

**The Role and Status of Women
Cleveland State University
2005-2006**

In 2005-2006, the President's Advisory Committee on the Role and Status of Women (PACRSW) returned to one of its earliest objectives, reviewing the status of women at the University and monitoring the University's progress toward gender equity. The Committee utilized institutional data primarily from the 2005 Book of Trends in addition to a few additional requests from the Office of Institutional Research. We thank Dr. Gitanjali Kaul, Vice Provost, and Dr. Jeffrey Chen for both the rich, comprehensive nature of the Book of Trends and the provision of additional analyses. Any errors in the disaggregation, reaggregation and aggregation of data are the responsibility of the Committee.

With respect to our student population, the data from Fall 2004 are clear and consistent with national trends. The majority of our students are female (56%) at both the undergraduate (55%) and the graduate (60%) levels. The majority of our full-time students are female (55%). The majority of our degree recipients are female ranging from 56% in 1999-00 to 59% in 2003-04. The implications of these data are rather clear. The greater number of women students combined with their greater representation among our full-time status student population generates greater FTE's. Their greater representation among full-time status is also of note to the extent that "timely graduation" is a goal.

Of significant concern however is the decline in the University's retention of female students. The University's retention rate for women students has declined from 67% in Fall 2000 to 58% in Fall 2003. The question that PACRSW must address is "why?" While the retention rate for male students has also declined over this same period, the decline is not as great (64% -> 60%). This gender difference may relate to gender-specific climate and/or support services issues.

With respect to CSU employees, gender representation is, overall, positive in that CSU has consistently employed the same number of women (50%) and men (50%) from 2000 to 2004. However, when one looks at the gender distribution by EEOC category, the numbers as of 2004 are less encouraging. 86 % of our clerical staff and 58% of our professional staff are women while only 29% of those in Executive/Administrative positions are women with no women in Skilled Crafts positions. Further disaggregation of the Executive/Administrative EEO category reveals substantially lower representation by women among key decision makers (e.g., vice presidents, academic deans). This distribution is a very gender stereotypic model of women's roles, a model that perhaps does not go unnoticed by our students.

Among our faculty, a linear relationship emerges between gender representation and faculty status. Sixty-four percent of our instructors (untenured), 45% of assistant (untenured) professors, 34% of associate professors and only 20% of full professors are women. Since faculty status is not readily apparent, this finding may be of lesser concern with respect to reinforcement of students' observational learning regarding gender stereotypes. However, there are perhaps more significant implications. Female students wanting a same-gender mentor, independent study advisor, thesis advisor, and/or dissertation advisor have fewer options. Women faculty members willing to assume such service activities may be easily overwhelmed and/or "distracted" from the publication and grant pursuits that are more highly "rewarded" by the University.

In mentoring new assistant professors, regardless of gender, service can not be encouraged over research and teaching. Given such advice to the untenured faculty,

tenured associate and full professors need to “pick up” greater responsibility for service to students not to mention general University functions (e.g., faculty governance, search committees). An examination of the number of women students in relationship to the number of tenured women faculty by college reveals the following student per faculty member ratios:

College of Business - 167:1
College of Education - 105:1
College of Engineering - 97:1
College of Science - 78:1
CLASS - 62:1
College of Urban Studies - 45:1
College of Law - 28:1*

The current research literature on mentoring concludes that female students benefit from same-gender mentoring in terms of support but benefit from a male mentor in terms of the likelihood of his “higher status” (e.g., history of grant procurement, professional networks). Simply put, the gender of the faculty mentor provides female students with different benefits. IF CSU were to have more than 33 (February 2006) full professors (i.e., same-gender and “high” status), the majority of our students might benefit.

With respect to university service, gender representation on committees ranges from the philosophical to the “required” (i.e., search committees). While serving the majority of our students is primary, institutional functioning can not be ignored. Yet such service further exacerbates demands on female faculty. In 2000, 34% of CSU faculty (i.e., tenured and untenured) were female. As of 2004, 34% of CSU faculty was female. In five years, there has been no change.

* Of three professions of medicine, dentistry and law, law is the profession that has made the greatest progress over the last decade toward gender equity. .