safety perceived by students waiting in the dark for their night class rides home, or items stolen from offices, or the difference in perceptions of safety by small and large persons of both genders. Actual examples were given in terms of University Blvd., and an abduction and rape a few years back.

For question set 9 & 10 (working environment), a "warm and friendly" atmosphere was invoked. However, examples were also given about unfair reprimands given to women but not to men, women being asked to "serve coffee," and, again, about the lack of women finalists in the presidential search.

For question set 11 & 12 (respect), most positive responses relied on the previous women's studies conference and this task force itself. On the negative side, lack of equal credit for equal work, women being "screamed at" by male authority figures,
and women being asked to "serve" at graduation were listed.

For question set 13 & 14, job satisfaction seemed related more to job than to gender. However, departmental power struggles were described that privileged males over females.

For question set 15 & 16 (inclusion/exclusion), women were shown to be included on many boards, committees, etc. No negative examples were given here.

For question set 17 & 18 (overall status), male faculty recognized that although some women may be found in high ranking positions, women generally are still called upon to "serve" more often than men in more mundane or menial capacities.

Dr. Burch was named often as exemplifying women's success at Western. However, in terms of both the presidential search and women in upper administration in general, male faculty who responded to this questionnaire noted "too few women."

Male Staff Respondents:

Male staff respondents were few in number and they did not respond to question set 1 & 2. For set 3 & 4, one positive comment related to women being hired into potentially advantageous maintenance jobs. For set 5 & 6, men expressed disapproval of "very bad language" and "talk and jokes" that were "out of line." For set 7 & 8, and 9 and 10, Western was described as "very safe."

Female Faculty Respondents:

Among female faculty members, positive responses to question set 1 & 2 (equal treatment) generally referred to equal access to privileges such as travel funds, sabbatical leaves, and computer services or equal application of penalties such as library fines. Teaching load assignments were considered equally distributed. On the other hand, most negative responses related to salary differences regardless of hard work, and even when considering other factors such seniority. The lack of women in upper leadership levels, especially that of the Presidency, was noted often. Traditional women's issues such as maternity or family leave were singled out, along with expectations that women would and should "serve" in traditional capacities, such as the reception held at DUC at graduation.
In regard to question set 3 & 4 (advancement opportunity), examples of women to be found in upper administrative levels were given and claims were made about women being given equal opportunity for tenure and promotion. One mentioned that her participation in a planning committee had "contributed directly to my retention here." Negative responses in this category highlighted the lack of women in upper administration, including the executive officer ranks, department heads, and full professors. Men were described as being "groomed" for administrative jobs, while women were merely given "internships" there. Instances were described in which men had made active efforts to block the hiring and promotion of women whom they perceived as having been "shoved down Western's throat." Those who were involved in Women's Studies and/or feminist research noted that not only did their work "not count," it was used to "count against" them. Indeed, some felt that it would be impossible to "win," in that early on they were criticized for lack of research. When they succeeded in publishing, they were then criticized for deficits in teaching and collegiality. The large percentage of women in part-time teaching positions was given as further proof of the lack of advancement opportunities for women. This negative category received the largest single number of responses from faculty women.

For question set 5 & 6 (sexual harassment/policy), female faculty gave examples of awareness of the policy as shown by meetings, videos, brochures, and conversations among co-workers. One even described the dismissal of a colleague for sexual harassment of students. However, among negative responses may be found several examples of harassment of students that seem to represent long-standing patterns. Many items related to inappropriate communication behaviors appear in these responses, ranging from references to women as "bimbos," or as "lesbians who hate men," to actual graphic depictions of women's physical appearance, or to their suitability for "domestic chores." Unwelcome advances combined with repercussions for rejections are noted along with the description of a "department head laughing about viewing pornography on the Net."

For question set 7 & 8 (safety), many were quick to note the new emergency phones and additional lighting as well as the escort service. Others, however, pointed to dark areas and deserted parking lots along with the parking structure and University Blvd. as unsafe places. (Later in this report, we provide a list of all places described as unsafe.)

For question set 9 & 10 (working environment), comfort seems to be offered by other females especially through women's
organizations, such as the Women in Transition and Women’s Studies. This survey was mentioned as a sign of a comfortable working environment. Many counter-examples of a hostile environment were given, however. These ranged from problems of single mothers not being recognized as legitimate, to jokes, name-calling ( ), open public hostility, and having one’s research publicly mocked. Again, communication problems seemed to dominate in the sense that one could not speak, but should retreat to one’s own space-

For question set 11 & 12 (respect), personal examples of good treatment, organizational support for the Women’s Alliance, and women members on the Board of Regents were listed. On the negative side, however, condescending and patronizing attitudes were found alongside references to being asked to “serve” in “subservient” ways. In addition, women’s research and writing were described as being neither supported nor respected. While men are shown respect by others’ use of their titles, women are called by their first names, a sign, to another writer, of

For question set 13 & 14 (job satisfaction), several respondents gave personal examples of their satisfaction, due, it would seem, to the presence of tangible rewards, consideration from others, and the pleasures of a teaching career. However, others cited advantages given to men over women, although they both struggled with family responsibilities. Those in Women’s Studies were described as “embattled.” Expressions of appreciation to faculty appears to have

For question set 15 & 16 (inclusion/exclusion), positive examples included committee and task force work, this survey itself, and Bring Your Daughter to Work Day. Negative examples appeared most often as powerful all-male networks and activities, ranging from the Dean’s Council to golfing, lunches, athletics, and private meetings. The College of Education was singled out for its lack of females in leadership positions regardless of the fact that it

For question set 17 & 18 (overall status), faculty women cited examples of women in high positions and women as recipients of large grants. One woman was singled out as a with power, who . Contrarily, others noted that although we have one highly visible woman in a high position, there were no women finalists in the presidential search. In addition, at the opening fall meeting only one woman
(and no people of color) appeared on the stage with the Governor. While, it is claimed, long-term women employees have been "for promotion, the net result has been that upper management levels are occupied by men, while the majority of women remain in clerical, housekeeping, and part-time faculty and staff positions.

Female Staff Respondents:

Among women staff employees, positive responses to question set 1 & 2 (equal treatment) generally described personal experiences of being recognized for good work or of equal numbers of men and women being paid equitably in one's department. Leadership for the 90s and facilities management training in the use of cleaning equipment and processes were mentioned as examples of equal participation. Negative examples far outweighed positive ones in this category, however. Males were described as receiving more opportunities in terms of talk time at meetings, internal promotions that women were denied, encouragement for seeking advancement, reclassifications and pay grade changes that women were denied, and the assignment of less odious tasks than cleaning of restrooms. Derogatory supervisor statements were listed, such as "and " Several mentions were made in the responses that although women and men work together on projects, men are recognized and rewarded for the work itself.

For question set 3 & 4 (advancement opportunity), examples were given of women being promoted and mention was made of a faculty woman who had been granted an extension for completion of her Ph.D. Counter examples were given of women who had been denied promotions, of "customized" job searches, comparisons of numbers of "men bosses" and "women bosses," of the "male bonding" that results in unequal opportunity, and, again, of the lack of women finalists in the presidential search.

For question set 5 & 6 (sexual harassment), examples were given of inappropriate jokes, pictures, and calendars that had been removed and of apparent consequences of harassment. However, although in one instance, a supervisor had promised to place a "letter" in the personnel file of one alleged offender, it had been learned that no such letter ever appeared. In another instance, no information on sexual harassment had ever been distributed in a particular department. In yet another, inappropriate touching had occurred. Supervisor communication to
female employees included name-calling, flirting, suggestive remarks and jokes, condescending remarks and those with sexual undertones, and comments such as "[censored]" and "[censored]." One person claimed that her supervisor "[censored]."

For question set 7 & 8 (safety), phones, lights, police presence, crime prevention programs and work-related safety classes were given as positive examples. Still, areas with poor lighting, no pay phones, and improper training in the use of chemicals were given as negative examples. (See list of perceived unsafe areas later in this report.)

For question set 9 & 10 (working environment), staff women described "permissions" they had received to attend workshops, decorate their work spaces, and fill out the survey itself. One said that her boss had assigned her to the "common areas" as a dorm housekeeper, but women working in men’s dorms present a significant source of negative incidents to WKU staff women (see next section under "respect"). A hostile environment was exemplified by communication behaviors such as name-calling, ridicule, rudeness, verbal harassment, cursing, intimidation, refusal to apologize, and verbal abuse, often in the presence of others. Women described supervisors "[censored]" or creating a "[censored]" or taking credit for their ideas.

For question set 11 & 12 (respect), staff women mentioned organizational support for the Women’s Alliance, the Staff Advisory Council, and the Women’s Advisory Council to the President. Conversely, however, staff women said that their supervisors’ communication reflected "[censored]" failure to introduce female staff members to “important visitors,” interrupting their communication with others either in person or on the phone, inappropriate touching, "[censored] and comments like, "[censored]." The major problem noted above relates to female facilities management employees assigned to work in male dorms, who must tolerate male students coming in and using the restroom while they try to clean it, regardless of the sign on the door that says, "Women working," or becoming abusive when denied access.

For question set 13 & 14 (job satisfaction), the one positive respondent said that she was "[censored]." On the negative side,
women are described as "limited," with limited opportunities to apply for challenging work. One office associate reported being told by her department head, ""

For question set 15 & 16 (inclusion/exclusion), the few positive comments given relate to women’s organizations and committee work. On the negative side, the problems of "token" inclusion and inclusion in women-only organizations with no power were mentioned. Some still had difficulties being allowed to attend Women’s Alliance meetings. Several listed "power" events of which women were not a part, such as lunches, golf tournaments, Super Bowl parties. Still others mentioned inclusion in the work, but exclusion from credit for the work."

For question set 17 & 18 (overall status), mention was made of women directors and other managers. However, an overall sense seems to prevail that women do not actually hold powerful positions, that while men are allowed to be innovators, women must be followers. One comment seems especially revealing in describing attitudes toward women in areas typically and historically controlled by men: ""

Student Issues:

Although the Task Force was not charged with determining the status of women students at Western, we did seek data from student employees, both undergraduate student workers and graduate assistants. Therefore, we did gather limited data from those groups. In the course of responding to this questionnaire, some male and female faculty and staff members reported incidents related to treatment of women students. Rather than summaries of either responses from students or responses about students, this report includes the following actual quotations:

Student Issues:
Although the task force process prevented respondents from identifying individuals in either positive or negative examples, we hope that those who have information to report will do so through appropriate channels. In terms of our responsibility to make this information available, one other item that relates to safety of the campus community seems to merit quoting in its entirety:

Areas of the campus perceived as unsafe include:

University Boulevard
Egypt Parking Lot
Offices that do not have telephones
Steps between Cherry Hall and the Credit Union
Parking lot across from Domino's
Sidewalks and steps behind Grise Hall, second floor exits
Sidewalks and steps at Academic Complex
Areas in front of Cherry Hall
College Street and related parking lots across from Cherry Hall
Dark areas near Preston Center
Walkways between PFT and East Hall
Crosswalks generally
Parking Structure

May 20, 1997

Dr. Judith Hoover
Department of Communications and Broadcasting
Western Kentucky University

Dear Dr. Hoover

The HSRB reviewed the application entitled "Task Force Report on the Status of Women at Western" on May 16, 1997, and had the following comments:

1. The office that charged the task force needs to review the application as the next highest authority before another submission to the Human Subjects Review Board. Dr. Barth will be in touch with you on this matter.

2. The HSRB's review revealed that the focus group technique did not ensure anonymity or confidentiality of subjects. There are many possible opportunities for breach of confidentiality.

3. The process of equitably selecting human subjects is unclear.

4. More than minimal risk to subjects is involved.

For these reasons, the HSRB could not approve the application. After your discussion with Dr. Barth, please contact Jay Slone, the Chair of the HSRB, or me if you need further assistance.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Phillip C. Myers
HSRB Coordinator
May 20, 1997

Dr. Judith Hoover
Department of Communications and Broadcasting
Western Kentucky University

Dear Dr. Hoover:

The HSRB reviewed the application entitled "Task Force Report on the Status of Women at Western" on May 16, 1997 and had the following comments.

1. The office that charged the task force needs to review the application as the next highest authority before another submission to the Human Subjects Review Board. Dr. Burch will be in touch with you on this matter.

2. The HSRB's review revealed that the focus group technique did not ensure anonymity or confidentiality of subjects. There are many possible opportunities for breach of confidentiality.

3. The process of equitably selecting human subjects is unclear.

4. More than minimal risk to subjects is involved.

For these reasons, the HSRB could not approve the application. After your discussion with Dr. Burch, please contact Jay Sloan, the Chair of the HSRB, or me if you need further assistance.

Sincerely,

Phillip E. Myers
HSRB Coordinator

c: File
HSHooverLeApp
May 29, 1997

Memorandum to: Human Subjects Review Board
Phillip E. Myers, Coordinator

From: Judith Hoover, Chair
Task Force on the Status of Women on Campus

Regarding: Response to your letter of May 20, 1997

I would like to respond to the four points you have outlined in your letter of May 20, 1997.

1. Dr. Barbara Burch, Cecile Garmon and I have met to discuss the proposal and my failure to obtain her signature on the forms submitted to the Board by the Task Force. I will request her approval of this memorandum and ask that she forward it on to you.

2. Your concerns regarding potential opportunities for breach of confidentiality require a good deal of clarification. As those concerns have been explained to me by Jay Sloan, I understand and concur with them. However, because we included information regarding potential individual interview questions along with our request to conduct focus groups, the board concluded that those questions would also be used as part of the focus group process. That is not the case. For example, although in individual interviews (in which confidentiality and anonymity can be maintained) we could conceivably ask questions about an interviewee’s own experience, we would not do so in the public setting of a focus group. Indeed, we will state clearly at the outset that the focus group may not be used to describe such experience in regard to sexual harassment or other issues in which hearsay could prove damaging. We are interested, however, in the extent to which Western’s sexual harassment policy is understood by persons in all employment categories. We are interested, as well, in the degree to which persons on the campus feel safe. For that issue, personal experience would be both valid and useful, but would not present a potential rumor threat to the well-being of others.

One of the benefits of focus group research lies in its ability to tap into hidden, but powerful, perceptions of organizational culture. Through this tool, we intend to develop and refine questions that will later appear on our larger Fall survey of employees. As you can see, the segment of our research that seeks to determine the status of women in terms of working environment consists of three related sequential projects: focus
groups, individual interviews and a more comprehensive paper and pencil survey.

Protocols for focus groups will include the following statements regarding ground rules: (a) These discussions may not serve as occasions for either accusing or intimating wrongdoing or policy violation by any individuals or in any specific departments. (b) Nothing said in these discussions should be construed as a reporting of wrongdoing or policy violation.

3. The process of selecting focus group members consists of the following: (a) randomized lists of persons have been generated by computer from EEO categories; (b) members of the task force will use those as calling lists, moving from top to bottom until a sufficient number of persons have agreed to participate. Groups will be separated by employment level and by gender in order to encourage openness and discourage dominance. Faculty focus groups will be separated by college as well in order to allow differences, if any, among colleges to emerge.

4. Risks to individuals are minimized by adherence to safeguards outlined above.
Dear Dr. Hoover:

Given our discussions with you concerning the difficulties inherent in protecting confidentiality, the Board continues to decline approval of the use of focus groups in this specific instance.

The Board is prepared to promptly review an application based upon the proposed alternative "critical incident report" methodology. The application should carefully describe your intended procedures and be accompanied by a rewritten consent form.

It is the Board's understanding that prior to submission of an application the researchers will consult with both Deborah Wilkins, University Counsel, and Dr. Elizabeth Lemerise, Department of Psychology on the informed consent document.

As in the previous instance, the application needs the signature of Dr. Burch.

Sincerely,

J. J. Sloan, Chair
Human Subjects Review Board
In future correspondence please refer to: ES9730 June 25, 1997.

Dr. Judith Hoover
Chair, Task Force on the Status of Women at Western
Department of Communication and Broadcasting
WKU

Dear Dr. Hoover:

Your research topic “Task Force Report on the Status of Women at Western,” has undergone review by the Western Kentucky University IRB for human subjects of research and it has been determined that risks to subjects are: (1) minimized and reasonable; and that (2) research procedures are consistent with a sound research design and do not expose the subjects to unnecessary risk. Reviewers determined that: (1) benefits to subjects are considered along with the importance of the topic and that outcomes are reasonable; (2) selection of subjects is equitable; and (3) the purposes of the research and the research setting is amenable to subjects’ welfare and producing desired outcomes; that indications of coercion or prejudice are absent, and that participation is clearly voluntary.

In addition, the IRB found that: (1) informed consent will be sought and documented from each prospective subject; (2) provision is made for collecting, using and storing data in a manner that protects the safety and privacy of the subjects and the confidentiality of the data; and (3) that appropriate safeguards are included to protect the rights and welfare of the subjects. Please store all data securely at an on campus location for a minimum of three years.

