

ac
sp

UPDATE

Special Issue
August 1990

Association of
Collegiate
Schools of
Planning

About this SPECIAL ISSUE:

On April 22, 1990 the ACSP Executive Committee received the report of the ACSP working committee on The Recruitment and Retention of Women and Minorities in Planning Education. The Executive Committee felt it important that all faculty in ACSP schools receive the report, in the form of a special issue of ACSP UPDATE. The ACSP Board and the editors of UPDATE urge you to read it and discuss it with your colleagues.

The working committee would be pleased to receive comments you may have about the findings of the report. Direct your comments to the Chair of the Working Committee: Marsha Ritzdorf, c/o Department of City and Regional Planning, 106 W. Sibley Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853 (Tele: 607-255-4332).

--The Editors

This newsletter is printed on recycled paper.

THE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF FACULTY WOMEN AND FACULTY OF COLOR IN PLANNING EDUCATION: SURVEY RESULTS

Submitted to the ACSP Executive Board, April, 1990
BY: 1987-89 Committee on The Recruitment and Retention
of Women and Minorities in Planning Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Forward	2
National Issues	3
Existing Reports on Minorities and Women in Planning Education	4
Methodology	4
Caveats	6
Survey Results: Demographics	6
Survey Results: Women Faculty and Faculty of Color	8
Survey Results: Department Chairs	18
Survey Results: Ph.D's in Planning Since 1980	20
Conclusions	25
Bibliography	26
Appendix A: Questionnaires	*
Appendix B: List of Schools Participating in Demographic Update	*
Appendix C: Feminist Planners and Designers/Minority Association of Planners and Architects Resolution	*

*These are not included in this reprint. They are available from Marsha Ritzdorf.

FORWARD

"I don't think an outsider especially a "non-traditional" candidate has much of a chance at all. My observation is that since 1980 the universities like other U.S. employers have got the message that affirmative action is not going to be enforced and have acted accordingly. I think that a person's age, race, ethnicity, social class, gender, religion, sexual orientation and handicap status all contribute to his or her distance from the WASP male ideal, a distance perceived as "strangeness" or "threat." The greater the distance, the less chance of employment." (white male respondent, Ph.D. survey)

In Fall of 1988, ACSP President Don Krueckeberg established a working committee on the Recruitment and Retention of Women and People of Color in Planning Education. He asked Marsha Ritzdorf, University of Oregon, to chair the committee. At the first meeting, the committee decided that it was impossible to address all the issues of both student and faculty recruitment and retention in the one year available to pursue their task. It was decided to focus on issues of faculty and that we would engage in the collection of data and anecdotal information regarding recruitment and retention issues. This report catalogs the result of that endeavor.

Throughout the report you will find a treasure of anecdotal reports from Ph.D. recipients and current faculty women and faculty of color. In some cases, the remarks are slightly altered to make them into complete sentences. In all cases, the names of institutions and individuals have been deleted. The words "people of color/faculty of color" and "minorities" are used interchangeably throughout this report. It is impossible to come up with one term with which everyone is happy. Because of the appallingly small number of faculty of color, the results are not broken down any further than that (except to report the number of Blacks, Hispanics, Asian-American/Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans who are among our colleagues). It is a sad statement on their numbers in our profession that any further breakdown by sex and race would destroy their confidentiality.

The committee would like to thank everyone who took the time to fill out and return questionnaires. People who were willing to share their specific experiences with us immeasurably enriched this report. They have our very special thanks.

In addition, we thank Ms. Marsha Greer, a MUP student in the Department of Planning, Public Policy and Management at the University of Oregon who served as the Graduate Research Assistant to this project for the past year. Without her persistence, outstanding research skills, and help this document would have been far harder to complete. Thank you also to Paul Brozovsky and Janice Gotchall who provided statistical and computer advice and Marguerite Canaday, our Wordperfect expert and final typist. The financial assistance which made this report possible was provided by ACSP and, at the University of Oregon, by the Department of Planning, Public Policy and Management and the Center for the Study of Women in Society.

1988-1989 COMMITTEE ON THE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION
OF WOMEN AND PEOPLE OF COLOR IN PLANNING EDUCATION

Marsha Ritzdorf, Chair, University of Oregon
Peter Fischer, University of Iowa
Marsha Greer, Graduate Assistant, University of Oregon
William Harris, University of Virginia
Catherine Ross, Georgia Institute of Technology
William Siembeida, University of New Mexico
Sylvia White, California Polytechnic-Pomona
Suzie Wirka, Student Representative, UCLA

NATIONAL ISSUES

Available research shows that women faculty and faculty of color are treated differently in higher education. They aren't paid as much as white male faculty in the same rank; they aren't promoted at the same rate; letters recommending them are often written differently; they aren't included in the informal decision-making network, and they often feel isolated in their work environment.¹ Although Federal programs and legislation were designed to eliminate differential treatment based on sex, race, or national origin, they have not equalized the status. Women and men of color still face an uphill road in higher education.