Your research therefore meets the criteria of Full Board review under the institutional human subjects protocol and is approved. Copies of your request for human subjects review, your application, and this approval, are maintained in the Office Sponsored Programs at the above address.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Phillip E. Myers, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Sponsored Programs and
Human Subjects Coordinator

Human Subjects File

HSA approvalLeHoover
Attachment 1 to Approval Letter
Dr. Judith Hoover, Chair
Task Force on the Status of Women at Western

Approval of this application is contingent upon your deleting the "College" descriptor from the Critical Incident Questionnaire.
APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF INVESTIGATIONS INVOLVING THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS

PLEASE TYPE OR USE A WORD PROCESSOR

Submit by the first working Monday of the month for screening prior to the HSRB meeting.

1. Principal Investigator's Name: Judith Hoover, Chairperson

Co-Investigator:

Department: Communication & Broadcasting Phone: 5291

2. If you are a student, provide the following information:

Faculty Sponsor: ___________________________ Department: _____________ Phone: _____________

Is this your thesis or dissertation research? Yes _____ No _____

3. Title of project: Task Force Report on the Status of Women at Western

4. Has this project previously been considered by the HSRB? Yes _X_ No _____

If yes, give approximate date of review May 16, 1997, June 20, 1997

5. Is a proposal for external support being submitted? Yes _____ No _X_ _____

If yes, you must submit one complete copy of that proposal as soon as it is available and complete the following:

a. Is notification of Human Subject approval required? Yes _____ No _____

b. Is this a renewal application? Yes _____ No _____

c. Sponsor's Name:

d. Project Period: From: _____________ To: _____________

6. You must include copies of all pertinent information such as, a copy of the questionnaire you will be using or other survey instruments, informed consent documents, letters of approval from cooperating institutions (e.g., hospitals or other medical facilities and/or clinics, human services agencies, individuals such as physicians or other specialists in different fields, etc.), copy of external support proposals, etc.
In the space below, please provide complete answers to the following questions.

1. PROPOSED RESEARCH PROJECT

A. Provide a brief summary of the proposed research. Include major hypotheses and research design.

In January, 1997, a Task Force to conduct a major study on the “Status of Women on Campus” was appointed by President Meredith and approved by the Board of Regents. The Task Force is comprised of twenty-one people, selected to represent all areas of the University community, with Dr. Judith Hoover, professor in the Department of Communication and Broadcasting as Chair. The Charge given to the Task Force is “To review the status of women faculty and staff employees at Western Kentucky University and to make recommendations for specific actions which might be taken to resolve any problems identified by the Task Force.” The study is to be completed within one year.

The major hypothesis for the study is that Western Kentucky University women employees experience equality with their male colleagues in all areas of University life. Where problems are identified in the areas of hiring, compensation, advancement, discrimination, sexual harassment, resources, and/or other areas, recommendations for specific actions will be made.

We are currently seeking approval for the use of a Critical Incident Questionnaire (see enclosed) that will be administered to a sampling of all employment groups.

B. Describe the source(s) of subjects and the selection criteria. Specifically, how did you obtain potential subjects, and how will you contact them?

Random listings of faculty/staff names, stratified by EEO category and gender have been generated by computer. Groups will be formed from these lists to represent all EEO categories.

Task Force members from the Environment Sub-Group will call down the lists of names until a sufficient number of persons have agreed to participate.

Participation will be entirely voluntary and confidential.

C. Informed consent: Describe the consent process and attach all consent documents.

All participants will be required to sign the attached proposed Informed Consent form. Before being asked to sign, the Task Force charge, study design, topic areas, data collection procedures and confidentiality protections will be explained to all participants.
D. **Procedures:** Provide a step-by-step description of each procedure, including the frequency, duration, and location of each procedure.

1. Participants will be called from randomized lists of employees from EEO categories and invited to participate in the research.
2. Participants will meet in a designated room at a specified time somewhere on campus.
3. The facilitator will explain the process, read through the consent/disclaimer form with them, and ask that they sign the form.
4. After the forms have been collected and put away separately by the facilitator, to be passed on to the PI, the Critical Incident Questionnaires will be distributed.
5. The participants will then fill out the questionnaire, will not sign their names, will give the questionnaire to the facilitator, and will return to their normal lives.
6. The facilitator will collect the questionnaires, and without looking at them will pass them on to the PI.
7. The PI will then take a black marker and mark out the names or titles of any individuals mentioned in the questionnaires (even though we have instructed that the participants not do so).
8. A temporary secretarial person will be hired to transcribe the responses into a computer software program designed specifically for analysis of qualitative data.
9. Once the responses have been transcribed, the paper copies of the responses will be destroyed.
10. The separate consent/disclaimer forms will be kept in a secure location, that is in a locked filing cabinet in the PI's office, for a period of three years, after which time they will be destroyed. During that period no one except the PI will have access to these forms.

(For further information see attached consent/disclaimer form and attached protocols.)

The following timetable will apply:

- **July 15-July 31:** Set up and administer Critical Incident Questionnaire to staff groups.
- **Sept. 1-15:** Set up and administer Critical Incident Questionnaire to faculty and student worker groups.
- **Oct. 1-30:** Pilot and administer survey; read results; begin to formulate findings and recommendations.
- **Nov. 1-30:** Write final report.

E. **How will confidentiality of the data be maintained?**

- All responses to Critical Incident Questionnaire will be anonymous.
- All participants will be instructed to avoid naming individuals and/or titles.
- The PI will go over each questionnaire and, with a marker, will black out any names or titles.
- All responses will be typed into a computer program designed for analysis of qualitative data.
- Transcribed responses will be password protected with access given only to authorized members of the Task Force.
- Upon completion of that data entry process all written responses will be destroyed.
- Signed consent/disclaimer forms will be kept in a locked file drawer in the PI's office for a period of three years, after which time they will be destroyed.
F. Describe all known and anticipated risks to the subject including side effects, risks of placebo, risks of normal treatment delay, etc.

No known or anticipated risks since participants will simply sit in a room and write their responses with no public discussion of their ideas.

G. Describe the anticipated benefits to subjects, and the importance of the knowledge that may reasonably be expected to result.

Anticipated benefits would apply to all women and other employees at Western. The study will identify problems, if any, in each of the study areas for women at Western and will recommend specific remedial actions to address these problem areas and improve the experience for women employees. Also, being asked about one's work life may serve as validation of the experiences of employees in non-managerial positions who typically are not consulted.

Additions or changes in procedures involving human subjects, as well as any problems connected with the use of human subjects once the project has begun, must be brought to the attention of the HSRB.
II. SIGNATURES

A. I certify that to the best of my knowledge the information presented herein is an accurate reflection of the proposed research project.

[Signature]
Principal Investigator

[Signature]
Co-Investigator

7/15/97
Date

B. Approval by faculty sponsor (required for all students):

I affirm the accuracy of this application, and I accept the responsibility for the conduct of this research, the supervision of human subjects, and maintenance of informed consent documentation as required by the HSRB.

[Signature]
Faculty Sponsor

7-19-97
Date

C. Approval by Departmental Committee/Head

I confirm the accuracy of the information stated in this application. I am familiar with, and approve of the procedures that involve human subjects.

[Signature]
Department Head

Date

D. Advising Physician*:

I certify that I am a duly licensed physician in the State of Kentucky and that, acting as advising physician, I accept the procedures prescribed herein.

[Signature]
Physician's Name and Signature

Date

*Physician signature is needed only if the project involves medical procedures and the investigator is not a licensed physician.
HSRB Determination:

Exempt from Review ( )  Expedited Review ( )  Full HSRB Review (Y)

( ) Disapproval

☑ Approval

a. approval, subject to minor changes
b. approval in general but requiring major alterations, clarifications or assurances
c. restricted approval

Comments:

See attached approval letter & attachment.

[Signature]
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INFORMED CONSENT/DISCLAIMER DOCUMENT

Project Title: Study on the Status of Women at Western Kentucky University

Investigator: Women's Status Task Force
Judith Hoover, Chair, FAC 190, 5291

You are being asked to participate in a project conducted through Western Kentucky University. The University requires that you give your signed agreement to participate in this project.

The investigator will explain to you in detail the purpose of the project, the procedures to be used, and the potential benefits and possible risks of participation. You may ask him/her any questions you have to help you understand the project. A basic explanation of the project is written below. Please read this explanation and discuss with the researcher any questions you may have.

If you then decide to participate in the project, please sign on the last page of this form in the presence of the person who explained the project to you. You should be given a copy of this form to keep.

1. Nature and Purpose of the Project: This study is designed to assess the current status of Women at Western and to determine if there are identifiable problems in the areas of working environment for women. Beyond identifying problems, the Task Force is charged with recommending solutions.

2. Explanation of Procedures:

A. The facilitator for this session will hand out a Critical Incident Questionnaire that includes 18 items. The items are arranged in groups of 2 questions each, one that asks you for a positive incident/example, and one that asks for a negative incident/example. If you have no incidents/examples to offer, please leave that space blank.

B. All of the 18 items relate to the work life experienced by women at Western. We have introduced 8 topics—

- equal treatment
- equal opportunity for advancement
- Western's sexual harassment policy
- safety
- comfortable vs hostile work environment
- respect
- job satisfaction
- inclusion vs exclusion

For the last set of items, we offer you the opportunity to introduce other topics we may not have thought about.

C. The facilitator will ask that you write your answers privately with no oral discussion except for clarifying questions directed to the facilitator.

D. Once you have completed the questionnaire, please give it directly to the facilitator.

DO NOT sign your name to the questionnaire.

3. Discomfort and Risks: No known or anticipated risks.

4. Benefits: Identification of problem areas for women at Western in any of the study areas will be accompanied by recommendations for real solutions. Also, being asked about one's own work life may serve as validation of the
experiences of employees in non-management positions who typically are not consulted.

5. Confidentiality:
   - All responses to the Critical incident Questionnaire will be anonymous.
   - All participants are instructed to avoid naming individuals and/or titles.
   - The PI will go over each questionnaire and, with a marker, will black out any names or titles.
   - All responses will be typed into a computer program designed for analysis of qualitative data.
   - Transcribed responses will be password protected with access given only to authorized members of
     the Task Force.
   - Upon completion of the data entry process all written responses will be destroyed.
   - Signed consent/disclaimer forms will be kept in a locked file drawer in the PI's office for a period of
     three years, after which time they will be destroyed.

6. Refusal/Withdrawal:

   Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from
   the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to refuse to answer any question(s)
   or to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty.

7. Participant Disclaimer:

   I agree to participate in this study, and I authorize the use of this information, presented anonymously, in
   the study.

   I believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown
   risks.

   I understand that I will receive no payment for my participation in this study, either from the Task Force on
   the Status of Women at Western or any representative of Western Kentucky University.

   The undersigned participant acknowledges that he/she is participating in a survey being conducted in
   conjunction with the Task Force Study on the Status of Women at Western.

   Participant acknowledges and agrees that any response(s) and/or information provided by the participant in
   conjunction with his/her participation in the study shall not be construed or considered by the University, its
   agents, employees or assigns, as a report to University officials, agents or assigns of any conduct, behavior or
   other action that might be considered a violation of internal University policies or procedures, or state and
   federal law or regulation. All information received by the Task Force shall remain anonymous.

   Participant understands and agrees that the members of the Task Force are not authorized or identified by the
   University as official recipients, investigators or processors of any report of alleged wrongful activity, behavior
   or conduct, including, but not limited to, allegations of sexual harassment or gender or race discrimination.
   Information received from participants shall remain anonymous, shall be compiled into a single report and will
   not be identifiable to any individual participant.

   Participant understands and agrees that if he/she is aware of information that would lead the participant to
believe that certain conduct behavior or other action has occurred that could be a violation of any internal University policies, procedures or state or federal law or regulation, the conduct should be reported immediately to the appropriate University official in accordance with University policies.

Signature of Participant ___________________________ Date ______________________

Witness ___________________________ Date ______________________

THE DATED APPROVAL ON THIS CONSENT FORM INDICATES THAT THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD.
PROTOCOLS FOR FACILITATORS
Task Force on the Status of Women at Western

Briefly explain charge of Task Force:
In January, 1997, Task Force was appointed by President Merkle to study the Status of Women on Campus.
Members of the Task Force were selected to represent all areas of the University community
The charge of the Task Force is to review all aspects of employment for women at Western and to recommend specific actions to remedy any problem areas which are identified.
To gather this information, a variety of qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques will be used, including a review of University policies/procedures, analysis of employment and compensation records, a Critical Incident Questionnaire, individual interviews, and a survey questionnaire.

Briefly explain how groups were formulated:
1. Groups were formed for all EEO categories, with very small groups combined, stratified by:
   - gender, with separate groups being held for supervisors, student workers, and graduate assistants. Faculty groups were also stratified by college. Through this process, the Task Force is trying to get input and information from all categories of workers at Western.

Points to emphasize:
- Participation in this group is voluntary.
- We feel this is an important undertaking and hope that you will agree to participate.
- Please ask questions.

Review the goals; how we will handle privacy/confidentiality; topic areas, data collection, analysis, and reporting; and the duration of the sessions. Answer questions, then ask participants to sign the informed consent form.

Goals:
- To learn from your experiences and perspectives, as part of our efforts to understand the status of women at Western in terms of employment, advancement, compensation, and working environment;
- To invite as many points of view as possible;
- To value equally all voices.

Privacy/Confidentiality:
- The use of these questionnaires may not serve as occasions for either accusing or intimidating wrongdoing or policy violation by any individuals or in any specific departments.
- Nothing described in these questionnaires should be construed as a reporting of wrongdoing or policy violation...
- Although quotations may appear in the ethnographic report, no participants will be identified either on transcripts or in the report itself.
Topic Areas:
- Safety and security of women at Western
- WKU's sexual harassment policy in terms of knowledge and understanding of it and viewpoints regarding its adequacy.
- Respect, equality, and treatment of women at Western
- Organizational culture and how it impacts women at Western
- Employment, advancement and job satisfaction for women at Western
- Inclusion or exclusion of women

Analysis and Reporting: Data will be analyzed by typical coding of themes, recurring perceptions, experiences, word usages, communication behaviors, etc. Data will be reported in two general ways:
- The composition of an ethnographic summary that includes perceptions of the status of women at Western
- A content analysis of the above mentioned themes and patterns that made up the critical incident responses

After reviewing these items quickly, have participants read and sign the consent release. Thank participants and tell them that the report is expected to be completed in December, 1997.
Memorandum

To: Judith Hoover
From: Phil Myers
Date: 7/22/1997
Subject: Correct date on the Human Subjects Approval Letter.

In our discussions today I neglected to affix the correct date. Here is a corrected copy.

Sorry for the inconvenience.

Sincerely,

Philip E. Myers, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Sponsored Programs and Human Subjects Coordinator

Human Subjects File

[Additional notes and signatures]
In future correspondence please refer to: HS9730 July 22, 1997

Dr. Judith Hoover
Chair, Task Force on the Status of Women at Western
Department of Communication and Broadcasting
WKU

Dear Dr. Hoover:

Your research topic "Task Force Report on the Status of Women at Western," has undergone review by the Western Kentucky University IRB for human subjects of research and it has been determined that risks to subjects are: (1) minimized and reasonable; and that (2) research procedures are consistent with a sound research design and do not expose the subjects to unnecessary risk. Reviewers determined that: (1) benefits to subjects are considered along with the importance of the topic and that outcomes are reasonable; (2) selection of subjects is equitable; and (3) the purposes of the research and the research setting is amenable to subjects' welfare and producing desired outcomes; that indications of coercion or prejudice are absent, and that participation is clearly voluntary.

In addition, the IRB found that: (1) informed consent will be sought and documented from each prospective subject; (2) provision is made for collecting, using and storing data in a manner that protects the safety and privacy of the subjects and the confidentiality of the data; and (3) that appropriate safeguards are included to protect the rights and welfare of the subjects. Please store all data securely at an on campus location for a minimum of three years.

Your research therefore meets the criteria of Full Board review under the institutional human subjects protocol and is approved. Copies of your request for human subjects review, your application, and this approval, are maintained in the Office Sponsored Programs at the above address.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

Phillip E. Myers, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Sponsored Programs and
Human Subjects Coordinator

c: Human Subjects File

HSApprovalLeHoover
Attachment 1 to Approval Letter
Dr. Judith Hoover, Chair
Task Force on the Status of Women at Western

Approval of this application is contingent upon your deleting the “College” descriptor from the Critical Incident Questionnaire.

I have asked Pamela Knippel, a member of the Task Force, to attend your meeting in my place today. I have a prior commitment to judge debate rounds at 3:00 and 4:00 for the Kentucky State Tornadoes Tournament being held on our campus.

In response to the protest that has been raised against the inclusion of quotas in an Ethnographic Report of the findings resulting from our use of a Critical Incident Questionnaire, which you employed in July, I can respond as follows:

1. I removed all names, department names, and any other identifiers from the handwritten items.

The comments were then typed and I analyzed the information and grouped the responses by the categories to be found on the Critical Incidents forms. At that point the typist and I were the only persons who had seen the responses.

Once I had completed the analysis, I instructed our typist to delete many more items, and to remove the categories (male/female, faculty/staff, years at Western, etc.).

After that, Pamela and I went back over each item, deleting whole portions that had any possibility of identifying any individual.

We are left with each question followed by all answers mixed together.

We conducted this research project in good faith and are now ready to present the data to the President, who will be free to do with it as he wishes.
February 20, 1998

Memorandum to: Human Subjects Review Board

From: Judith Hoover, Chair
   Task Force on the Status of Women

I have asked Pamela Napier, a member of the Task Force, to attend your meeting in my place today. I have a prior commitment to judge debate rounds at 2:00 and 4:00 for the Kentucky State Forensics Tournament being held on our campus.

In regard to the protest that has been raised against the inclusion of quotations in an Ethnographic Report of the findings resulting from our use of a Critical Incident Questionnaire, which you approved in July, I can respond as follows:

I removed all names, department names, and any other identifiers from the handwritten items.

The comments were then typed and I analyzed the information and grouped the responses by the categories to be found on the Critical Incidents forms. At that point the typist and I were the only persons who had seen the responses.

Once I had completed the analysis, I instructed our typist to delete many more items, and to remove the categories (male/female, faculty/staff, years at Western, etc.).

After that, Pamela and I went back over each item, deleting whole portions that had any possibility of identifying any individual.

We are left with each question followed by all answers mixed together.

We conducted this research project in good faith and are now ready to present the data to the President, who will be free to do with it as he wishes.
The HSRB decision was against your proposal. I do not have the minutes in front of me, so I am not sure of the exact wording. The sense is that the full text of responses to the critical incident questionnaire should not be included in the report submitted to the president, that any quotations in the text should be paraphrased, and this decision rests upon the language of the informed consent document.

Jay Sloan
COMPENSATION STUDY

a. Quantitative Assessment Gender Gaps in WKU Salaries

b. Report of the Compensation Subcommittee

A QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF GENDER GAPS IN WKU SALARIES

A Report Prepared For
The Task Force on the Status of Women at Western
Western Kentucky University
September 1997

by
Brian Goff, Professor of Economics, WKU
Dan Koenker, Professor Psychology, WKU
A QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF GENDER GAPS IN WKU SALARIES

A Report Prepared For
The Task Force on the Status of Women at Western
Western Kentucky University
September 1997

by

Brian Goff, Professor of Economics, WKU
Dan Roenker, Professor Psychology, WKU
PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In order to increase the amount of information available to the Task Force on the Status of Women at WKU, its Subcommittee on Compensation requested that we develop quantitative assessments of the influence of gender on the pay of WKU faculty, staff, and administrators. In recognition of the sensitivity and importance of this issue, we set out to conduct an analysis of the data using methods commonly accepted in statistics and economics without regard to the ultimate implications of the results. Due to the availability (or lack thereof) of certain data as well as disagreement over technical issues, a similar study conducted by different investigators and/or at a different time might yield different results. Nonetheless, given the data at our disposal and within the limits for any statistics-based study, we offer this report as one based on a dispassionate effort to employ credible methods and sound judgement based on our professional backgrounds. Whatever flaws may be present in our methods or disagreements which may arise concerning the implications, we hope the report is received as a “good faith” effort to supply the Task Force with reliable information.

We extend special thanks to Tony Glisson, Cheryl Smith, and others in WKU’s Human Resources Office as well as to Bob Cobb and Bob August in Academic Computing for assistance in locating data and making it available to us in convenient formats. We are also grateful to Dick Cantrell, Cathy Carey, Bill Davis, Ray Mendel, Dan Myers, Betsy Shoenfelt, and the Subcommittee on Compensation for providing comments on our efforts and drafts of this report. The support of Vice President Barbara Burch was essential to making this report possible. Other than the accuracy of the “raw data” provided to us, responsibility for any remaining flaws in our analysis rests with us.


For the sake of space, citations to a few of these articles appear under Additional References at the end of the report.

1In addition to the Becker and Tourkminish article, a few of the most recent of these are listed under Additional References below.

OVERVIEW

The main objective of our report was to compute and interpret quantitative estimates of differences in pay between men and women at WKU -- the gender gap -- while taking into account non-gender related factors influencing pay. To accomplish our goal, we obtained employment related data for all faculty, staff, and administrators. The factors at our disposal included salary, unit and/or job identifiers, a limited set of personal characteristics (including gender), and several other factors such as length of service. We calculated simple, descriptive measures of the average and variability of salary by gender. Then, we used a statistical technique (regression analysis) to calculate the impact of gender while accounting for several other influences on pay.

A relatively large literature in economics employs similar statistical tools to examine the relationship between gender and pay. Articles by Gunderson and more recently Becker and Toutkoushian are the most wide ranging surveys of the methods used in the measurement of male-female wage differentials. Studies continue to appear which attempt to improve on several facets of the measurement of gender differentials including the factors included in the analysis as well as in the statistical methods utilized. In recent years, for example, quantitative studies have highlighted the importance of factors such as worker reliability, continuity of employment, mobility, variations in returns to training and education, fringe benefits, on-the-job training, turnover, fertility rates, and others.

Moreover, a relatively extensive economics literature centers directly upon measuring gender-based differentials in university settings. These studies include some which look at salaries at a point in time, some which combine data across several institutions, and some which track trends in pay over several decades. All of the studies employ regression or regression-related statistical techniques but differ on the details of the methods (a subject which we discuss more in the Appendix).

These studies, predominantly based on 1970s and 1980s data, have typically found gender-based differentials but with wide variability in the size of the differentials. The studies which have tracked pay over time have generally found the size of the gender-based differentials declined from the 1970s to the 1980s.

Two statistical investigations by WKU graduate students employed these kinds of


2For the sake of space, citations to a few of these articles appear under Additional References at the end of the report.

3In addition to the Becker and Toutkoushian article, a few of the most recent of these are listed under Additional References below.


56
measurement strategies to investigate gender gaps for WKU faculty and staff. The faculty study found wage differentials of about $1500 to $2500 on average after controlling for other influences. The staff results indicated the possibility of larger wage gaps -- $4000 to $5000 on average after controlling for many other influences.

We do not view statistically oriented studies -- certainly not a single study -- as the sole means of acquiring information about possible gender bias at WKU. Yet, studies rooted in standard statistical practice are critical in supplying a foundation of knowledge on the subject. It is not perfection which grants systematic, statistical inquiries an advantage over more anecdotal means of gathering information. Conclusions drawn using scientific methods can be and have been wrong at times. The advantage of properly conducted statistical studies lies in their ability to produce well-defined results, results where something is known about likely errors, and results which can be replicated and/or compared to well-defined alternatives.

Finally, because various campus personnel may be more or less familiar with our methods, we should emphasize that multi-factor regression methods are most reliable when used to explore outcomes for groups of 30 to 40 individuals or more and where a gender is represented by more than just one or two individuals. Otherwise, the results may be sensitive to one or two atypical salaries. As a result, we can assess widespread policies which create gender gaps possibly due to gender bias among various sub-groupings of faculty, staff, and administrators. Further, we can assess whether one or two outlying salaries are influential in driving gender results. However, regression methods are not designed to determine whether an outlying value reflects gender bias or a non-gender driven salary difference due to special circumstances.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

Table 1 presents simple descriptive statistics about gender and 1998 fiscal year salary data for WKU employees. All salary figures here and in the later results are in dollars. The averages and medians for WKU (full time) faculty, staff, and administrators display sizable differences based on gender. Of course, these figures do not reflect other factors related to both gender and pay.

Our initial data set obtained from the Office of Human Resources consisted of 29 factors related to employment. This anonymous, "raw" data included the following set of variables by individual: 4 numerical identifiers, two employment status variables, annual salary, contract length, division categories, department categories, original hire date, current hire date, service date, sex, race.

---


6We use the term "salary" for annual pay regardless whether pay is based on hourly wages or other contractual bases.

7Average is mean pay for the full sample of individuals. Median pay is the pay level for which half of the sample falls below and half above that level. The standard deviation (std. Deviation) is a measure of the typical difference between individuals and the mean pay level.
categories, marital status, faculty rank categories, tenure status, tenure date, rank at hire, the Corroon
data discussed below, and the faculty market salary data. We also obtained market benchmark data
for faculty from the College and University Personnel Association.
Using the past empirical literature as a guide coupled with professional judgement and some
preliminary investigation, we constructed the regression models of pay discussed below from this
set of factors. As with all studies of this type, our objective in building the models was to account
for as much of the differences in pay as these factors and sound economic/statistical practice would
permit. Because the factors included in the final statistical models of pay differ across faculty, staff,
and administrators, we describe each of these models separately along with the main results. In most
cases, the reasons for the inclusion of a factor should be apparent. A comprehensive listing of all
factors obtained and constructed are listed in the Appendix along with more discussion on specific
factors and detailed statistical results.

Table 1
Descriptive Measures of Salary per Year by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty Female</th>
<th>Faculty Male</th>
<th>Staff Female</th>
<th>Staff Male</th>
<th>Admin. Female</th>
<th>Admin. Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$39,556</td>
<td>$47,256</td>
<td>$20,124</td>
<td>$23,513</td>
<td>$50,709</td>
<td>$58,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$39,042</td>
<td>$48,102</td>
<td>$18,468</td>
<td>$22,443</td>
<td>$45,242</td>
<td>$58,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>$17,275</td>
<td>$13,342</td>
<td>$8903</td>
<td>$10,985</td>
<td>$18,899</td>
<td>$21,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Gender Gap Estimates:
The factors and the specific measures associated with them which were included in our
primary analysis of faculty pay are listed below:

Gender (Female/Male);
Rank (In-rank/not in-rank for Professor, Associate Professor, Instructor-Lecturer);^3
Special Tenure Status (individuals not on regular tenure track);
College Affiliation (Affiliated/Not Affiliated for Each College);
Longevity (Age in years)^5
Market Benchmark (salary in dollars by rank within department from national survey);

^3This makes Assistant Professors the reference group for comparison.
^5For faculty and administrators, age proved a more significant measure of longevity than
service time. For staff, service time was more important.
Employment Status (full time or not full time).\(^{10}\)

Most of these factors are self-explanatory. However, due to the importance of the Market Benchmark data, we discuss it at more length. This data is from 357 four-year public colleges and universities as reported in the *National Faculty Salary Survey, 1996-97.*\(^{11}\) Our salary data is for fiscal year 1998, so the benchmark data lags a year behind. If salaries by rank and discipline increased by the same amount over the year, the year difference would only influence the “intercept term” in the regressions without influencing other factors. While changes across rank and discipline may not have been the same, we have no reason to expect a systematic link to gender.

Table A.1 presents the results of the main regression analysis using all the preceding factors and based on 467 full-time faculty.\(^{12}\) These factors account for 75 percent of the differences in pay across individuals. The key result pertains to the Gender factor. *From the standpoint of common statistical practice, the Gender factor does not provide statistically reliable evidence of a gender gap for faculty salaries.*

This conclusion is supported by all of the additional versions of the regression analysis which are also reported in the Appendix (Table A.2) with the exception of the assistant professor subsample. The additional versions which consider older versus younger faculty, faculty by individual college, and part-time faculty as well as accounting for technical issues did not produce statistically reliable gender gaps.\(^{13}\) The assistant professor breakdown found a gap of $1550 in favor of males. We discuss this more in the next section.

*Staff Gender Gap Estimates*

The factors and the specific measures associated with them which were included in our primary analysis of staff pay are listed below:

**Gender (Female/Male):**

\(^{10}\)Department heads are included with faculty rather than administrators. Community college faculty are also included. Their small numbers make their inclusion or exclusion inconsequential. For technical reasons discussed in the Appendix, we separated full time faculty from part time for the final regression analysis. The results discussed here are for full time faculty, although we do include part-time faculty results in the Appendix.

\(^{11}\)These schools are predominantly non-Ph.D. granting institutions. The report is published by the College and University Personnel Association.

\(^{12}\)In the main versions of our models, individuals with missing data for a factor were excluded. For faculty, these were mostly individuals in areas where market benchmark data was not available. Additional results were obtained which included these individuals, and these are reported in the Appendix.

\(^{13}\)Although coefficients are not reported, we also considered “interactions” between gender and professors, associate professors, and age to account for possible gender differences across ranks and on age of entry. These interactions exhibited no influence on salaries.
Contract Terms (12 months/ not 12 months: Full-time/part-time: Temporary/Permanent);
Longevity (Years Since First Hired at WKU);
Years of Break in WKU Service Time;
Presidential or Vice Presidential Office (employed/not employed in one of these offices);
Knowledge Requirements (set of 3 measures);
Problem Solving Requirements (set of 2 measures);
Decision Making Requirements (set of 2 measures);
Supervision Requirements (1 measure);
Working Contacts Requirements (1 measure). 14

The knowledge, problem solving, decision making, supervision, and working contracts requirements are measures reported in the “Corroon Study” of staff jobs. 15 Their inclusion warrants important clarifications. No matter how carefully constructed, any study which awards points for particular requirements includes some degree of arbitrary judgement in determining the set of skills it attempts to measure and in determining the point differences between different skill or requirement levels. Due to these weaknesses, attempts to use such point totals as a “stand alone” basis for salary adjustments are invalid because labor markets do not necessarily reward the skills measured or reward them on the basis of the point differentials which are awarded. For instance, most point systems such as these would not be very effective in explaining how or why Madonna or Mike Tyson might earn $30 million in a year while a Nobel winning physicist might earn $70,000 unless they are specially constructed to account for these kinds of outlying values.

Therefore, we want to make clear that our use of the Corroon points of various job requirements is not a statement about what a particular job or person should be paid on the basis of their point totals. Rather, we use the point totals to control for what is compensated by the university. If the point totals from the Corroon data are correlated with pay differences across individuals, these data allow us to take account of inter-personal differences which would otherwise be omitted and, thereby, reduce the opportunity for gender gap estimates to be erroneously attributed to these omitted factors. Use of some other point system which takes account of other skills and/or uses different point totals might improve these controls.

Table A.3 presents results of the main regression analysis using all of the preceding factors for 774 staff members. 16 The factors account for 81 percent of the differences in pay across individuals. The results for the Gender factor from Table A.3 estimates that females received, on average, $982 less than males after taking account of the other factors. If we compute a range around this figure which takes account of likely statistical error, the range would run from a gap in favor of males of about $390 to $1570. 17 Alternative versions based on service time and

---

14 The employment status variable (full time) was not important to the staff results.
15 More detail on the specific measures is provided in the Appendix.
16 As with the faculty data, individuals with missing values for a factor were omitted from this version but were included in alternative results reported in the Appendix.
17 This is roughly the 95 percent “confidence interval” around the estimate of $982.
consideration of technical alternatives estimate similar gaps when using all 774 staff. These appear in Table A.4. We discuss additional versions which attempt to more precisely identify the nature of these gaps in the next section of the report.

Administrator Gender Gap Estimates

The factors and the specific measures associated with them which were included in our main regression analysis of administrative pay are listed below:

Gender (Female/Male);
Contract Terms (12 months/ not 12 months; Full-time/part-time; Temporary/Permanent);
Longevity (Age in years);
Presidential or Vice Presidential Office (employed/not employed in one of these offices);
Dean Office (employed/not employed in one of the college dean’s offices):

Table A.5 presents the full regression analysis all of the preceding factors for 95 administrators. The factors account for 64 percent of the differences in pay across individuals. As in the faculty equations, the Gender factor is not different from zero from the standpoint of common statistical practice. The alternative versions of the analysis reported in Table A.6 which examine administrators by age, salary level, and which examine technical issues warrant the same conclusion.

FURTHER ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF ESTIMATED GENDER GAPS

Because of interest in removing gender bias from WKU salaries, the gender-based salary differentials for the assistant professor sub-sample and for staff are of obvious importance. One key point is that gender gaps and gender bias are not necessarily equivalent. In general, estimated gender gaps should be viewed as the maximum amount of gender bias which may exist. The gender-based staff and assistant professor salary gaps which we reported above are specifically measures of the differences in male-female pay after taking account of the other factors included in the analysis. Because of time and data limitations, we did not include some factors or methods in our analysis which statistical studies in the literature have shown can reduce the estimated gender gap.

How much of the estimated gender gap might reasonably be attributed to gender bias in assistant professor or staff salaries? While we do not have enough information to fully resolve this question with complete certainty, additional information may be helpful. We would emphasize that our purpose is not to make the gender bias estimates as small as possible; instead, it is to make sure that gender gap estimates account for as much of the non-gender based differences as our data will allow.

Assistant Professor Gaps

Because the faculty models include market salary data, the assistant professor model is more complete and excludes fewer factors which could potentially account for the gap than does the staff model. On the other hand, the existence of a gap for assistant professors but not for professors or associate professors runs counter to the usual pattern of gender bias. Typically if gender bias is present, one would expect to find the gaps to be more pervasive among higher ranking faculty.
Associate professor and especially professor salaries are usually not as closely linked to market salaries since most faculty at these ranks are promoted internally rather than hired externally.

We conducted additional tests to determine more precisely the nature of the gender gap for assistant professors. These additional tests revolved around attempting to determine if the gap reflected a uniform policy across assistant professors or if it could be tracked to particular sources and whether these sources reflect gender bias or other explanations.

First, we split the assistant professor sub-sample into those above the average age for assistant professors and those below the average age for assistant professors. Typically, assistant professors are hired into tenure track jobs, and a tenure decision is reached resulting either in promotion or termination. However, some faculty are hired under special circumstances and remain assistant professors for longer than normal periods. The atypical nature of older assistant professors is confirmed by a brief examination of the assistant professor data set. While the median age of the 145 assistant professors is 41 years, 33 individuals are aged 50 and over. Among those below average age, the average service time is 3 years; among those above average age, average service time is 12 years.