Although the number of women has increased in all ranks since 1975, the difference in tenure rates of women and men is significant. In 1975 (in all institutions), 64 percent of men were tenured compared to 46 percent of women. In 1988, 69 percent of men were tenured while the percentage of women tenured faculty remained the same at 46 percent (Gray, 1988). Also, in 1988, 18 percent of full-time faculty women were in non-tenure track positions compared to 7 percent of faculty men. Women are also more frequently found in part-time positions.

Menges and Exum (1983) state that although student populations have moved toward "greater gender, cultural, and racial inclusiveness," faculty women and faculty of color have not made significant strides. Data for minority faculty is difficult to find and interpret. Women of color suffer double discrimination. In 1985, Black women constituted 1.9 percent of full-time faculty in higher education (Moses, 1989).

Although tenure and promotion procedures may affect all faculty, women and minorities are more affected than White male faculty by the lack of their presence in the senior ranks that review them (Menges Exum, 1983). Women and minority faculty are often asked to serve on many committees which may take them away from activities that are rewarded as scholarly and counted more heavily in review processes. "Women and minorities may be offered more such 'opportunities' than are White males" (Menges, Exum, 1983, p.131). In addition, teaching and advising loads are often heavier for women (Sandler, 1986; Simeone, 1987).

White men have defined what scholarship is in Academia (Spender, 1980; Menges, Exum, 1983). Women and minorities may pursue issues that contrast or contradict the accepted White male learning. Their research may not be accepted as scholarly because it challenges set conventions and often employs different research methods (Sampson, 1978; Menges, Exum, 1983; Exum et. al 1984).

People of color are concentrated in certain academic fields. In 1980-81, of all doctorates received by Blacks, 53% were in education and 20% in social sciences; Hispanics were concentrated in education and humanities; Asians in physical and biological sciences and engineering, and Native Americans in education and social sciences (Exum, 1983).

Their total numbers are very small and recent articles in the Chronicle of Higher Education have emphasized the declining pool. In addition, people of color with Ph.D's can seek and obtain better jobs for more money outside of higher education (Suinn, Witt, 1983; Grigsby, 1988).

Although there has been an increase in the number of women and minority faculty in the past 20 years, the increase is smallest and slowest at the top of the status hierarchy. In research universities (the location of most planning graduate programs), "In recruitment, selection, and promotion decisions, the academic market is characterized by reliance on precedence and custom, absence of clear and universally agreed-upon formal standards, use of ambiguous criteria, and closed, confidential decision-making" (Exum et.al., 1984). Women and Minorities must work harder to prove their legitimacy and authority and must constantly demonstrate excellence. (Exum et.al., 1984, p.306)

¹ For a complete discussion of the literature see: Greer, Marsha. 1990. PLANNING EDUCATION: RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF FACULTY WOMEN AND FACULTY OF COLOR, unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Oregon, Department of Planning, Public Policy and Management, Eugene, Oregon.

EXISTING REPORTS ON MINORITIES AND WOMEN IN PLANNING EDUCATION

In 1987, Amy Waters and William Harris surveyed the 63 accredited or provisionally accredited planning programs and asked them to describe participation by African Americans in their department both historically and at the present moment. Twenty-nine departments (46%) responded. Seven indicated they had never had a black faculty member. The first full-time appointment occurred at the University of Pennsylvania in 1964, and most of the hiring occurred between 1968-1976 when 14 Blacks were appointed to full-time status.

In 1988, J. Eugene Grigsby III presented ACSP with a report on Minority Participation in Planning Education. He addressed disturbing questions concerning the invisibility of minorities and the role that minority faculty could/should play in shaping curriculum and recruitment and retention of minority students. He commented on the importance of minority faculty in shaping accurate knowledge about the critical policy questions facing the majority of urban and metropolitan regions as their population becomes culturally diverse in sizable (often majority) proportions.

Grigsby noted that planning programs are not graduating minority Ph.D.'s, and that many of those who graduate are going into other professions where compensation and opportunities for promotion are better.

Hill (1990) argued that the methods of recruiting are to blame for the lack of minority faculty in planning education. To solve this problem, Hill proposed a program consisting of identification, matriculation, summer support, and dissertation support. He cited the success the planning program at Cleveland State University has had with this approach. One of the goals is to broaden the intellectual views of a department, so, like Grigsby suggests, the minority view is included in planning education.

In 1987, Yvette Galindo, Mary Beth Welch, and Susie Wirka presented the ACSP Board with a report on Gender, Race, and Disability in Planning Education oriented towards student recruitment, retention, and passage into the profession. On behalf of the Feminist Planners and Designers Group and the Minority Association of Planners and Architects (both at UCLA), they asked the board to adopt a resolution addressing this issues (Appendix C).

Ross (1990) indicated that only 11 women were full-time full professors in planning education. She cited a 1985 APA survey of professional planners where results show more women are entering the profession and the potential pool for future academicians has like-wise grown. But, the report also showed a significant reduction in the number of Hispanic planners. She addressed recommendations to increase recruitment and improve retention of women and minorities in planning including a call for a statement by ACSP in support of the increased representation of minorities and females in the profession and any member institutions, and the need for the PAB to include in accreditation an evaluation of an increase in a program's minority and female representation.