The results of estimating gender gaps for the older and younger assistant professors appears in Table A.7. These results do, in fact, help to narrow the search for the source of the gender gap. For the younger assistant professors, the gender factor is not different from zero from the standpoint of common statistical practice. For the older assistant professors, a gap of $2400 is present. Another difference between the two groups not reported in the Table is the differential effect of market benchmarks. For the younger set, market benchmarks and actual salaries are closely related -- a nearly one-to-one relationship. For the older set, no statistically reliable relationship is even present. This provides further evidence of fundamental differences between the mechanisms driving pay for older and younger assistant professors.

Then, to further track down the possible sources of the gap for older assistant professors, we conducted tests which identify whether the gap hinges more heavily on one or more particular college. These results also appear in Table A.7 and show that the gender gap for older assistant professors is removed when the faculty from the College of Education are deleted from the sample. This indicates that the estimated gap would appear to rely most heavily on pay differences in that college. These additional tests reject the idea of a systematic gender bias against female assistant professors in general or a systematic gender bias against older female assistant professors in general.

Our next question centered on whether the results suggesting gender gaps among older assistant professors in the College of Education reflected general male/female differences or whether the differences among this sub-group could be linked to one or two special cases. Our strategy was to estimate the gender effect for all 14 people and then reestimate the effect with any one or two outlying salaries excluded. Because the number of people under consideration in this sub-group is now very small (14), we proceeded with simpler two-variable regressions between gender and salary.\footnote{This procedure is equivalent to conducting a one-way analysis of variance which compares the variance across genders to the variance within gender and generates an F-test of the difference. While this limits our ability to explicitly take account of other factors, most of the factors from the full model have been at least partially taken into account by the fact that the}
The results of this procedure also appear in Table A.7. With all 14 data points included, the gender effect is over $4000 in favor of males. However, when one outlying value is excluded, the gender effect does not differ from zero from the standpoint of common statistical practice. In other words, the result hinges on a single data point rather than on policies across all individuals. As an additional check, we used the same procedure for Ogden and Potter Colleges and found no gender effect for older assistant professors even with outliers included.\(^{19}\)

As we stated in our first section, the presence of an outlier which drives a gender gap does not ultimately determine whether gender is at the root of the influence of the outlier or whether some other reason for the outlier exists. To determine the circumstances reflected in any single outlying data point, one must dig deeper into the facts surrounding that data point.\(^{20}\) In sum, though, these additional procedures do not support a conclusion of systematic gender bias against all assistant professors, all older assistant professors, or older assistant professors in the College of Education; instead, they show that the estimated gender gap for assistant professors can be traced to an identifiable special case (i.e., individual).

**Staff Gaps**

The staff gap includes a large number of people with large degrees of diversity in their characteristics and jobs. First, as an additional strategy for taking the diversity among staff members into account on top of utilizing the Corroon data, we estimated gender gaps for staff based on several breakdowns by salary levels -- above and below the mean pay ($22,230), below $13,500, between $13,500 and $22,230, between $22,230 and $31,000, and above $31,000.\(^{21}\) By grouping individuals by salary levels in this way, we attempted to reduce the degree of diversity between individuals and, thereby, generate more precise estimates of gender gaps. Also, this procedure helps to determine if gender gaps tend to be linked to different salary levels. We report these results in Table A.8.

The results show a $377 gender gap among staff with salaries below the average salary level. Further, among this group of 455 people, the gender gap disappears for those with the lowest salaries (below $13,500). Among the 323 staff members between $13,500 and $22,230, a $323 gap persists. On average, this amounts to a 1.8 percent gap for people in this group. For the other groupings, no gender gap is apparent from the analysis.

Second, our analysis does not go as far as some other analyses with have been reported in the literature in taking account of differences at the level of individuals. Because of the large degree of diversity among staff jobs, these limitations may be important. Omitted factors such as direct measures of productivity differ between individuals and not just males and females. One of the most rigorous studies of this issue to date shows that a model which takes more complete account of individuals in this sample are so similar.

\(^{19}\)Lack of data prevents separate estimation for the College of Business.

\(^{20}\)To protect anonymity, we do not disclose additional information on this outlying value which might explain the reasons for it but would also help to identify the person.

\(^{21}\)These breaks were chosen because $13,500 is roughly one standard deviation below the mean and $31,000 is roughly one standard deviation above the mean. This is based on the mean and standard deviation for the 774 staff used in these regressions.
individual differences can reduce estimated gender gaps by 50 percent.\textsuperscript{22} If the 50 percent reduction in the gap were applied to our estimate, the gender gap would fall to $490.

Again, we cannot state with certainty that either $323 or $490 is the exact measure of gender bias. Still, these additional results highlight the need for caution before making large, staff-wide adjustments in attempts to overturn gender bias.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The preceding data analysis leads to several conclusions:

1) The data do not support a finding of systematic discrimination against women among WKU's faculty and administrators once a set of other factors related to pay are taken into account:

2) The absence of systematic gender gaps for most faculty and administrators does not rule out the possibility of gender bias in faculty or administrative pay. However, if and where such discrimination may occur, it would seemingly be limited to isolated cases, and therefore, not reflected in campus wide salary studies such as ours;

3) The most comparable version of a 1992 regression study of WKU faculty pay found a $1700 gender gap in favor of males. In part, our use of more detailed market benchmark salary data may have reduced this gap. Additionally, a combination of university policies regarding gender, increased awareness of the issue, and/or changing personnel may have helped to reduce the gap;

4) A basic version of our model for all staff members showed a $980 gap in favor of males. The range around this figure which accounts for likely sampling error runs from $400 to $1500;

5) A more detailed version of the staff gender gap shows gender-based salary differences in favor of males of $320. However, this gender gap is only present for staff making around $13,000 to $22,000 annually.

As with almost any statistical study, improvements are possible with better data, more time, and more expertise. As we have already noted, we account for individual productivity with only indirect means. The exact effects on our estimates of more direct productivity measures is still uncertain. Additionally, we do not account for self selection effects. Whether because of social

custom and pressure, family background, individual preferences, or other factors, the self-selection into various jobs tends to differ for males and females as groups. Historically, females have tended to select lower paying occupations. In a relatively homogenous set of employees and accompanying jobs such as is the case with faculty, the gender gap may not be affected by the self-selection influence. In a more diverse set of employees and jobs as in the staff, the estimate of the gender gap may overstate the true gender-based pay differences if this effect is not taken into account.  

The procedure for adjusting for self-selection bias involves estimating a model of occupation choice and then using data from the occupational choice model as a separate factor in the salary model. Our data set is not complete enough to permit application of this methodology.
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BACKGROUND ON STATISTICAL ISSUES IN GENDER STUDIES

SINGLE V. MULTIPLE EQUATION STRATEGIES

A basic disagreement in the literature concerns whether to estimate a single equation for both men and women or estimate separate equations for men and women. The single equation approach utilizes an intercept-shifting categorical variable for male-female. The implicit assumption of this approach is that all other factors which influence pay do so independently of gender. A second approach (most frequently referred to as the Oaxaca decomposition method) estimates separate equations for men and women. Then, average values for women can be “plugged” into the male equation to estimate female pay based on the parameters of the male equation and/or male averages can be plugged into the female equation to estimate male pay based on the parameters of the female equation. These computations can then be compared to actual pay and predicted pay for men and women from their own equations.

The Oaxaca approach allows coefficient (slope) differences for every factor in the equation rather than just an intercept shift. Because of this, it has been more frequently used than the single equation approach. However, both methods are still in use in both academic articles and in courts of law. The single equation method has the advantage of simplicity of estimation and interpretation for both the investigators and for readers/juries.

One potential weakness of the Oaxaca method relative to the single-equation method is that the two equation approach does not indicate whether a coefficient difference across the male/female equations is due to a gender bias practice or non-discriminatory difference between the male and female workforce. In this way, the estimated wage gap may not only be due to productivity based factors omitted from the analysis but also to productivity based factors included in the analysis.

An alternative to the two equation approach which permits slope differences to be taken into account without directly influencing the estimated wage gap is to use interaction terms between the male-female variable and some of the other factors in the equation. Another way is to estimate the intercept-shift equation for various sub-samples of the data based on variables for which coefficient differences based on gender may be present.

In our estimates, we used the single equation approach for three reasons: 1) F-tests of the null hypothesis of equal coefficients across male and female equations could not be rejected at or below the 5 percent level — this is the standard method for testing whether two data sets can be legitimately pooled into a single equation, 2) for simplicity of estimation and interpretation, and 3) to avoid the conundrum of increasing the estimated wage gap just discussed. However, to account for slope

24The articles cited in the preceding footnotes form the basis of the discussion here as well as standard econometrics texts such as G.S. Maddala, Introduction to Econometrics, New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1992, provides a brief synopsis of this general to specific approach and additional citations on pp. 494-495.

25In the econometrics literature, these kind of F-tests are commonly referred to as Chow tests (D. Gujarati, Basic Econometrics, McGraw-Hill, 1988, provides an overview.) The basic idea is to compare residual sum of squares from the pooled equation versus the sum of residual
differentials on key variables, we estimated our equation for several sub-samples based on age, service time, salary, and college.

Transformation of Salary Data

A second difference often found between studies in the economics literature is the use of salary data in levels (actual dollars) versus the use of the natural log of salaries as the dependent variable. The primary effect of the transformation of salaries into ln(salaries) is to reduce the variance of the dependent variable -- a $100,000 salary becomes only 25 percent greater than a $10,000 when converted to natural logs salary rather than 900 percent greater using levels of salaries. The transformation is especially useful when the salary data depart radically from normality such as when several large salaries skew the distribution to the right. The log-linear format also permits detection of some kinds of non-linear effects of the factors upon pay.

Where departures from normality or non-linear effects are substantial, the coefficients from the log-linear equation provide more accurate information about the relationship between variables because the transformation implicitly makes outlying salaries less influential. The coefficients from log-linear equations are interpreted as the relative change in salaries given an absolute change in the independent factor. For example, a coefficient of 0.05 on Gender (female = 1) means that when Gender equals 1, salaries are 0.05 or 5 percent lower than when Gender's value is 0 (male).

We found the distribution of the salary data for WKU faculty and administrators to closely approximate the normal distribution with only small skew and kurtosis coefficients. As a result, we expected the linear and log-linear specifications to yield very similar results. In contrast, the distribution of salaries data for WKU staff was heavily skewed to the right with sizable kurtosis also, indicating that differences between linear and log-linear versions may appear. However, we found the results were very similar even using the staff data. Therefore, we utilized the linear function for most of our results to make interpretation simpler. We do, however, include gender coefficients based the log-linear equations for each group below.

Factor Inclusion/Exclusion

Third, one of the most fertile grounds for differences between studies in the literature is the inclusion and/or exclusion of factors other than gender. In this matter, we had little choice because of data and time constraints. We obtained all pertinent data collected by Human Resources and Administrative Computing as well as market data on faculty salaries from the national survey cited earlier. From this set of potential factors, we checked for extreme multicollinearity between factors (redundancy) by computing simple correlation coefficients. Then, we estimated "over fitted" equations -- equations which included estimated parameters whether the estimates were statistically significant or not. This allows hypotheses to be tested with all available control variables in use. Most of the results presented below are based on such over fitted models.

Inclusion of insignificant regressors can influence values for significant regressors. To adjust for this possibility, we also estimated equations which pared clearly insignificant control factors (p-values > 0.10) from the models to see if the gender coefficients were changed in these more
parsimonious equations. This follows the “general to specific” strategy of Hendry.26

Statistical Significance

Finally, the issue of what constitutes a reliable or “statistically significant” coefficient crops up in our study as it does in all statistical work. Those familiar with statistics are familiar with the issues regarding the use of sample statistics (such as regression coefficients based on sample data) to estimate unobservable parameters. Along with each regression coefficient, a standard error for that coefficient is estimated which measures the likely sampling error for the coefficient (but does not account for non-sampling errors). Generally speaking, a coefficient which is more than twice as large as its standard error is viewed as reliably different from zero, at least with respect to sampling problems. P-values (generated by computations based on standard errors) are produced in the regression analysis which allow a quantitative estimate of the likelihood of finding the estimated coefficient if the hypothesis of a zero coefficient were actually the truth. Common practice in statistics as well as standards generally used by courts of law reviewing statistical evidence treat p-values above 0.05 with suspicion. When p-values fall below 0.05 and especially 0.01, the estimated coefficient is typically viewed as reliably different from zero as long as other aspects of the analysis are satisfactory.

We stick to these common conventions in our interpretations of coefficient in this report below but recognize that the difference in practical relevance between a p-value of 0.049 and 0.056 is based much more on individual preferences than it is on scientific certainties.

Details on Estimates

Faculty Estimates

The selection of factors for the faculty model was relatively straightforward. The main issues involved measures such as measurement of longevity. In this case, we used age instead of service time based on contribution to model fit as well as coefficient significance. Probably the most important control factor in this equation is the market benchmark data. It brings into the analysis a measure of the competitive forces (both inside and outside of academics) which helps to determine differentials across individuals and disciplines.

Unlike the gender factor, splitting the data by full-time versus part-time faculty leads to large coefficient differences for several variables. The same kind of F-tests which could not reject a null hypothesis of equal coefficients across gender do reject the null across full-time versus part-time. Because of this and because the vast majority of faculty in our sample are listed as full time (about 90 percent), we conducted almost all of our analysis in terms of full time faculty.

The primary faculty equation is reported in Table A.1. The gender coefficient is -914 (a gap favorable to males) but its p-value is 0.20, indicating the coefficient is not very large relative to its standard error. In other words, a different data set such as one for a different year might be below -914 but it could also very easily be a positive number.

Of the other coefficients in the equation, the market benchmark, contract length, and College

26See Maddala, Introduction to Econometrics, pp. 494-495 for a brief synopsis of this general to specific approach and additional cites.
of Business affiliation are the most important in determining salaries. The lack of importance of faculty rank in explaining salaries may seem odd. The inclusion of market benchmark as a factor explains these lack of results. With market benchmark by rank and department included, the faculty rank variables only account for systematic deviations from these benchmarks at WKU within each rank.

Table A.2 reports the gender coefficients and p-values for the estimation of the equation for alternative subsets of faculty and/or specifications based on breakdowns of the data by age, college rank, measurement of salaries, handling of missing data, and by excluding irrelevant factors. These allow for auxiliary issues to be addressed. These alternative equations can account for 60 to 90 percent of the differences in pay across individuals. With one exception (the assistant professor subset) all of the coefficients are negative but no p-value is lower than .13.

The coefficient for part-time faculty also appears in this set of results. Even though it has a seemingly large, negative coefficient (-2648), its p-value is still only 0.13. The relatively smaller sample size contributes to a much larger standard error in its case.

The R² indicates that the model explains differences among younger faculty much better than among older faculty. Several reasons may exist for this. For instance, any gender bias from past years may be more likely to show up in older faculty than younger faculty. Also, the omission of individual productivity measures may be more important for faculty with several years on the job than faculty more recently hired. The model also does not perform as well in explaining the part-time sample. This is not surprising given the relatively more diverse nature of this employment.

The assistant professor results appearing in Tables A.2 and A.7 are discussed at some length in the main text. As we indicate there, this is the exception to the lack of statistically significant gender gaps. The professor, associate professor, and instructor/lecturer subsets all have p-values in excess of 0.50 -- not even in the ballpark of significance under common standards. In contrast, the assistant professor coefficient has a p-value of less than 0.01 -- a level which strongly rejects the hypothesis of a zero coefficient.

As we note in the text and as the results in Table A.7 indicate, this gender gap for assistant professors can be traced to older assistant professors and primarily to the College of Education. The coefficient on younger assistant professors is -886 with a p-value of 0.17 while for older assistant professors the coefficient is 2404 with a p-value below 0.01. The first procedure we used to estimate the college effects was to drop one college at a time from the analysis for the older assistant professors. The set of all older faculty reduces the sample size to 62. For the colleges, the sample

27 In the faculty and administrative equations, age was strongly related to pay whereas WKU service time measures were not. For faculty, age probably serves as a better measure of longevity because non-WKU faculty experience matters for pay. For staff, especially non-professional staff, time spent outside of WKU may count for little.

28 We used three variables for these ranks rather than one variable with 3 or 4 levels where ranks were the levels (e.g. 0, 1, 2, 3) because estimating a coefficient for each rank is not as restrictive as estimating a single coefficient. Additionally, using multiple levels implicitly assumes the intervals between the levels has meaning (e.g. 3 is 3 times bigger than 1) when no such conclusion is warranted.
size ranges from only 2 to 21.

Dropping the COBA, CAHSS, and CSTH do not substantially influence the coefficient or p-values. The coefficients all exceed $2000 and the p-values fall from 0.06 to 0.01. One very slight influence of dropping these college occurs for Ogden only with the p-value falling to 0.06. In contrast, when CEBS is dropped, the coefficient is cut in half and the p-value rises to 0.16. Since only about 14 faculty members are involved when the data set is reduced to assistant professors above average age and residing in the College of Education, no conclusion about gender bias should be drawn from such a small sample size without a more case by case investigation.

The final procedure we used was to estimate simple regressions between salary and gender for the older assistant professors in CEBS, CAHSS, and CSTH. Table A.8 shows the coefficient and p-value for the CEBS data with and without one outlying value. With the value, the coefficient is $-4438$ with a p-value of 0.05. Without the outlier, the p-value falls to 0.24, indicating a coefficient not significantly different from zero. The p-values for the coefficient in these simple regressions are identical to the p-values associated with the ANOVA F-statistic. The results for CAHSS and CSTH are not reported in the Table. Their p-values were 0.11 and 0.34 respectively with outliers included.

**Staff Estimates**

Overall, the estimation of the staff equation is a more demanding problem than the faculty or administrative equations because of the greater dissimilarities in jobs and characteristics of the employees filling the jobs. The jobs run the range from executive level, salaried jobs to hourly jobs paying near minimum wage. As a result of this greater heterogeneity of jobs and individuals, a much larger amount of job-specific and individual-specific information is required in order to estimate an equation which models salary variability as well as the faculty equation. Also, the wide diversity of jobs makes collecting and using market data for such a large group impractical.

We used two alternatives to market benchmarks for staff salaries. First, we included variables which categorized individuals in the President’s office and in the Vice President’s offices. Second, and as we mentioned in the body of the report, we included job characteristics/requirements data collected in the Corroon study. The three “Knowledge” variables account for #1 (education) -- typical level of academic training required for entry into the job, #2 (experience) -- the typical number of years an employee must have to enter this job and be fully functional, #3 (breadth/depth) -- assesses the required technical knowledge in the field. The two “Problem Solving” variables account for #1 (nature and discretion) -- assesses how unusual problems are and the amount of individual responsibility used to solve them and #2 (availability of information) -- availability/ usability of knowledge necessary to solve problems. The two “Decision Making” variables account for #1 (impact) -- the extent of expense/harm/hardship which may result from a decision and #2 (scope) -- how far reaching a job’s decisions are. Supervision is the responsibility to direct the work of others. “Working Contacts” places value on varied items such as relationships which the employee has with others, sophistication of interpersonal skills needed, and diversity of duties.29

29Additionally, service time and breaks in service time were included in the staff equation along with age. In these equations, these service time measures were more important than age in explaining salary differences.
In the version presented in Table A.3, the Gender coefficient is -82 with a p-value below 0.01. Therefore, the likelihood of finding a zero coefficient due to sample variability alone is very small. If we compute a range around -982 which takes account of likely statistical error, the range would run from a gap in favor of males of about $-390 to $-1570. Contract length, years at WKU, break in service time, the knowledge variables, problem solving (nature/discretion), decision making (impact), and supervision requirements are also important in the equation.

Table A.4 and A.8 reports the Gender coefficients and p-values for the estimation of the equation for alternative subsets of staff and/or specifications based on breakdowns of the data by service time, salary, measurement of salaries, handling of missing data, and by excluding irrelevant factors. These alternative equations show wide differences in accounting for pay across individuals -- ranging from 27 percent in the case of pay between $22,230 and $31,000 up to 81 percent. As we discussed in the main text, the gender coefficients are sensitive to the use of employees with different levels of pay. The below average group has a coefficient of -377 along with a p-value of 0.02. Cutting this group down more, the group between $13,500 and $22,230 displays a gender coefficient of -323 with a p-value of 0.03. These results support the conclusion that the estimated gender gap is not merely due to sampling error for this grouping. In contrast, the other salary groupings display p-values of 0.09 or above.

Because of the non-normality of the salary data, the version which uses the natural log of salaries as the dependent variable is of special interest. The Gender coefficient of -0.05 in this version implies that when Gender equals one (females) salaries are, on average, 5 percent lower than when Gender equals zero (males). At the mean salary level for staff for the 768 people in this sample ($22,294), a 5 percent reduction equals an $1111 reduction. In other words, the log-linear version and the linear version estimated gender gaps within $129 of each other when the entire staff is used.

Administrators

Job characteristics and pay levels do not differ nearly so dramatically with administrators as with staff personnel. Still, the nature of the administrative data makes the use of market benchmarks difficult since the main classification of individuals is by office rather than by specific job. For example, any administrator in the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs is categorized by that office rather than as Vice President or Assistant Vice President. The same holds true for dean offices also.

As a result, rather than attempting to use market benchmarks, we again used the categorical variables for the President's office and each of the Vice President's offices. These variables will capture any differences in the average level of pay in these offices versus other administrative offices. In addition, we used categorical variables to mark whether an individual was employed in one of the college dean offices or not.

The primary administrative equation is reported in Table A.5. The Gender coefficient is large, -4973, and its p-value is 0.13. Although seemingly large the coefficient cannot be reliably viewed as different from zero once sampling error is taken into account. Why would such a large coefficient value still show up as statistically insignificant. Most simply, the coefficient is not very

---

30This is roughly the 95 percent "confidence interval"
large relative to its standard error. To use analysis of variance terminology, the amount of variation within the male-only and female-only groups is large relative to the amount of variation between males and females. Of the other coefficients in the equation, age, contract length, and employment in one of the higher level administrative offices are the most important in determining salaries.

Table A.6 reports the Gender coefficients and p-values for the estimation of the equation for alternative subsets of administrators and/or specifications based on breakdowns of the data by age, inclusion of faculty, measurement of salaries, handling of missing data, and by excluding irrelevant factors. These alternative equations can account for 54 to 72 percent of the differences in pay across individuals. None of the p-values fall below the 0.16 level. As with the faculty results, such high p-values render any additional conclusions about coefficient values meaningless.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Benchmark</th>
<th>0.00 (not shown)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Age)</td>
<td>0.24 (not shown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Length (12mo. = 1)</td>
<td>0.44 (0.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (Professor = 1)</td>
<td>0.95 (0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (Assoc. Prof = 1)</td>
<td>0.79 (0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (Asst. Lecturer &lt; 1)</td>
<td>0.92 (0.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Tenure Status</td>
<td>0.15 (0.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (COBA = 1)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (CEBS = 1)</td>
<td>0.41 (0.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (CAHSS = 1)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.80)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>0.75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>123 (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Cases with missing data were deleted from the analysis reducing observations from 519 to 467. Means/standard deviations for continuous variables are Salary (48,997/13,272), Market (45,061/11,831), and Age (49.3/6.1). The F is the F-statistic for the null of all coefficients equal zero.
Table A.1
Detailed Regression Results for Full Time Faculty Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient/(p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>8501/(&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female = 1)</td>
<td>-914/(0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Benchmark</td>
<td>0.67/(&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity (Age)</td>
<td>90.3(0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Length (12mo. =1)</td>
<td>14403/(&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (Professor =1)</td>
<td>-95/(0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (Assoc. Prof. = 1)</td>
<td>-378/(0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (Instr./Lecturer = 1)</td>
<td>493/(0.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Other&quot; Tenure Status</td>
<td>-815/(.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (COBA = 1)</td>
<td>12560/(&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (CEBS = 1)</td>
<td>412/(0.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (CAHSS = 1)</td>
<td>1624/(0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>123/(&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Cases with missing data were deleted from the analysis reducing observations from 519 to 467. Means/standard deviations for continuous variables are Salary (48,997/13,232), Market (49661/11,651), and Age (49.3/9.3). The F is the F-statistic for the null of all coefficients equal zero.
### Table A.2
Faculty Gender Results from Alternative Specifications/Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Gender Coefficient/(p-value)</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Median Age Only</td>
<td>-1345/(0.25)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Median Age Only</td>
<td>-715/(0.23)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBA Only</td>
<td>-243/(0.93)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEBS Only</td>
<td>-269/(0.83)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAHSS Only</td>
<td>-536/(0.68)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTH Only</td>
<td>-1768/(0.15)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors Only</td>
<td>-1032/(0.54)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors Only</td>
<td>-481/(0.67)</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors Only</td>
<td>-1556/(&lt;0.01)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors/Lecturers Only</td>
<td>1223/(0.65)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln(Salary) as Dependent Variable</td>
<td>-0.02/(0.18)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Substituted for Missing Data</td>
<td>-1106/(0.13)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Faculty Only</td>
<td>-2648/(0.13)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors with p &lt; 0.10 Only</td>
<td>-890/(0.21)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Unless otherwise noted, the coefficients are for full time faculty using 467 observations with non-missing values. The mean substituted for missing data version uses 519 observations for full time faculty. The part time coefficient uses 43 observations with non-missing values. Number of females/number of total faculty in sample by college: COBA (6/54); CEBS (54/117); CAHSS (58/163); CSTH (57/177).
### Table A.3
Detailed Regression Results for Staff Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient/(p-value)</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient/(p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4007/(&lt;0.01)</td>
<td>In VP (IT) Office</td>
<td>-7990/(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-982/(&lt;0.01)</td>
<td>Knowledge (#1)</td>
<td>71/(&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Length (12 mo. = 1)</td>
<td>3296/(&lt;0.01)</td>
<td>Knowledge (#2)</td>
<td>54/(&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity (Years since First Hired)</td>
<td>315/(&lt;0.01)</td>
<td>Knowledge (#3)</td>
<td>186/(&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Break in WKU Service Time</td>
<td>-295/(&lt;0.01)</td>
<td>Problem Solving (#1)</td>
<td>150/(&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Solving (#2)</td>
<td>-61/(0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In President’s Office</td>
<td>-482/(0.82)</td>
<td>Decision Making (#1)</td>
<td>2.4/(0.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In VP(AA) Office</td>
<td>-738/(0.69)</td>
<td>Decision Making (#2)</td>
<td>68/(&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In VP(F&amp;A) Office</td>
<td>-3912/(0.14)</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-111/(&lt;0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In VP (SA) Office</td>
<td>-4666/(0.21)</td>
<td>Working Contracts</td>
<td>25/(0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>173/(&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Cases with missing observations were deleted. Explanations of the job skill variables are included in the text. Means/Standard deviations: Salary (22,230/8,337); Years Since Hired (9.8/8.0); Break in Service (0.8: 2.7). F is the F-statistic for the null of all coefficients equal zero.
Table A.4  
Staff Gender Results from Alternative Specifications/Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Gender Coefficient/(p-value)</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Average Time Since Hired</td>
<td>-1041/(0.04)</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average Time Since Hired</td>
<td>-847/(0.02)</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln(Salary) as Dependent Variable</td>
<td>-0.05/(&lt;0.01)</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Substituted for Missing Data</td>
<td>-1632/(&lt;0.01)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors with p &lt; 0.10 only</td>
<td>-1017/(0.01)</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Except as noted, the estimates use the same model as the full sample staff model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient/(p-value)</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-14104/(0.16)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female = 1)</td>
<td>-4973/(0.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity (Age)</td>
<td>759/(&lt;0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract (12 mo. = 1)</td>
<td>31078/(&lt;0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of President</td>
<td>28981/(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Office (AA = 1)</td>
<td>26116/(&lt;0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Office (F&amp;A = 1)</td>
<td>34133/(&lt;0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Office (IA = 1)</td>
<td>34788/(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Office (SA = 1)</td>
<td>29503/(0.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Office (COBA = 1)</td>
<td>37915/(&lt;0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Office (CEBS = 1 = 1)</td>
<td>21751/(0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Office (CAHSS = 1)</td>
<td>18867/(0.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Office (CSTH = 1)</td>
<td>-4568/(0.65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$: 0.64
$F$: 10.9/(<0.01)
Observations 95

Notes: Means/standard deviations for continuous variables are Salary (55,751/21,212) and Age (48.9/8.4).
Table A.6
Administrative Gender Results from Alternative Specifications/Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Gender Coefficient/(p-value)</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Average Age</td>
<td>-7226/(0.16)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average Age</td>
<td>-4628/(0.26)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Above Average</td>
<td>-931/(0.82)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Below Average</td>
<td>-1520/(0.57)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln(Salary) as Dependent Variable</td>
<td>-0.10/(0.16)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors with p &lt; 0.10 Only</td>
<td>-4848/(0.17)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Unless otherwise noted, the coefficients use the factors from the full faculty model. The above average age assistant professor data set includes 72 faculty with average time since hired of 3 years with 6 percent from COBA, 20 percent from CEBS, 29 percent from CAHSS, and 44 percent from CSTH. The below average age assistant professor data set includes 57 faculty with average time since hired of 12 years with 1 percent from COBA, 23 percent from CEBS, 33 percent from CAHSS, and 33 percent from CSTH.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Gender Coefficient/(p-value)</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Average Age for Assistant Professors</td>
<td>-886/(0.18)</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average Age for Assistant Professors (42.5)</td>
<td>-2404/(&lt;0.01)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average Age for Assistant Professors AND Without COBA</td>
<td>-2339/(0.01)</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without CEBS</td>
<td>-1298/(0.16)</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without CAHSS</td>
<td>-2613/(0.06)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without CSTH</td>
<td>-3510/(0.01)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Only Models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEBS Only</td>
<td>-4439/(0.05)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEBS Only without 1 Outlier</td>
<td>-2127/(0.24)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Unless otherwise noted, the coefficients use the factors from the full faculty model. The above average age assistant professor data set includes 72 faculty with average time since hired of 3 years with 6 percent from COBA, 20 percent from CEBS, 29 percent from CAHSS, and 41 percent from CSTH. The below average age assistant professor data set includes 57 faculty with average time since hired of 12 years with 3 percent from COBA, 23 percent from CEBS, 35 percent from CAHSS, and 35 percent from CSTH.
Table A.8
Staff Gender Gap Estimates by Salary Level Groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Gender Coefficient/(p-value)</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Average Salary</td>
<td>-546/(0.33)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average Salary</td>
<td>-377/(0.02)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary under $13,500</td>
<td>-59/(0.46)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary between $13,500 and Average</td>
<td>-323/(0.03)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary between Average and $31,000</td>
<td>23/(0.94)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary above $31,000</td>
<td>-1608/(0.09)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The estimates use the same model as the full sample staff model. Number of observations for salary groupings are as follows: Above average (n = 313); Below average (n = 455); Below $13,500 (n = 101); $13,500-average (n = 354); average - $31,000 (n = 189); Above $31,000 (n = 124).
After reviewing the responses to the memorandum that had been distributed to all faculty, staff, and student employees and the remarks of the representatives of the administrative staff who attended the February 26, 1997, task force meeting, the Compensation Subcommittee met to determine its focus. Although the category of compensation includes benefits as well as salaries and wages, the group agreed that all constituencies seemed concerned primarily with the issue of comparable pay. Very few memorandum respondents had cited non-salary benefits in their lists of important concerns.

With that in mind, the committee reviewed salary and wage studies that had been done in recent years using Western Kentucky University faculty and staff data:

*Does Sex Discrimination Exist in Faculty Salaries at Western Kentucky University? An Empirical Examination of the Wage Gap* by Reed Vesey, masters thesis, Department of Economics (1991)

*Salary Differentials for Non-Faculty Male and Female Employees at Western Kentucky University -- Is it Discrimination?* by Jill Friedmann, graduate student in Economics (1994)

*Faculty Senate Annual Salary Report (1996-97)*

*Study of the Western Kentucky University Classification and Compensation Plan, W.F. Corroon (1996)*

Concerns were expressed about the clarity and reliability of the data in these existing documents, partly because of the lapse in time and partly because the Corroon study had caused some changes in the staff pay structure (retroactive to January 1996). The committee concluded that a new faculty and staff salary and wage study should be commissioned. Subcommittee chairperson Dan Roenker obtained approval from President Thomas Meredith for a summer stipend to fund the project and then secured a commitment from Brian Goff of the Economics Department to perform the study with Dr. Roenker's assistance.

During the summer of 1997, Dr. Roenker and Dr. Goff met with Tony Glisson (Human Resources Director) and Cheryl Smith (Compensation Coordinator) to discuss their data needs. Assistance was also received from Bob Cobb and Bob August in Administrative Computing Services. In late August Dr. Goff and Dr. Roenker completed the study, which began with this overview statement:

*The main objective of our report is to compute and interpret quantitative estimates*
of differences in pay between men and women at WKU -- the gender gap -- while taking into account non-gender-related factors influencing pay. To accomplish our goal, we obtained employment-related data for all faculty, staff, and administrators. The factors at our disposal included salary, unit and/or job identifiers, a limited set of personal characteristics (including gender), and several other factors such as length of service. We calculated simple, descriptive measures of the average and variability of salary by gender. Then, we used a statistical technique (regression analysis) to calculate the impact of gender while accounting for several other influences on pay.

Elaborating on the "other influences on pay," the authors said:

In addition to anonymous salary data, our initial data set consisted of 29 other factors related to employment. We also obtained market benchmark data for faculty from the College and University Personnel Association. Using past empirical literature as a guide coupled with professional judgement and some preliminary investigation, we constructed the regression models of pay discussed below from this set of factors. As with all studies of this type, our objective in building the models was to account for as much of the differences in pay as these factors and sound economic/statistical practice would permit. Because the factors included in the final statistical models of pay differ across faculty, staff, and administrators, we describe each of these models separately along with the main results. In most cases, the reasons for the inclusion of a factor should be apparent. A comprehensive listing of all factors obtained and constructed is included in the Appendix along with more discussion on specific factors and detailed statistical results.