METHODOLOGY

In the summer of 1988, a series of three questionnaires were mailed to the three groups that the committee felt could provide valuable input on the questions surrounding recruitment and retention. Copies of the questionnaire are included as Appendix A of this report. The groups surveyed were:

- a. current department chairs of ACSP member planning programs;
- b. current faculty women and faculty of color in ACSP member schools; and
- c. recipients of Ph.D.s in Planning since 1980.

There were myriad questions which were identified as important. The answer to three demographic questions seemed important to frame the parameters of any recruitment efforts which would improve the numbers of women and minorities in planning education.

1. Was the anecdotal evidence that 25-33% of planning faculty would retire in the next ten years true?
2. Could we develop an accurate list of faculty broken down by race, gender and ethnicity?
3. Were planning programs hiring planning Ph.D.s or primarily Ph.D. graduates from other disciplines?

The remaining questions focused on the whole spectrum of experiences of women and people of color as students and faculty members. In summary they are:

1. Are Ph.D. students considering careers in planning academia?
2. Is there a difference between white males and under represented groups in terms of hiring, promotion, decision to choose an academic career, etc.?
3. Do women students and students of color experience discrimination in school?
4. What is the importance of mentoring and is there a difference in the mentoring experience among groups?
5. For those Ph.D.'s who had experienced the academic interview process, what were the most important positive and negative experiences?
6. How did candidates evaluate whether a school would have an environment which welcomed cultural, racial, and gender diversity?
7. If current holders of planning Ph.D.'s had it to do again would they consider a Ph.D. in planning or at all?
8. What was the opinion of the three groups about differential treatment of women and people of color in hiring in planning education?
9. What was the opinion of the three groups on the inclusion/exclusion of sufficient materials about race, gender, disability, and international issues in planning education? Was there a difference?
10. Among teaching faculty, was there a difference between white men, women and faculty of color regarding the inclusion of course materials related to race, gender, ethnicity, and disability? Did they include materials on these topics in their own courses?
11. Was there a difference in the perceptions of chairs and faculty on issues of fairness regarding departmental resources, committee assignments, etc.?
12. Was there a difference in perception between chairs and faculty about the acceptability of research on race and gender in planning departments?
13. How many women and faculty of color felt they had been discriminated against in their careers? In their current departments? What specific incidents were they willing to share?
14. How many women and/or men had been sexually harassed as a student? as a faculty member? What specific incidents were they willing to share?

The following sections of the report begin with the answers to the three demographic questions. The results of the questionnaires by group follow, beginning with the women faculty and faculty of color, followed by the chairs, and lastly the Ph.D. surveys. A brief concluding section comes after these results.

CAVEATS

In comparing the answers of Ph.D. respondents and current teaching faculty, we are often dipping into the same group of respondents. There is no way of knowing how often this occurs. It is possible that we had a heavier representation of current planning teaching faculty who chose to answer the Ph.D. questionnaire. Since there were/are only 4-5 chairs in ACSP member schools who are either women or minorities (at the moment 3 white women and two black men), there is little overlap between chairs and faculty. All anecdotal comments received were included in the text with the exception of one which was illegible. Within each section of the report, each anecdote reflects a different person's experience. All comments are grouped at the end of the subsection to which they apply.

SURVEY RESULTS: DEMOGRAPHICS

Demographics

In order to have the latest possible demographic figures, ACSP member schools (in North America), as identified in the roster in the back of the 1988 Guide to Graduate Education in Planning, were contacted in January, 1990 for updated figures. Seventy-seven schools responded to our request out of 115. Forty-eight (63.2%) are accredited while twenty-eight (36.8%) are not.

The total number of women faculty and faculty of color is small. Of 570 faculty teaching 50% or more time in planning at responding schools, only 99 (17%) are women and only 79 (14%) are people of color.

FACULTY BY RACE/ETHNICITY

	Total		Accredited		Non-Accredited	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
White	491	86.1	348	61.1	143	25.0
Black	32	5.6	25	4.4	7	1.2
Hispanic	13	2.3	13	2.3	0	0
Native American/ Asian American/ Pacific Islander	3	.5	0	0	3	.5
	<u>31</u>	<u>5.4</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1.8</u>
TOTAL	570	100.0	407	71.4	163	28.5

The table shows that about 71% of the faculty members in responding institutions are in accredited programs. About 4% of the total in accredited programs are Blacks, while Hispanics comprise about 2%, and Asian American/Pacific Islanders make up about 4%. White faculty in accredited programs comprise 61% of the total faculty. There are no Native American faculty in accredited programs as reported by institutions.

This table suggests:

- 71% of the white faculty are in accredited programs
- 78% of the black faculty are in accredited programs
- 67% of the Asian American/Pacific Islander faculty are in accredited programs
- 0% of the Native American faculty are in accredited programs
- 100% of the Hispanic faculty are in accredited programs

1. Race and Gender of Current Faculty at Responding Institutions

Only 11.5% of the total tenured faculty are women and only 12.7% are people of color. Only 22.7% of the faculty of color are tenured women, and only 17.7% of the total tenured white faculty are women in the responding institutions.