Details of the study appear as the attachment entitled *A Quantitative Assessment of Gender Gaps in WKU Salaries*. Included here are the report's conclusions.

1) The data do not support a finding of systematic discrimination against women among WKU's faculty and administrators once a set of other factors (such as longevity, rank, and benchmark market value) related to pay are taken into account;

2) The absence of systematic gender gaps for most faculty and administrators does not rule out the possibility of gender bias in faculty or administrative pay. However, if and where such discrimination may occur, it would seemingly be limited to isolated cases, and therefore, not reflected in campus-wide salary studies such as ours;

3) The most comparable version of a 1992 regression study of WKU faculty pay found a $1700 gender gap in favor of males. In part, our use of more detailed market benchmark salary data may have reduced this gap. Additionally, our results may indicate that a combination of university policies regarding gender, increased awareness of the issue, and/or changing personnel have helped to reduce the gap;

4) A basic version of our model for all staff members showed a $980 gap in favor of
males. The range around this figure which accounts for likely sampling error runs from $400 to $1500. A more detailed version of the staff gender gap shows gender-based salary differences in favor of males of $320 in the category of staff making around $13,000 to $22,000 annually.

As with almost any statistical study, improvements are possible with better data, more time, and more expertise. This study includes no direct measures of individual productivity. Additionally, it does not account for societal customs and pressures that historically have channeled females into lower paying occupations.

The committee recognizes that all data analysis techniques have limitations. For example, the tools used in this study are designed to detect evidence of systemic bias in the allocation of salaries. Those tools do not permit the identification of individual cases in which bias may, in fact, exist, although the presence of numerous such cases would be detected by the regression tools used.

Although the primary focus of the Compensation Subcommittee was the issue of gender-based differences in pay, the group decided to look also at non-salary benefits that are gender related.

In her 1995 paper Western Kentucky University Faculty Pregnancy Leave Practices: A Report on Current Practices and Perceptions, Dr. Betsy Shoenfelt of the WKU Department of Psychology questioned all academic department heads concerning practices and opinions related to covering classes during a faculty member’s maternity leave. Fifteen options were ranked for willingness to use, fairness to the pregnant faculty member, and fairness to other departmental faculty.

Although having other faculty cover classes for the absent faculty member during and after childbirth is by far the most frequently used option at WKU, it was rated second in fairness to the pregnant faculty member and twelfth in fairness to other faculty members. The option of hiring a temporary instructor was deemed the most fair to all faculty members. Dr. Schoenfelt concluded that when funds and a qualified instructor are available, this is the preferred option. She noted, however, that “not all options are equally viable for every department” and that heads “favor the flexibility in covering classes provided in the current maternity leave policy.”

In an April 1997 working paper, Perceived Fairness of Maternity Leave Policies in a University Setting, Dr. Shoenfelt continues the discussion of perceptions of fairness in the workplace (“organizational justice”). Using data obtained from a questionnaire distributed to faculty members, she found that “faculty members were significantly more willing to support a policy that had been established through a participative process” and that “maternity leave policies that required less work from other faculty members were perceived as more fair than policies that increased their workload.” She concluded that “administrators would be wise to use a participative method in determining any policy option if they are seeking an option that will be perceived as fair and one which faculty are willing to support.”
Non-faculty maternity policies are outlined in the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 which is included as Policy #4-51 in the Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual of the WKU Department of Human Resources. After a maximum total leave time of 12 weeks (including sick leave, vacation days, and paid or unpaid leave), the employee will be returned to her “prior position or an equivalent position with equivalent pay, benefits, and working conditions.”

Although little or no concern was expressed by memorandum respondents regarding child care, the subcommittee was curious about the availability of on-campus facilities. Information obtained through Colleen Mendel, Director of Training and Technical Assistance Services, indicated that the Western Kentucky University Child Care Center does not exist solely for the benefit of faculty and staff members. The two WKU centers offer federally funded Head Start programs as well as day care, kindergarten, and after-school services to the entire community. Enrollment is competitive, despite the fairly expensive rates for those who do not qualify for assistance.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that as the faculty grows younger, interest will grow in having more convenient and reliable day care services, including a drop-in sick-child center.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the Subcommittee on Compensation lead the members to make the following recommendations.

1. The gender-based salary difference discovered among staff personnel in the $13,000 to $22,000 pay range should be addressed.

2. Outliers not detected in the 1997 salary study should not be ignored; their situations should be examined and any cases of bias eliminated.

3. Salary studies (using the data gathering structure now in place) should be conducted every three years.

4. A directory of non-salary benefits and services of particular interest to women should be prepared and distributed among female faculty and staff.
EMPLOYMENT/ADVANCEMENT STUDY


b. Gender Charts
Report of the  
Employment and Advancement Subcommittee  
February 10, 1998

This subcommittee focused on the effect that gender considerations have on the selection, hiring, and subsequent advancement of university personnel. The committee first studied the gender composition of five groups that appear during the faculty and professional staff hiring process: a) search committees, b) applicants, c) qualified applicants, d) persons interviewed, and e) persons hired.

This report also addresses the issues of tenure and promotion for female faculty and provides a detailed look at the gender composition of faculty and staff within each university unit.

Sections I and II include charts with findings about the employment and advancement of women on the campus. Section III contains the conclusions and recommendations.

The data for the employment issues were obtained from the Affirmative Action Office, the data for tenure awards and promotions were obtained from the Office of Vice President of Academic Affairs, and the data for the gender composition were obtained from the Administrative Computing center. During the compilation of these data, we identified the following limitations:

- The data concerning the hiring process at Western were available for approximately two years (1996 and 1997). Data about hiring practices before the organization of the Office of Affirmative Action do not exist in a reliable format.

- The data reporting the gender composition of departments, colleges, units, and areas do not include split positions (about 20 positions that are funded through more than one budget). We excluded split positions (persons paid from two departmental budgets) so people and positions would not be counted twice.

- The data reporting the composition of departments do not include optional retirees.

- In some instances, the composition of departments and areas has changed multiple times over the last five years (e.g., Anthropology, Academic Computing). When possible, this report places departments/areas in the divisions where they are currently assigned.

- The data used to report the gender composition of departments, colleges, units and areas provides a "snapshot" extracted from a database that changes as positions are vacated and filled. Therefore, if the snapshot had been taken a few weeks before or after these data were collected in the Fall 1997 semester, the actual gender composition would be different from the data reported.

- No detailed data were available for non-exempt (hourly) personnel.
SECTION I: Findings and analysis of the gender compositions of (a) search committees, (b) job applicants, © qualified job applicants, (d) persons interviewed, and (e) persons hired, tenure awards, and the promotion of faculty.

Note: The “period” referred to in each chart may be 1993-1997 or 1996-1997. Please consult each chart for the specific time period.

Chart 1
“Gender Ratios in Hiring Process for Faculty Positions”

Findings: A near balance of gender existed in the composition of faculty search committees. The majority (approximately 70%) of applicants, for faculty positions, were male. The majority (approximately 65%) of “qualified applicants” were male. However, both the number of applicants given on-campus interviews and the number of new faculty hired were about 50% female.

Chart 2
“Gender Ratios in Hiring Process for Administrative/Staff Positions”

Findings: The composition of search committees was about 60% male. The number of applicants was about 65% male, the number of qualified applicants was about 55% male, the number interviewed was about 60% male, and the number hired about 60% male.

Chart 3
“Tenure Awards”

Finding: During the period, 46 of 48 females (96%) and 52 of 54 males (96%) received tenure.

Chart 4
“Promotion of Eligible Faculty to Assistant Professor”

Finding: During the period, 100% of the eligible females and 100% of the males were promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor.

---

1“Qualified Applicants” is a rating designation, defined and assigned by the search committee to each applicant. This rating system helps the committee in ranking applicants.
"Promotion of Eligible Faculty to Associate Professor"

Finding: During the period, 40 of 42 females (95%) and 51 of 57 males (89%) were promoted to the rank of Associate Professor.

"Promotion of Eligible Faculty to Professor"

Finding: During the period, 16 of 16 females (100%) and 29 of 33 (88%) males were promoted to the rank of Professor.

SECTION II: Findings on the gender composition of faculty and staff by college; staff by executive area, faculty by specific departments, and staff by specific units.

"Gender Composition of Faculty by College"

Findings: The College of Business Administration consistently had the lowest percentage of female faculty, while the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences and the Community College had the closest balance by gender.

"Gender Composition of Non-exempt Staff by College"

Findings: This chart displays the high percentage of females in non-exempt (hourly) positions. These positions are typically secretarial (office associate) positions.

"Gender Composition of Exempt Staff by Executive Area"

Findings: The executive area of Student Affairs tended to be the most balanced of all executive areas in the number of exempt (salaried) positions. As a group, executive areas have been trending toward balance since 1993.

"Gender Composition of Non-exempt Staff by Executive Area"

Findings: The bulk of employees in this classification come from the Facilities
Management Unit of Finance and Administration and from the Public Safety Unit of Student Affairs. These persons are not counted in chart 8. (See detailed analysis on charts 16a/b, 18a/b, 20, 22, 24a/b, 26)

Chart 11
“Faculty Gender By Department: College of Business Administration”

Findings: All departments show a consistently high percentage of male faculty. Since 1993, the College has had an overall faculty composition rate of about 89% male.

Chart 12
“Faculty Gender by Department: College of Education and Behavioral Sciences”

Findings: The college has three departments that have been consistently about 60% male: Educational Leadership, Physical Education and Recreation, and Psychology. The Department of Consumer and Family Science has had a consistent rate of about 80% female, while the School of Integrative Studies in Teacher Education has had a rate of about 60% female. Since 1993, the College has had an overall composition rate of about 50% female.

Chart 13
“Faculty Gender by Department: Ogden College of Science, Technology and Health”

Findings: Eight of the 12 department faculties have been at least 75% male. The departments of Nursing and Allied Health and Human Services had the highest percentage of females. Since 1993, the College has had an overall composition rate of about 70% male.

Chart 14
“Faculty Gender by Department: Potter College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences”

Findings: Five of the 11 departments’ faculties have been at least 75% male. Although the departments of English and Modern Languages and Intercultural Studies had a near balance, the College has had an overall composition rate of about 70% male since 1993.

Charts 15a and 15b
“Gender of Exempt Staff in Academic Affairs”

Exempt Staff refers to professional non-faculty persons.
Findings: Five of the 17 areas had a majority of male exempt (salaried) staff: Academic Advising, Agricultural Exposition Center and University Farm, Deans’ Offices, Institute for Economic Development, and Student Publications. A majority of female staff is found in the areas of Admissions, Continuing Education, Center for Teaching and Learning, Forensics, International Programs, and Office of the Registrar. Since 1993, the majority of exempt staff in the Academic Affairs area has been female, with a trend toward balance. (Chart 9)

Charts 16a and 16b
“Gender of Non-exempt Staff in Academic Affairs”

Findings: With the exception of the Agricultural Exposition Center/University Farm, the majority of all non-exempt staff within the area of Academic Affairs has been female. Since 1993, Academic Affairs has had approximately 90% females in all non-exempt positions. (Chart 10)

Chart 17
“Gender of Exempt Staff in Finance and Administration”

Findings: In eight of the 13 units in the area of Finance and Administration, more than 75% of exempt staff positions were held by males. No females were reported within the Bookstore, Business Services, Central Stores, ID Center, Postal Services, or the Print Shop. Since 1993, the majority of exempt staff within Finance and Administration has been male, but the trend has been toward balance. (Chart 9)

Charts 18a and 18b
“Gender of Non-exempt Staff in Finance and Administration”

Findings: The majority of non-exempt employees within Finance and Administration are females. The largest unit, Facilities Management, had a consistent composition of about 60% male. Since 1993, the overall composition of non-exempt staff has been near balance. (Chart 10)

Chart 19
“Gender of Exempt Staff in Institutional Advancement”

Findings: Since 1993, the majority of exempt staff in the area of Institutional Advancement has been male. In 1996, Alumni Affairs lost one male and gained one female, making it the only unit with a majority of female staff. (Chart 9)

Chart 20
“Gender of Non-exempt Staff in Institutional Advancement”

91
Findings: All non-exempt staff in the Institutional Advancement area have been female since 1993. (Chart 10)

Chart 21
“Gender of Exempt Staff in Information Technology”

Findings: This executive area was created in 1997 and is an amalgamation of several technology units. This area has trended toward balance since 1994, but remains at approximately 65% male. (Chart 9)

Chart 22
“Gender of Non-exempt Staff in Information Technology”

Findings: The majority of non-exempt staff within the Information Technology area is female. Administrative Computing is the only unit in which males are employed (with the exception of Telecommunication in 1996). The unit has tended to remain at approximately 35% male since 1993. (Chart 10)

Charts 23a and 23b
“Gender of Exempt Staff in Student Affairs”

Findings: Overall this unit has tended toward balance, with approximately 55% of all exempt staff being female since 1993. Three units, Public Safety, Student Activities, and the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs, consistently reported that 100% of their employees since 1993 have been male. (Chart 9)

Charts 24a and 24b
“Gender of Non-exempt Staff in Student Affairs”

Findings: In nine of the 12 units, 100% of the non-exempt staff has been female. Public Safety consistently has reported approximately 65% male employees, Downing University Center approximately 60% males, and Career Services 20% male. Since 1993, the non-exempt staff in Student Affairs has averaged about 60% female. (Chart 10)

Chart 25
“Gender of Exempt Staff in President’s Area”

Findings: Within this executive area, Athletics accounts for nearly 80% of all exempt staff positions. Within this group, approximately 80% of all positions have been male. (Chart 9)
"Non-exempt Staff in President’s Area"

Findings: 100% of non-exempt staff has been female. This trend has been consistent since 1993. (Chart 10)

SECTION III: Conclusions and Recommendations.

CONCLUSIONS

1. In the 1996-1997 academic year, a slim majority of interviewees (92 females/89 males) and actual hires (38 females/34 males) for faculty positions was female. However, the overwhelming majority (713 males/361 females) of qualified applicants was male. (Chart 1). For Administrative/Staff positions, the minority (197 females/293 males) of interviewees and new employees (50 females/73 males) was female. (Chart 2)

2. The University appears to award faculty tenure and promotions without regard to gender. (Chart 3, 4 and 6) No detailed analysis could be made about those individuals not promoted.

3. In the period 1993-1997, the University had approximately 33% female faculty. In the 1996-1997 academic year, the data revealed a low of 9.6% females in the College of Business Administration to a high of 51.3% females in the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences. This same year was the only one in which the numbers of new faculty members were balanced by gender in all colleges. (Charts 7, 11,12,13,14)

4. During 1993-1997, over 60% of all persons hired for non-exempt staff (hourly) positions was female. (Charts 8 and 10)

5. Between 1993 and 1997, the percentage of females hired for exempt staff (salaried) positions increased to 45% but has not changed in two years. (Charts 9 and 2)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Appropriate offices should review for gender bias the current system(s) for tracking and reporting staff employee turnover, recruitment, job advertising, interviewing and actual hiring. Any system(s) adopted after this examination should be linked to established equal opportunity goals.

2. To help improve gender ratios in all units, the University should monitor, track, and
publish faculty gender data regarding vacancies (to include retirements/optional retirements), recruitment, hirings, promotions, and tenure awards. The University should provide adequate computer resources for this task to the appropriate offices (Academic Affairs, Human Resources, and Affirmative Action). Such data should be used for oversight, review, and follow up.

3. The University should analyze job vacancies and applicant pool(s) to expose the patterns of hiring in specific units and, where appropriate, assist units in developing strategies to increase the number of females hired.
CHART 1: Gender Ratios in Hiring Process for Faculty Positions 1996-1997

CHART 2: Gender Ratios in Hiring Process for All Non Faculty Administrative & Staff Positions 1996-1997
CHART 3. Tenure Awards by Gender
1992/93-1996/97

CHART 4. Promotion of Eligible Faculty to Assistant Professor by Gender
1992/93-1996/97
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CHART 5. Promotion of Eligible Faculty to Associate Professor by Gender 1992/93-1996/97

Females  Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Promoted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHART 6. Promotion of Eligible Faculty to Professor by Gender 1992/93-1996/97

Females  Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Promoted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHART 9. Gender Composition of Exempt (Salaried) Staff* by Executive Area 1993-1997

CHART 10. Gender Composition of Non Exempt (Hourly) Staff by Executive Area 1993-1997

*Not reported with departmental data.
CHART 11. Faculty* Gender by Department
College of Business
1993-1997

CHART 12. Faculty* Gender by Department
College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
1993-1997

*Includes exempt staff positions
CHART 13. Faculty* Gender by Department
Ogden College
1993-1997

CHART 14. Faculty* Gender by Department
Potter College
1993-1997

*Includes exempt staff positions.
CHART 15a. Gender of Exempt (Salaried) Staff* in Academic Affairs 1993-1997

CHART 15b. Gender of Exempt (Salaried) Staff* in Academic Affairs (Cont.) 1993-1997

*Not reported with departmental data.
CHART 18b. Gender of Non Exempt (Hourly) Staff in Finance & Administration (Cont.)
1993-1997

CHART 19. Gender of Exempt (Salaried) Staff in Institutional Advancement
1993-1997

CHART 21. Gender of Exempt (Salaried) Staff in Information Technology 1993-1997
CHART 22. Gender of Non Exempt (Hourly) Staff in Information Technology 1993-1997

CHART 23a. Gender of Exempt (Salaried) Staff in Student Affairs 1993-1997
CHART 23b. Gender of Exempt (Salaried) Staff in Student Affairs (Cont.)
1993-1997

CHART 24a. Gender of Non Exempt (Hourly) Staff in Student Affairs
1993-1997
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CHART 26. Gender of Non Exempt (Hourly) Staff in President’s Area
1993-1997
Dear WKU Employee:

You are being asked to fill out a short survey about the status of women at Western Kentucky University. It should take you only a few minutes to complete this survey. Your responses will be kept confidential. Please be assured that your participation is voluntary. Your completed responses will not be linked to you personally. Thank you for your participation. Your input is very valuable to us.