RACE AND GENDER OF CURRENT FACULTY MEMBERS

	<u>Men</u>	<u>Tenured</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Tenured</u>	<u>Total Respondents</u>	<u>Total Tenured</u>
White	403	(331)	82	(40)	464	(371)
Black	21	(16)	11	(6)	33	(22)
Hispanic	8	(5)	5	(2)	13	(7)
Asian American/ Pacific Islander	29	(22)	1	(1)	30	(23)
Native American	3	(2)	0	(0)	3	(2)
TOTAL	464	(376)	99	(49)	563	(425)
%	82.5		17.5		100.00	

2. Retirements

In January, 1990 all ACSP member schools in North America were contacted and asked to respond to an inquiry about the retirements they anticipate in the next five years and in the five years after that. The results confirmed the anecdotal evidence that we face serious retirement issues. Of the 115 institutions, 77 (67%) responded, with one of the respondents refusing to give us the information (see Appendix B for list of responding schools). In those schools which responded, twenty-nine percent (29%) of the 570 faculty members who are 50% or more time in planning are expected to retire in the next 10 years.

3. Are Planning Ph.D.'s Hired by Planning Schools?

Only one-third of the teaching faculty have Ph.D.'s in Planning in the responding schools. This figure is slightly higher if only hires since 1980 are calculated. In that period, 43 percent of the total men hired and 37 percent of the total women hired had Ph.D.s in Planning.

Total Number and % with Ph.D. in Planning

Hires since 1980	229	94	41%
Men hired since 1980	161	69	43%
Women hired since 1980	68	25	37%

The remainder of the faculty have degrees across a multitude of fields and 13.3 percent of the faculty members do not have Ph.D.'s in any field.

Ph.D. FIELDS OF ALL FACULTY IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS

<u>Field of Ph.D.</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Planning	189	33.2
Geography/Regional Sc.	76	13.3
Non-Ph.D.	78	13.7
Political Sc.	23	4.0
Economics	33	5.8
Pub Policy/Urb. Affairs	12	2.1
Social Sc./History	21	3.7
Law	13	2.3
Arch/Design	20	3.5
Engineering	10	1.8
Other	50	8.8
Unknown	44	7.7

SURVEY RESULTS: WOMEN FACULTY AND FACULTY OF COLOR

One hundred-fourteen surveys were delivered to faculty women and people of color. At the time the survey was distributed, the means of identifying them was a combination of all member schools in the 1988 ACSP Guide listings and anecdotal knowledge as to the identification of faculty of color. Seventy (61%) completed questionnaires were returned. Fifty-nine (52%) of the respondents were women while 11 (10%) were men. Fifteen percent of the total (women and men) were people of color. For purposes of this survey that includes Hispanic respondents.

Incidence of Overall Discrimination

Nearly two-thirds of the respondents indicated that they had experienced job-related discrimination based on race, sex, or ethnic origin. Fifty-one percent experienced discrimination as a student (54% of the women and 59% of the people of color). A larger percent, 61 percent, indicated that as faculty they have experienced discrimination. Eighty-eight percent of the faculty of color (men and women) and 58 percent of the women experienced discrimination. Over a third (37%) indicated that they had experienced such discrimination in the department where they are currently employed. This includes 55 percent of the men of color and one-third of the women.

"The discrimination is always there but it is always subtle."

"The worst type of discrimination is often very subtle. I was in one school for four years with 40 other colleagues. Yet only one would ever discuss work with me. All of the others (overwhelmingly male) would ask questions about my house or child. Whenever I entered a group discussion, the conversation shifted to jokes."

"I am consistently punished in subtle and unsubtle ways (such as a lack of graduate student support) for being a feminist."

"I feel that women and people of color, especially those whose work relates to issues of special concern to women or people of color are seriously undervalued in planning education."

Rank

In concert with national research concerning rank, male respondents outrank female respondents. This is most striking in the assistant professor ranks, where thirty-nine percent of our female respondents are assistants, and only nine percent of the male respondents are assistant professors.

RANK (by percentage) n=70 Respondents

	<u>Men of Color</u>	<u>Women</u>
Lecturers/researchers	---	5%
Assistant Professors	9%	39%
Associate Professors	46%	31%
Full Professors	46%	25%

Although their numbers are small, minority male faculty seem to be progressing to higher ranks at a more rapid rate. Ninety-one percent of the men are tenured while only 56 percent of the women respondents are tenured. However, the flip side of this issue is the fact that there are more women entering planning academia and therefore there are more of them in assistant professor positions.

NUMBER OF HIRES FOR 77 INSTITUTIONS RESPONDING TO SURVEY

<u>Hires 1980-89</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Total Hires</u>
Total, all hires	234	100
Men	166	70
White men	156	66
Men of color	10	4
Women	68	30
White women	55	25
Women of color	13	5

Twenty-eight percent of the Ph.D. graduates in planning between 1980-89 were women, and 30 percent of the hires made in the same period are women (although only one-third of them had Ph.D's in Planning). Of all women faculty, 51.5 percent have been in their present position for six years or less, while only 23.8 percent of the men have been in their positions for six years or less.

However, the statistical relationship between gender and tenure is highly significant. Of the 99 women, 49.5 percent are tenured and 50.5 percent are not. For men, 80.9 percent are tenured and 18.5 percent are not. This has a $p < .0001$. Although the data does not support a conclusion that women are currently being discriminated against in the tenure process, rates should be carefully evaluated again in a few years since national studies confirm that tenure for women faculty is a problem in most disciplines (Simeone, 1987), and a significant proportion of the women faculty are just now beginning to come up for tenure.

Recruitment

In order to assess whether or not women and people of color are identified and recruited, questions were posed to existing faculty and to department chairs concerning advertisement for positions, identification and recruitment of women and people of color, and affirmative action guidelines and procedures.

Forty-four percent of the faculty indicated that their search committees did not channel advertisements to publications directed to women and people of color at either the state or national levels. Thirty percent said yes, while 24 percent didn't know.

Sixty-seven percent said their search committees are responsible for being certain that women and people of color are identified and recruited, 17 percent said no while 13 percent didn't know.

Forty-one percent indicated that search committees were given guidelines by the department or institution concerning questions and criteria that cannot be used according to affirmative action law while 24 percent said no guidelines were given and 33 percent didn't know. Several faculty members pointed out that just because search committees are given guidelines there is nothing to enforce their use. They commented:

"I was asked several illegal questions during my interview. It was stated outright by the program head that if I was a "troublemaker" (a code word used to describe another department member who had accused the chair and department head of being sexist and named them in a class action suit by the women faculty in our state) like another woman in the department that I wasn't wanted."

"As a top student applying for a tenure track job, I was informed that the reason my application was not acceptable to the department was directly related to sexist attitudes."

"It is assumed that search committees are responsible for the inclusion of women and people of color in the hiring pool whether they do it or not depends on the individuals."

"I was harassed twice during job interviews." At one interview a male department chair said: "If I hire a white male, I know I don't have to worry about him going off and getting pregnant right away."

Hiring

Fifty-three percent of respondents indicated that the department is required to report distribution of position offers by sex, rank, and race/ethnicity while 16 percent say they aren't required to report this information and 29 percent don't know if such a requirement exists.

In concert with reporting requirements, women and people of color were asked if departments were required to report distribution of hires by sex, rank, and race/ethnicity. Fifty-nine percent said yes, 10 percent said no and 31 percent didn't know.

Half of the respondents (50%) didn't know if departments were required to report the terms and conditions of employment by sex, rank, and race/ethnicity.

Asked whether institutional policies exist which require that women and people of color candidates be given preference in future hiring, 39 percent said yes while 40 percent said no.

Although it is essentially the job of the chair to know the answers to the above questions, it is disturbing that such a large percentage of women and faculty of color did not know the answers to these questions which, while not affecting their hires, will affect the hiring of future colleagues.

When asked what factors influenced their first teaching job search, 61 percent of the respondents indicated job availability while 39 percent indicated they liked the location. Twenty-one percent indicated someone recommended them for the job.

In subsequent job searches, only 37 percent indicated job availability. Twenty-nine percent were interested in the prestige of the program, 26 percent indicated someone recommended them and, 21 percent indicated they wanted to be on a more collegial faculty.

"I feel that I was encouraged to apply for jobs in which the department had no intention of hiring me but wanted a woman on their list for affirmative action reporting purposes."

Salaries

Forty-seven percent indicated that the institution doesn't consistently apply procedures for identifying salary inequities between women and men faculty while 31 percent didn't know whether they do or not.

When salary inequities exist, only 21 percent indicated that the institution takes timely corrective action to reduce the inequities (40% didn't know).

At the departmental level, only 41.4 percent indicated that their department provide equitable distribution of opportunities for summer employment to increase base income, 21.4% said the department did not provide equitable opportunities, 14.3% did not know, and 15.7% said it was not applicable to their department.

"In my first academic job, the environment was discriminating, women received lower salaries and less advancement."

"I have always been the lowest paid faculty member. A new white male assistant professor was recently hired at \$6,000 above my salary as an associate professor."

Retention

The major problems for women and people of color are going to be retention and advancement rather than entrance.

Distribution of department resources, tenure, promotion, compensation, and fringe benefits are all factors in retaining faculty. In addition, the departmental climate is extremely important as well. Respectful treatment by colleagues and an atmosphere free of sexual and racial innuendos and harassment are important for retaining female and minority scholars. While women respondents often discussed incidents of overt discrimination, faculty of color consistently reported they felt they were harassed in covert and subtle ways.

"As you move up the ladder you really feel the discrimination."

1. Tenure and Promotion

It goes without saying that the most important issues for a young academic revolve around the potential of tenure and promotion. Only 57 percent of the respondents indicate that their institution requires departments to develop explicit written criteria by which junior faculty are evaluated for tenure. Of the 33 percent who said the institution doesn't have that requirement, 11 percent indicated their department had developed written criteria anyway. In the remaining 22 percent of institutions, there are no requirements and often no clear criteria.

Sixty-nine percent of the respondents indicated that all faculty under tenure consideration must be informed in writing in advance of the tenure review process. Seventy-four percent indicated that a vote of all tenured members of the department is required for tenure decisions, and 69 percent indicated an appeals process is provided for a negative tenure vote. Several respondents reported bitter experiences from their tenure processes which they related to their race/gender.