Please fill in the bubbles that correspond to the letter above each number or position. Once you have completed the survey, please return it in the envelope provided to you and report it at or before close of business on Wednesday, December 8, 1987.

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Task Force on the Status of Women at WKU

CAMPUS-WIDE SURVEY

a. Study of the Status of Women on Campus Survey Cover Letter

b. WKU Status of Women Survey Instrument

c. WKU Status of Women Survey Report

d. WKU Status of Women Survey Questions Ratings Charts

e. Human Subjects Review Board Approval Documentation
WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
STUDY OF THE STATUS OF WOMEN ON CAMPUS
190 FINE ARTS CENTER
BOWLING GREEN, KENTUCKY 42101

November 20, 1997

Dear WKU Employee:

You are being asked to fill out a short survey about the status of women at Western Kentucky University. This survey is part of the year-long study by the Task Force on the Status of Women at WKU. It should take only a few minutes of your time. Your participation is fully voluntary and confidential. You may quit at any time, and you may refuse to answer any question. If you do not wish to participate, please return this survey in the enclosed envelope uncompleted. Your completed responses will mean that you consent to participate in this survey. Thank you for your participation. Your input is very valuable to us.

On the next page are statements about the status of women at Western Kentucky University. There are no right or wrong answers. You are simply expressing your opinions. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement by using the following scale:

SD = Strongly Disagree  D = Disagree  N = Neither Agree nor Disagree  A = Agree  SA = Strongly Agree

Please fill in bubbles that correspond to the letters above using a number 2 pencil. Once you have completed the survey, please enclose it in the envelope provided to you and return it in campus mail no later than Wednesday, December 3, 1997. Please do not write your name on the envelope or on the survey.

Thank you again for your participation.

Sincerely,

Task Force on the Status of Women at WKU
WKU STATUS OF WOMEN SURVEY

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- Use a No. 2 pencil only.
- Make solid marks that fill the response completely.
- Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change

CORRECT: O   INCORRECT: ✓

1. Listed below is a series of statements about the status of women at WKU. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement as it pertains to your work area.

   a. Women have less opportunity to participate in decision-making activities than men have.  
   • Strongly Agree   • Agree
   • Neither Agree nor Disagree   • Disagree
   • Strongly Disagree

   b. Women have less opportunity than men have for advancement.  
   • Strongly Agree   • Agree
   • Neither Agree nor Disagree   • Disagree
   • Strongly Disagree

   c. Women are less likely to be promoted than men are.  
   • Strongly Agree   • Agree
   • Neither Agree nor Disagree   • Disagree
   • Strongly Disagree

   d. Employing women in administrative positions is a priority.  
   • Strongly Agree   • Agree
   • Neither Agree nor Disagree   • Disagree
   • Strongly Disagree

   e. The WKU campus is a physically safe environment.  
   • Strongly Agree   • Agree
   • Neither Agree nor Disagree   • Disagree
   • Strongly Disagree

   f. Persons in my work area fully understand WKU's policy regarding sexual harassment.  
   • Strongly Agree   • Agree
   • Neither Agree nor Disagree   • Disagree
   • Strongly Disagree

2. Using the same scale, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as it pertains to WKU.

   a. The WKU campus is a physically safe environment.  
   • Strongly Agree   • Agree
   • Neither Agree nor Disagree   • Disagree
   • Strongly Disagree

   b. The WKU campus is a physically safe environment.  
   • Strongly Agree   • Agree
   • Neither Agree nor Disagree   • Disagree
   • Strongly Disagree

   c. Employee evaluations at WKU are conducted without regard to gender.  
   • Strongly Agree   • Agree
   • Neither Agree nor Disagree   • Disagree
   • Strongly Disagree

3. For research purposes only, we would like to know the following information about you:

   a. Are you (Please fill in one.) Faculty Staff
   • Male   • Female
   b. Are you Male Female
   • Male   • Female

   c. In the spaces provided, please write the number of years you have worked at WKU as a full-time employee. Darken the corresponding bubbles below your entry.

Thank you for your participation! Please return this form in the enclosed envelope by Wednesday, December 3, 1997.
WKU Status of Women Survey Report
February 4, 1998

Description of the Process

It was determined by the Task Force, based on the initial single-item memorandum distributed to all full-time employees and to student workers, that further data on perceptions of several topics (e.g., safety, sexual harassment, respect, advancement, job satisfaction, pay equity) were needed. Based on the initial memorandum, on the critical incidents questionnaire, and on the needs of each of the subcommittees, research questions on areas of concern for inclusion in the survey were generated. The purpose of the survey was to determine the perceptions of the WKU population. Since it was deemed important that everyone have an opportunity to express opinions on each of the areas of concern, it was decided by the Task Force that the survey instrument be mailed to all full-time faculty and staff of Western Kentucky University rather than to a sample from this population.

Once the research questions were determined, items for inclusion in the survey were developed. It was decided to use a series of Likert statements in order to determine the perceptions, attitudes, and opinions of the population. Survey statements and demographic questions were developed, discussed, and revised by the entire Task Force. A cover letter from the Task Force was also written. The survey itself was printed on scanable survey forms in order to expedite the data analysis. Several Task Force members agreed to pretest the cover letter and the survey instrument on the scanable forms. Results of the pretesting were given to one Task Force Member who then incorporated the pretest suggestions and corrected any problems. A second group of pretesters then pretested the revised survey instrument and the cover letter. Again, appropriate suggestions were incorporated into a final version of the survey and the cover letter. Approval of the survey, cover letter, and process was given by the WKU Human Subjects Review Board prior to the mailing of the survey via campus mail on November 20, 1997. The deadline return date indicated in the cover letter was December 3, 1997.

Description of the Respondents

One thousand five hundred twenty-five surveys were mailed through campus mail in November to the full-time faculty and staff of Western Kentucky University. A cover letter and return envelope also were included in the mailing. Of the 1525 surveys sent, 733 were returned for a 48 percent response rate. Of the 733 returned, 685 had usable, completed responses. The percentage of faculty respondents was 44.4 and the percentage of staff respondents was 55.6. This is reasonably close to the population percentages of faculty (37.1 %) and staff (62.9 %). The percentage of male respondents was 41.3 and female respondents was 58.7. This is compared to 48.9 percent males and 51.1 percent females in the population percentages of full-time employees. The number of years worked at WKU by respondents ranged from less than one to 36. The average number of years worked was 11.58 years; however, approximately 50 percent of the respondents have worked eight years or less.
Descriptive Statistics of the Responses

Respondents were asked to indicate how strongly they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements using the standard five-point Likert scale. Lower value responses represent disagreement and higher value responses represent agreement. The center response was labeled “Neither Agree nor Disagree” (This response was assigned a value of three on the five point scale for statistical analysis; “strongly disagree” was assigned a value of one; “disagree” was assigned a value of two; “agree” was assigned a value of four and “strongly agree” was assigned a value of five.) The data in the following table show the overall mean and standard deviation for each of the statements in the survey.

Overall Means for All Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women's opinions concerning job-related matters are taken less seriously than are men's opinions.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing women in administrative positions is a priority.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions make it more difficult for a woman than for a man to achieve job satisfaction.</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women have less opportunity than men have for advancement.</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are treated with less respect than are men.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women have less opportunity to participate in decision-making activities than men have.</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in my work area fully understand the concept of sexual harassment.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in my work area fully understand WKU's policy regarding sexual harassment.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are not retained in their jobs as frequently as are men.</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WKU campus is a physically safe environment.</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and men are paid comparable wages for comparable work at WKU.</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee evaluations at WKU are conducted without regard to gender.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, women and men are treated equally at WKU.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means reported on a five point scale where “1” is Strongly Disagree and “5” is Strongly Agree.

Data Analysis

Before determining if statistically significant differences exist in the data between males and females and between staff and faculty, a two-way analysis of variance was performed to test for interaction effects between sex and faculty/staff status. With one exception, there were no two-way interaction effects for sex and faculty/staff status. The only statistically significant interaction effect (p = 0.050) was for the statement: Persons in my work area fully understand the
concept of sexual harassment. Means* for this statement are presented below.

Male faculty: 3.64  Male staff: 3.94  Female faculty: 3.15  Female staff: 3.80

* Means reported on a five point scale where "1" is Strongly Disagree and "5" is Strongly Agree.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed for the main effect of sex in order to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the mean responses to the statements for males and females. The data in the following table indicate that for each of the statements, there was a statistically significant difference between male and female responses. In every case, females perceived there to be a greater problem for females than males perceived (e.g., females agreed more strongly than males that "women are treated with less respect than are men").

Results of Test for Differences in Means for Male and Female Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean* for Males</th>
<th>Mean* for Females</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women's opinions concerning job-related matters are taken less seriously than are men's opinions.</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing women in administrative positions is a priority.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions make it more difficult for a woman than for a man to achieve job satisfaction.</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women have less opportunity than men have for advancement.</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are treated with less respect than are men.</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women have less opportunity to participate in decision-making activities than men have.</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in my work area fully understand the concept of sexual harassment.**</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in my work area fully understand WKU's policy regarding sexual harassment.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are not retained in their jobs as frequently as are men.</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WKU campus is a physically safe environment.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and men are paid comparable wages for comparable work at WKU.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee evaluations at WKU are conducted without regard to gender.</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, women and men are treated equally at WKU.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means reported on a five point scale where "1" is Strongly Disagree and "5" is Strongly Agree.

** Interaction effect. Means: Male faculty 3.64  Male staff 3.94  Female faculty 3.15  Female staff 3.80

The data in this last table show the results of a one-way analysis of variance looking for differences in responses between faculty and staff. Where there is a statistically significant difference between faculty and staff perceptions, the faculty responses are more favorable toward
women. There is no difference in perceptions between faculty and staff on employing women in administrative positions and on the safety of the WKU campus.

### Results of Test for Differences in Means for Faculty and Staff Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean* for Faculty</th>
<th>Mean* for Staff</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women's opinions concerning job-related matters are taken less seriously than men's opinions.</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing women in administrative positions is a priority.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions make it more difficult for a woman than for a man to achieve job satisfaction.</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women have less opportunity than men have for advancement.</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are treated with less respect than are men.</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women have less opportunity to participate in decision-making activities than men have.</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in my work area fully understand the concept of sexual harassment.**</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in my work area fully understand WKU's policy regarding sexual harassment.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are not retained in their jobs as frequently as are men.</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WKU campus is a physically safe environment.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and men are paid comparable wages for comparable work at WKU.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee evaluations at WKU are conducted without regard to gender.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, women and men are treated equally at WKU.</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means reported on a five point scale where "1" is Strongly Disagree and "5" is Strongly Agree.
** Interaction effect. Means: Male faculty 3.64 Male staff 3.94 Female faculty 3.15 Female staff 3.80
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women's opinions concerning job-related matters are taken less seriously</td>
<td>OPINIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than are men’s opinions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing women in administrative positions is a priority.</td>
<td>EMPLOY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions make it more difficult for a woman than for a man to</td>
<td>WORKCOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieve job satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women have less opportunity than men have for advancement.</td>
<td>ADVANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are treated with less respect than are men.</td>
<td>RESPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women have less opportunity to participate in decision-making activities</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than men have.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in my work area fully understand the concept of sexual harassment.</td>
<td>SEXUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in my work area fully understand WKU’s policy regarding sexual</td>
<td>SEXPOLICY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harassment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are not retained in their jobs as frequently as are men.</td>
<td>RETAINED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WKU campus is a physically safe environment.</td>
<td>SAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and men are paid comparable wages for comparable work at WKU.</td>
<td>WAGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee evaluations at WKU are conducted without regard to gender.</td>
<td>EVALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, women and men are treated equally at WKU.</td>
<td>EQUALTRT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WKU Status of Women Survey
Question Ratings

OPINIONS

- DISAGREE: (188) 27.9%
- ST DISAGREE: (161) 23.9%
- NEITHER: (85) 12.6%
- ST AGREE: (73) 10.8%
- AGREE: (168) 24.9%

EMPLOY

- DISAGREE: (162) 24.1%
- ST DISAGREE: (63) 9.4%
- NEITHER: (207) 30.8%
- ST AGREE: (74) 11.0%
- AGREE: (165) 24.6%
WKU Status of Women Survey
Question Ratings

WORKCOND
- DISAGREE (205) 30.7%
- ST DISAGREE (141) 21.1%
- NEITHER (131) 19.6%
- AGREE (139) 20.8%

ADVANCE
- DISAGREE (163) 24.1%
- ST DISAGREE (142) 21.0%
- NEITHER (84) 12.4%
- AGREE (204) 30.2%
WKU Status of Women Survey
Question Ratings

**RESPECT**

- **Disagree** (175) 26.6%
- **ST Disagree** (154) 23.4%
- **Neither** (103) 15.6%
- **Agree** (161) 24.4%

**DECISION**

- **Disagree** (188) 27.9%
- **ST Disagree** (144) 21.3%
- **Neither** (65) 9.6%
- **Agree** (187) 27.7%
WKU Status of Women Survey
Question Ratings

SEXUAL

AGREE (312) 46.1%
ST AGREE (148) 21.9%
ST DISAGREE (29) 4.3%
NEITHER (83) 12.3%

SEXPOLICY

AGREE (268) 39.7%
ST AGREE (109) 16.1%
ST DISAGREE (33) 4.9%
DISAGREE (108) 16.0%
NEITHER (157) 23.3%
WKU Status of Women Survey
Question Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RETAINED</th>
<th>SAFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE (208) 31.2%</td>
<td>DISAGREE (129) 19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST DISAGREE (134) 20.1%</td>
<td>ST DISAGREE (26) 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST AGREE (17) 2.6%</td>
<td>ST AGREE (41) 6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE (85) 12.8%</td>
<td>AGREE (360) 53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEITHER (222) 33.3%</td>
<td>NEITHER (115) 17.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Status of Women Survey Question Means by Status and Gender

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male Faculty</th>
<th>Male Staff</th>
<th>Female Faculty</th>
<th>Female Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinions</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workcond</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexpolicy</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evals</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Tr</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In future correspondence please refer to HS9819, November 20, 1997

Dr. Judith Hoover
Department of Communication and Broadcasting
Western Kentucky University

Dear Dr. Hoover:

Your research topic "Task Force on the Status of Women at WKU," has undergone review by the Western Kentucky University IRB for human subjects of research and it has been determined that risks to subjects are: (1) minimized and reasonable; and that (2) research procedures are consistent with a sound research design and do not expose the subjects to unnecessary risk. Reviewers determined that: (1) benefits to subjects are considered along with the importance of the topic and that outcomes are reasonable; (2) selection of subjects is equitable; and (3) the purposes of the research and the research setting is amenable to subjects' welfare and producing desired outcomes; that indications of coercion or prejudice are absent, and that participation is clearly voluntary.

In addition, the IRB found that: (1) informed consent will be sought and documented from each prospective subject; (2) provision is made for collecting, using and storing data in a manner that protects the safety and privacy of the subjects and the confidentiality of the data; and (3) that appropriate safeguards are included to protect the rights and welfare of the subjects. Please store all data securely at an on campus location for a minimum of three years.

Your research therefore meets the criteria of Expedited review under the institutional human subjects protocol and is approved. Copies of your request for human subjects review, your application, and this approval, are maintained in the Office Sponsored Programs at the above address. Please report any changes to this approved protocol to this office. A request to update the protocol or inform the HSRB of the conclusion of the project will be sent to you for continuing review approximately a year from now. Our best wishes for your research.

Sincerely,

Director, Office of Sponsored Programs and
Coordinator, Human Subjects Review Board

c: Human Subjects File 9819

HSApprovalHoover
APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF INVESTIGATIONS INVOLVING THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS

PLEASE TYPE OR USE A WORD PROCESSOR

Submit by the first working Monday of the month for screening prior to the HSRB meeting.