Sixty-seven percent of women and people of color indicated that there are no written guidelines either from the department or institution to encourage equitable retention of faculty women and people of color. Over half of the respondents don't know whether the department is required to report on the distribution by sex, race, or ethnicity of contract renewals and non renewals, suspensions, dismissals, or resignations.

When asked if the institution conducts analyses by sex, age, race for all academic promotions, 34 percent said yes, 34 percent said no, and 29 percent didn't know.

Seventy-three percent indicate that research on issues concerning women and people of color are given recognition as appropriate scholarship by their department. However, for those who are located in departments where their research is devalued, it is a major issue.

Several faculty members mentioned that they felt it was difficult to get research concerning gender and race published in journals which were considered acceptable to their colleagues. One person specifically mentioned that his/her department only counted journals which are mentioned in the Social Science Citation Index (which research has shown has an under representation of such articles). There were many comments related to these retention issues.

"When I went up for tenure, a number of new requirements were made up especially for me to meet."

*

"The faculty consistently gave the worst votes to women for tenure while supporting several men who had never published with unanimous departmental votes."

*

"In my former teaching position, there was overt discrimination for tenure review."

*

"At my last institution my chair was non-supportive. It was clear to me that I could not get through a tenure process, so I left."

*

"In my tenure case non-tenured faculty without Ph.D.'s evaluated my case...it was a mess. I was denied tenure consideration because I was the wife of another university employee."

*

"I had to take my tenure/promotion case to court."

*

"I couldn't get promoted until I filed a formal grievance."

*

"Minority faculty members are easily dismissed and are held to more strenuous standards."

*

"My superior regards my scholarly efforts as insignificant. He only comments on my appearance and never my work."

"I've had to earn faculty respect over many years. They were not supportive of my area of interest."

"I do not feel supported. My research is devalued and there is limited moral support for change."

"A recent tenure review of another colleague made it clear research on women and people of color was not valued in our department."

"Recognition of scholarship on women or people of color is begrudging."

"My interests have not been viewed as valuable or important by my colleagues."

"There are reviewers for journals who are harsh about minority issues research."

"For your research on women or people of color to count it has to be in a "recognized" journal."

Distribution of Department Resources

Most respondents felt their departments were doing a good job of equitably distributing resources and assignments to tasks of higher or lower institutional prestige.

DO YOU FEEL THE FOLLOWING ARE FAIRLY DISTRIBUTED IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?
N=59 Women 11 Men

	YES%	NO%	Responding "Yes"	
			WOMEN%	MEN%
Opportunities to teach advanced undergraduate and graduate courses	83	10	83	82
Teaching loads	80	14	76	100
Number of committee assignments	74	17	71	91
Appointments to committees of higher and lower institutional importance	61	27	58	82
Assigned office space and equipment	80	14	78	91
Availability of secretarial and other support	87	6	85	100
Assignment of student advisees	76	16	73	91
Assignment of graduate assistants	74	10	75	73
Travel money and release time for attending workshops, summer institutes, and conferences for professional development	87	6	86	91

Several respondents did share their frustration about the distribution of duties and resources in their departments:

"The men in my department were given \$600.00 stipends to attend a program at _____. I was given nothing."

"There is subtle discrimination as a faculty through other's choice of words and examples; the refusal of women's requests for space, equipment, or release time."

"I've been punished in various ways by my department for being a feminist. These include lack of graduate student support, being closed out of decision making (when possible) and being treated disrespectfully."

3. Respect and Recognition

Although 83 percent of respondents feel welcomed and valued in their department, there were many comments regarding a lack of respect and recognition for the contributions women and faculty of color are making. There seems to be a lack of recognition of the extra assignments which are often given when you are the only, or one of few, women or people of color in your department, school, campus etc. Other comments pointed to a general lack of respect on the part of their colleagues and students in their departments:

"I have been consistently rated lower than the other faculty members in teaching, service, and research despite carrying heavier teaching loads, usually several times more graduate students, better teaching evaluations. I have far more service to the profession both nationally and locally, university, college, department and college committee assignments, and appointments by the governor and the city council to citizen committees which none of my male colleagues have. I can only conclude that my efforts are not considered of equal value."

"There was a tendency to undervalue the kinds of things I often had to do: committee assignments, student advising and teaching courses outside my area of expertise."

"I have been made peripheral to our Ph.D. program and overloaded with minority student responsibilities."

"It is clear I was hired as a token black."

"I have been yelled and sworn at in faculty meetings with the words "F--k you (my name)." No one else is treated this way."

"My colleagues called me by another woman's name for years."

"People treat me with the "invisible syndrome," they pretend to listen to what I have to say at faculty meetings but really don't."

"As the only female faculty member in the department, I am not privy to some of the informal communication."

"My graduate assistant told me he did not want to work with a woman. Later, he misplaced the final exams from my class."

"I have had explicit references made to my gender and race in course evaluations. There have been numerous instances."

4. Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment is one of the most potent forms of lack of respect. Nearly a fourth of faculty women have experienced harassment. Indeed, more faculty members reported sexual harassment as a faculty member (21% overall, 24% of the women, 9% of the men) than as students (19%). The following incidents were experienced as faculty members:

"A prestigious senior faculty member put his hand on my thigh during a faculty seminar and kept whispering in my ear. 'What are you doing here? You should be home f--king.' I felt utterly paralyzed and my colleagues who saw it going on did nothing. Later they asked me why I hadn't done anything! I was untenured at the time."

"A senior faculty member offered me a prestigious appointment in return for sex."

"Consistent and regular approaches were made by a faculty member in another department in our building including a physical assault."

"At one department I worked in the chair reportedly made passes and asked for sexual favors."

"I was physically abused by a visiting faculty member."

"At a faculty search committee meeting, a male faculty member stated that what we needed to liven up these meetings was to show pornographic movies. There ensued a discussion of good porno flicks. I was very uncomfortable as well as embarrassed."

"One male faculty member thought it was cute to use as a greeting 'How's your sex life.'"

"I experienced serious sexual harassment (calls and letters) from a colleague at another institution in our geographic area."

5. Isolation

Isolation in their job is a concern of 36 percent of the respondents (36 percent of the women and 36 percent of the men). Forty-one percent (41%) of the people of color feel isolated.

The three major reasons given for feelings of isolation are that they work in a field peripheral to planning (16%), that there aren't enough people to relate to in the community (14%), and that they have nothing in common with their colleagues (11%).

6. Mentoring

Advice and support is important at all stages of career development. When asked if the department encourages senior faculty to mentor junior women and people of color, 66 percent said no, 29 percent said yes, and 4 percent didn't know. Over two-thirds (68%) of the women said that there isn't encouragement for mentoring while 55 percent of the males said there is. Several commented that, although there was a departmental policy encouraging mentoring, it did not really exist in practice.

Two-thirds indicate that there has been a special mentor in their career. Not surprising considering the ratio of male to female faculty, 50 percent indicate their mentor was male. Only 39 percent of the mentors were planning faculty. While only 14 percent indicated that it has been detrimental to their career to not have had a mentor, quite a number of respondents mentioned incidents of discrimination and lack of support they experienced as they worked on their planning degrees:

"The lack of minority faculty as mentors and students creates an atmosphere of alienation. Faculty seem to expect the worst."

"As a student with a 4.0 average, I was told by a professor in charge of an awards program he wouldn't recommend me for an honor society because it was "all men" and it "wouldn't seem right."

"As a student I felt there were lower expectations for me. I was passed over for fellowships, there were faculty members who had to be persuaded to serve on my committee."

"There was differential treatment of me by faculty on issues related to post-Ph.D. placement."

"I was a graduate student as a faculty wife. I was never considered for scholarships or teaching assistantships even though I had an excellent grade point average, therefore, I never had a mailbox or got any of the announcements or information about things going on in the department."

"As a student at _____ I was never aided in getting a job or supported by fellowships although less good students were supported. Although I am probably the most successful; of my classmates, I had a hard time originally getting into the Ph.D. program and got no support while I was in it."

"As a graduate student in a prestigious planning program, I was told to brush up on my secretarial skills."

"Efforts to have senior faculty mentor junior faculty have not been very successful."

7. Fringe Benefits

Issues related to family life are also important. Several of the respondents indicated they were a "trailing spouse" to a partner who himself/herself was an academic. Others indicated they had a "trailing partner." For these faculty, programs which value part-time workers and/or provide help in partner employment are very helpful. Over a third of the respondents indicate that part-time faculty aren't eligible for faculty development while another 37 percent don't know if part-time faculty are eligible. Sixty-three percent indicated that their institution does not have a trailing partners program to help with employment. Nearly a third indicated that two people (spouse/partner) are not permitted to share a single tenure track faculty appointment while 60 percent didn't know.

Issues related to child rearing were the most mentioned as potentially problematic to faculty. Thirty-nine percent of the institutions do not provide a parental leave program for new parents. Thirty-six percent of the faculty respondents did not know if it existed or not. A child care center for faculty and staff is available for 54 percent but not for 36 percent of the respondents. Respondents were asked which fringe benefits would/could be helpful to them in their careers:

	<u>YES%</u>
Prorated fringe benefits for part-time faculty	17
Fringe benefits for temporary faculty	14
Job sharing a position	9
Campus child care	31
Parental leave	14
Other dependent care benefits	16

Curriculum

Current planning curricula do not have enough material on race, gender, and disability according to 70 percent or more of the respondents. Material concerning international issues is felt to be sufficient by 46 percent and insufficient by 43 percent.

Asked whether they include materials about these subjects, 84 percent indicate they include materials about race (85% of the women, 82% of the men, and 94% of people of color) and 86 percent include material about gender (88% of the women, 73% of the men, and 88% of the people of color).

Only 40 percent indicate they include material about disability while 71 percent include material about international issues.

Preferential Treatment

Respondents were asked whether or not retirements among planning faculty during the next 10 years would increase opportunities in the field for women and people of color. Seventy-six percent think opportunities will increase for women to enter planning in academia, 57 percent think opportunities for people of color will increase, 46 percent think opportunities will increase for non U.S. citizen faculty, and 33 percent said opportunities will increase for other.