1. Principal Investigator's Name: Judith Hoover, Chairperson
   Co-Investigator:
   Department: Phone: 5291

2. If you are a student, provide the following information:
   Faculty Sponsor: Department: Phone:
   Is this your thesis or dissertation research? Yes No

3. Title of project: TASK FORCE ON STATUS OF WOMEN AT W&L

4. Has this project previously been considered by the HSRB? Yes No
   If yes, give approximate date of review June 25, 1997

5. Is a proposal for external support being submitted? Yes No
   If yes, you must submit one complete copy of that proposal as soon as it is available and complete the following:
   a. Is notification of Human Subject approval required? Yes No
   b. Is this a renewal application? Yes No
   c. Sponsor’s Name:
   d. Project Period: From: To:

6. You must include copies of all pertinent information such as, a copy of the questionnaire you will be using or other survey instruments, informed consent documents, letters of approval from cooperating institutions (e.g., hospitals or other medical facilities and/or clinics, human services agencies, individuals such as physicians or other specialists in different fields, etc.), copy of external support proposals, etc.
In the space below, please provide complete answers to the following questions.

1. PROPOSED RESEARCH PROJECT
   
   A. Provide a brief summary of the proposed research. Include major hypotheses and research design.

   In January, 1997, a Task Force to conduct a major study on the “Status of Women on Campus” was appointed by then President Meredith and approved by the Board of Regents. The Task Force is comprised of twenty-one people, selected to represent all areas of the University community, with Dr. Judith Hoover, professor in the Department of Communication and Broadcasting as Chair. The Charge given to the Task Force is “To review the status of women faculty and staff employees at Western Kentucky University and to make recommendations for specific actions which might be taken to resolve any problems identified by the Task Force.” The study is to be completed within one year.

   The major hypothesis for the study is that Western Kentucky University women employees experience equality with their male colleagues in all areas of University life. Where problems are identified in the areas of hiring, compensation, advancement, discrimination, sexual harassment, resources, and/or other areas, recommendations for specific actions will be made.

   We are currently seeking approval for the use of a survey that will be administered to all full-time employees of WKU.

   B. Describe the source(s) of subjects and the selection criteria. Specifically, how did you obtain potential subjects, and how will you contact them?

   The subjects will be all full-time employees of WKU. They will be contacted by mail with a cover letter and a survey form.

   Participation will be entirely voluntary and confidential.
C. Informed consent: Describe the consent process and attach all consent documents.

Since this is an anonymous mail survey, consent is obtained by the completion of the survey. The cover letter states: Your completed responses will mean that you consent to participating in the survey.

D. Procedures: Provide a step-by-step description of each procedure, including the frequency, duration, and location of each procedure.

Surveys and cover letters will be mailed via campus mail to all full-time employees of WKU. Also enclosed will be a return envelope in which the completed survey will go. The duration of this process will be approximately two weeks.

Surveys will be scanned and a data file will be generated.

The data will be statistically analyzed.

A report will be generated.

E. How will confidentiality of the data be maintained?

There will be no names associated with any of the surveys, data file, or report. Responses to the surveys are simple closed responses with no opportunity for any names or additional input.

F. Describe all known and anticipated risks to the subject including side effects, risks of placebo, risks of normal treatment delay, etc.

No known or anticipated risks to subjects.

G. Describe the anticipated benefits to subjects, and the importance of the knowledge that may reasonably be expected to result.

Anticipated benefits would apply to all women and other employees at WKU. The study will identify problems, if any, in each of the study areas for women at WKU and will recommend specific remedial actions to address these problem areas and improve the experience for women employees.

Additions or changes in procedures involving human subjects, as well as any problems connected with the use of human subjects once the project has begun, must be brought to the attention of the HSRB.

C:\BOLTON\WP\TASKFORC\IRBFORM.WPD
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II. SIGNATURES

A. I certify that to the best of my knowledge the information presented herein is an accurate reflection of the proposed research project.

Judith Hoover
Principal Investigator

11/14/97
Date

Co-Investigator


B. Approval by faculty sponsor (required for all students):

I affirm the accuracy of this application, and I accept the responsibility for the conduct of this research, the supervision of human subjects, and maintenance of informed consent documentation as required by the HSRB.

Gary A. Randall
Faculty Sponsor

11/5/97
Date

C. Approval by Departmental Committee/Head

I confirm the accuracy of the information stated in this application. I am familiar with, and approve of the procedures that involve human subjects.

Department Head


D. Advising Physician*:

I certify that I am a duly licensed physician in the State of Kentucky and that, acting as advising physician, I accept the procedures prescribed herein.

Physician’s Name and Signature


*Physician signature is needed only if the project involves medical procedures and the investigator is not a licensed physician.
Project Title: ____________________________________________

Investigator: ____________________________________________
(include name, department and phone of contact person)

------------------------------------------------------------------------

(This portion is for HSRB use only.)

HSRB Determination:
Exempt from Review ( ) Expedited Review (x) Full HSRB Review ( )
( ) Disapproval

(✓) Approval

a. approval, subject to minor changes

b. approval in general but requiring major alterations, clarifications or assurances

c. restricted approval

Comments:

_____________________________________________________________

Human Subjects Review Board Chair

11/19/97

Date

_____________________________________________________________

Human Subjects Review Board Coordinator

11/20/97

Date

If you have questions regarding review procedures or completion of this HSRB application, contact the Office of Sponsored Programs:
Director -- Dr. Phillip E. Myers, HSRB Coordinator, (502) 745-4652
E-mail: phillip.myers@wku.edu
Sponsored Programs Specialist -- Ms. Marilyn Anderson, HSRB Recorder, (502) 745-5852
E-mail: marilyn.anderson@wku.edu
Dear WKU Employee:

You are being asked to fill out a short survey about the status of women at Western Kentucky University. This survey is part of the year-long study by the Task Force on the Status of Women at WKU. It should take only a few minutes of your time. Your participation is fully voluntary and confidential. You may quit at any time, and you may refuse to answer any question. If you do not wish to participate, please return this survey in the enclosed envelope uncompleted. Your completed responses will mean that you consent to participate in this survey. Thank you for your participation. Your input is very valuable to us.

On the next page are statements about the status of women at Western Kentucky University. There are no right or wrong answers. You are simply expressing your opinions. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement by using the following scale:

SD = Strongly Disagree  D = Disagree  N = Neither Agree nor Disagree  A = Agree  SA = Strongly Agree

Please fill in bubbles that correspond to the letters above using a number 2 pencil. Once you have completed the survey, please enclose it in the envelope provided to you and return it in campus mail no later than Wednesday, December 3, 1997. Please do not write your name on the envelope or on the survey.

Thank you again for your participation.

Sincerely,

Task Force on the Status of Women at WKU
WKU STATUS OF WOMEN SURVEY

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- Use a No. 2 pencil only.
- Make solid marks that fill the response completely.
- Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.

CORRECT: ○ INCORRECT: ✓

Listed below is a series of statements about the status of women at WKU. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement as it pertains to your work area.

1. Women's opinions concerning job-related matters are taken less seriously than are men's opinions.

2. Women are treated with less respect than are men.

3. Women have less opportunity than men have for advancement.

4. Women have less opportunity to participate in decision-making activities than men have.

5. Persons in my work area fully understand the concept of sexual harassment.

6. Persons in my work area fully understand WKU's policy regarding sexual harassment.

7. Women are not retained in their jobs as frequently as are men.

Using the same scale, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as it pertains to WKU.

- The WKU campus is a physically safe environment.

- Women and men are paid comparable wages for comparable work at WKU.

- If you marked SD or O, which group do you believe tends to be more favorably treated?
  - Males
  - Females

- Employee evaluations at WKU are conducted without regard to gender.

- Overall, women and men are treated equally at WKU.

- If you marked SD or O, which group do you believe tends to be more favorably treated?
  - Males
  - Females

For research purposes only, we would like to know the following information about you:

- Are you (Please fill in one.) Faculty Staff?

- Are you Male Female?

Thank you for your participation! Please return this form in the enclosed envelope by Wednesday, December 3, 1997.
CLIMATE AND CULTURE SUBCOMMITTEE STUDY
Climate and Culture Subcommittee Study
January 28, 1998

Nine members of the Task Force to Study the Status of Women on Campus volunteered to serve on the Climate and Culture Subcommittee. The group decided to pursue the following procedures: distribute a memorandum to all employees asking that they list areas of concern regarding women’s employment on campus; conduct a set of follow-up focus group interviews which would provide an opportunity for participating employees to discuss their perceptions of women’s working conditions and the resulting effects on employment at Western; and use the information from the first two activities to develop and administer a university-wide survey which would describe the perceptions and the relative degree of acceptance of all employees of women’s employment.

The first memorandum was distributed to all full-time employees and to student workers, and the following topics emerged from the responses: safety and security of women on campus; WKU’s sexual harassment policy in terms of knowledge and understanding of it and viewpoints regarding its adequacy; respect for equality and treatment of women at Western; organizational culture and how it impacts women at Western; employment, advancement, and job satisfaction for women at Western, inclusion or exclusion of women in decision-making roles; pay equity.

The second step, conducting focus groups, hit a significant snag since it was determined that the Task Force should submit its plan for focus group activity to the WKU Human Subjects Review Board. That submission was made in May with a target date of June for focus groups and individual interviews. The subcommittee members worked with the Chair of the Task Force to develop all the required documents for the HSRB; these documents were submitted in early May; various iterations of rejection were conveyed by the HSRB during late June until a final rejection was issued. There was no opportunity for the Subcommittee to make a personal appearance at HSRB meetings nor did the HSRB make any request for clarification or further information. At this point it became necessary for the Task Force to be represented by its chairperson in a series of meetings with the Interim President who attempted to assist in acquiring consent from the HSRB. Others present at this series of meetings included some members of the HSRB, the University Counsel, and the Chair of the Climate and Culture Subcommittee. After lengthy deliberations and delays, the Chair of the HSRB informed the Chair of the Task Force that permission for conducting focus groups was absolutely denied. (Task Force representatives were not admitted to any of these HSRB meetings.)

In July the Chair of the Task Force and the Chair of the Subcommittee attempted to develop an alternative method for acquiring information. They went to the HSRB and requested permission to hold a series of critical incidents meetings with any University employee who would agree to attend and participate. A critical incident questionnaire is a qualitative instrument that allows researchers to gather examples or “incidents” that are meaningful to respondents, in a short span of time, while protecting the anonymity of respondents.*

After a very difficult meeting, the Subcommittee finally received permission in late July to conduct these critical incidents sessions. The meetings for employees to write anonymous accounts of critical incidents were held in September for full-time faculty and staff and during October for part-time faculty, staff, graduate assistants, and student workers. Responses to the written instrument were transcribed and then responses to this instrument and to questions resulting from the work of the other two subcommittees led to the development of research questions which became the base of the campus-wide Survey developed and conducted during November.

Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction. From the Survey responses regarding the working environment for women at WKU, a clear gender split in perception on each topic emerged. For each of the thirteen variables covered by the Survey, the responses are statistically significantly different based on gender. In each case, females perceive the work environment to be less supportive of women than do male respondents.

With regard to the Critical Incidents Report, there are specific examples provided which suggest a similar conclusion. (See of the Critical Incidents Report.) The responses show that in eight of nine sets of paired questions, male respondents provided more positive incidents than negative incidents; in the ninth set, the responses were equal. In seven of nine sets, females provided more negative incidents than positive incidents. In the eighth set several seemingly positive responses indicated, however, that women are included as “tokens,” or are included in all-female activities rather than mixed gender activities. Because these responses indicate a difference in the perceptions of males and females about the working conditions of WKU employees, we urge a careful examination of the graphs and summary reports included in the appendices.

Information about respondents to the Survey also indicates employment category; respondents identified themselves as male or female and faculty, staff or administration. For purposes of this analysis, we have divided responses between employment categories of faculty or staff with administrative responses included in the latter. Responses to the thirteen items of the Survey revealed statistically significantly different perceptions between faculty and staff members in all but two areas. There was no significant difference in responses among faculty and staff members regarding whether or not the employment of women is a priority or whether or not the WKU campus is a physically safe environment. The respondents indicated a statistically significant difference between opinions of males and females on all items. Again, we urge a careful examination of the graphs and summary reports included in the appendices.

I. Sexual Harassment.

A. Findings: Responses to the Survey indicate that most respondents believe the university’s sexual harassment policy is understood. Note that even though there is general
agreement on the statements about sexual harassment in the Survey, there is still a significant difference in male/female faculty responses in which male faculty indicate more strongly than do female faculty that people in their work areas understand sexual harassment. (See Table 2.) This male/female difference is not present among staff responses where males and females report equal levels of perceived understanding about sexual harassment. These levels are higher than those reported by faculty members. On the other hand, a different picture emerges with respect to reported understanding of WKU’s Sexual Harassment Policy. Males claim that employees have a clearer understanding of the policy than females claim employees have, and this difference is present for both faculty and staff members.

The sixty-five Critical Incidents respondents, however, indicate that this understanding is simply ignored in some units. Perceptions of sexual harassment incidents on campus, while perhaps sporadic, are clear and strongly defined by certain respondents. Inconsistency appears to exist among units regarding the procedures by which reports of sexual harassment are handled. (See of the Critical Incidents Report.) Fifty-six positive incidents were listed along with 46 negative ones. The direct quotations range from a statement about inappropriate comments such as, “” to a direct statement that “”

B. Conclusions. Responses to the Survey indicate that faculty and staff members generally agree that sexual harassment and WKU’s sexual harassment policy are fully understood by people in their work areas. However, Critical Incidents responses indicate that sexual harassment does exist on Western’s campus, and the WKU policy on sexual harassment is not being followed.

C. Recommendations. Workshops and seminars have not eradicated the problem, so other efforts need to be made. Posters should be distributed to all floors in all buildings with a strongly worded statement that sexual harassment will not be tolerated. In order to deal with specific instances, the University should designate a person, such as an ombudsperson, as an individual to whom staff, students, and faculty could present their cases and seek advice. That person would be responsible for investigating the situation.

II. SAFETY

A. Findings. The responses to the Survey regarding physical safety generally indicated that people believe the campus is relatively safe. Still, there is a statistically significant difference in male/female responses with males reporting more often than females that the campus is safe. (See Table 2.)

In the Critical Incidents Report, 84 women and 18 men responded with 50 positive and 52 negative incidents cited. Specific areas of the campus were perceived as unsafe. (These are listed on the last page of the Critical Incidents Report.) The comment from one respondent was chilling: 
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B. Conclusions. The numerous safety problems/areas mentioned in these responses warrant action.

C. Recommendations. The University should add more lighting in specific areas, install more emergency call boxes, and increase foot and bicycle police patrols in the interior of the campus by reallocating some automobile patrols from the periphery. The University should also review the campus in light of specific spots of danger which are mentioned in the responses. (See Critical Incidents Report.)

III. WORK ENVIRONMENT

A. Findings. Responses to every item about the work environment in the Survey indicate a statistical difference between perceptions of males and females and between faculty and staff employees. Generally, males see the work environment as more favorable for females than do females, and faculty view the work environment as more favorable for females than do staff members.

Instances were given in the Critical Incidents responses which relate such behaviors as name-calling, dehumanizing behaviors, and intolerance or devaluing of women. Instances were listed which range from derogatory remarks about the Women’s Studies Program to situations in which women custodians were cleaning restrooms and men walked in, used the urinals, and verbally abused the women. One respondent observed that men are shown respect by others’ use of their titles, though women are called by their first names, clearly a sign of “familiarity.” (See the Critical Incidents Report.) (There were a total of 432 responses to this item including 204 positive incidents and 228 negative examples.)

B. Conclusions. Male Survey respondents generally view the work environment for females as positive; female Survey respondents generally disagree. Critical Incidents respondents indicate that women at Western continue to have difficulty in achieving job satisfaction, respect, opportunities to participate in decision-making activities, and equity in employee evaluation.

C. Recommendations. The University should investigate the conditions of Western’s interpersonal intra- and interdepartmental work environment and develop programs for eliminating problems.

IV. COMPENSATION
A. Findings. The Survey results indicate that males are generally undecided about the comparability of wages between males and females, while females generally believe that wages are not comparably assigned. This pattern is the same for both faculty and staff respondents. The Critical Incidents Report included 19 direct negative comments and two others regarding allocation of travel funds to persons in parallel positions. Although this may not appear to be a large number of responses, they emerged in spite of the fact that we did not ask for critical incidents regarding disparity in compensation. Instances such as the following were given:

B. Conclusions. Despite WKU’s efforts in recent years, respondents report a perception that there is disparity in pay between males and females performing comparable work.

C. Recommendations. The University should address inequities in compensation and actively engage in educating the University community about compensation issues.

V. ADVANCEMENT

A. Findings. On the issue of opportunity for advancement, males view the opportunity for females to advance at WKU more favorably than do female respondents to the Survey. In addition, there is a smaller, but statistically reliable, effect for faculty/staff. Faculty generally view the opportunity for advancement for females more favorably than do staff members. (See Table 2.)

The Critical Incidents Report (a total of 107 responses) gives some specific problematic examples, such as tailored job searches which were designed for specific men and the failure to include a woman as finalist in the latest presidential search. In fact, the multiple references to the Vice President for Academic Affairs underline that she is the only woman to serve as a vice president in the history of this university. (See the Critical Incidents Report.)

B. Conclusions. Female respondents to the Survey report that women do not have the same opportunities for appointment or advancement that men enjoy at Western. Male respondents
generally disagree.

C. **Recommendations.** The University should develop, promote, and adhere to a rigid policy designed to increase the number of women at all levels of upper administration in non-academic areas as well as academic, including academic department headships, deanships, vice presidencies, and the presidency.
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