Twenty-six percent think that women are receiving preferential treatment in hiring done by schools of planning, while 41 percent feel that is not the case. Twenty-nine percent feel that people of color are receiving preferential

treatment in hiring while 34 percent do not. Only 10 percent feel people from other countries are receiving preferential treatment in hiring by schools of planning while 43 percent feel that is not the case.

SURVEY RESULTS: DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

One hundred and twenty-one chair surveys were sent out, representing all schools listed as ACSP schools in the back of the ACSP Guide to Graduate Education, 1988. Seventy-three (60.3%) were returned. In general, the department chairs felt their institutional and departmental policies were working to promote the inclusion of women and faculty of color.

Institutional Policies

Thirty-seven (51%) indicated that institutional policies existed which require women and people of color be given preference in future hiring. Thirty-three (45%) reported that set aside funds exist at their school for the recruitment of faculty of color and women. Almost all departments are required to report offers and hires by sex and race. However, only twenty-two (30.6%) reported that they have to report renewals and non renewals of contracts by race and gender and the percentage was approximately the same for reporting of dismissals or resignations by race or gender.

Less than half the chairs indicated that there are written institutional guidelines to encourage equity (47.2%) and about a third indicated such guidelines were distributed to faculty (34.7%).

Less than half of the chairs reported that they knew that their institutions were analyzing academic promotions by race/sex (45.8%), analyzing salary inequities by race/sex (30.6%), or acting to correct salary inequities by race/sex (47.2%). Although the majority knew if their school provided child care services for faculty (56.9% said yes, 31.9% said no), less than half were aware of other benefit issues.

Most disturbing, were the percentages of chairs who reported they did not know the answers to these questions since they are often of concern to and/or asked about by prospective/current junior faculty who are often balancing a dual career, child rearing relationship in their personal life. The table below reports those percentages:

<u>Question</u>	<u>% Chairs "Don't Know"</u>
1. Trailing partners program	16.7
2. Can two people job share a tenure track position?	29.2
3. Are there written equity guidelines?	12.5
4. Are there institutional policies giving hiring preference to women/POC?	8.3
5. Are the equity guidelines provided upon hiring?	16.7
6. Are there special hiring funds for women/POC?	18.1
7. Is dept. required to report renewals, suspensions, dismissals by race/sex?	16-18*
8. Are part-timers eligible for fringe benefits?	12-15*
9. Is there institutional analysis of promotions, by race/sex?	29.2
10. Is there institutional analysis of salary inequities by sex/race?	43.1
11. Is there institutional correction of salary inequity by race/sex?	30.6
12. Is there parental leave?	26.4
13. Is child care available?	9.7
14. Are there other dependent care benefits?	36.1

* these answers collapse several responses

ailing partners programs were reported to exist at their schools by only thirteen (18%) of respondents and fifteen (0%) reported that two people could share a tenure track position.

Departmental Policies

1. Recruitment

In recruiting candidates to apply for faculty vacancies, nearly two-thirds of the chairs (61.1%) reported that they advertised in channels directed towards women and faculty of color, and they sought help from appropriate special interest groups. Sixty-three (87.5%) indicated they direct their search committees to assure that women and candidates of color are identified and recruited.

2. Mentoring

Half of the chairs report that they encourage senior faculty to mentor junior faculty.

3. Department resources and work loads

The majority of chairs felt they were doing a good job of equitably distributing departmental workloads and resources. Their answers paralleled the faculty responses (page 13).

DO YOU FEEL THERE IS EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF THE FOLLOWING IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?*

	<u>% Yes</u>	<u>% No</u>
1. Teaching advanced and Undergraduate Courses	84.7	4.2
2. Teaching loads	86.1	4.2
3. Number of Committee Assignments	83.3	5.6
4. Appointments to committees of higher and lower institutional status	76.4	4.2
5. Office space and equipment	84.7	5.6
6. Secretarial support	86.1	4.2
7. Student advising assignments	81.2	4.2
8. Graduate assistance	79.2	4.2
9. Travel money and release time	84.7	5.6

* numbers do not add up to 100%, the other answers were "don't know," not applicable or no answer

4. Tenure and Promotion

Most chairs felt that their department recognized research on issues of gender and race as legitimate scholarship (81.9%). Most of the institutions (73.6%) provided written criteria for tenure evaluation. However, 23.6 percent of institutions did not, but almost all of the departments in those schools reported that they provided written departmental guidelines. Only two chairs reported that there were no written guidelines at either level. Appeals processes for negative tenure appeals were reported at 86.1 percent of the institutions.

5. Opinions

The chairs were asked to answer four opinion questions regarding obstacles to hiring women and faculty of color in their own departments. In general, their answers reflect an interest in recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty. They felt that the necessary specialties, departmental interest, and information were available.

OBSTACLES TO HIRING: OPINIONS OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

<u>Question*</u>	<u>Not Major Obstacle</u>	<u>Not an Obstacle</u>	<u>A Major Obstacle</u>
1. Do women and people of color, lack necessary specializations?	37.5	31.9	22.2
2. Is there a lack of department interest in the recruitment of faculty women and faculty of color?	90.3	8.3	---
3. Is there a lack of adequate recruitment information on women and people of color?	66.7	26.4	6.9
4. Is their too much extra time and effort to find and recruit them	68.1	23.6	8.3

*Answers do not add up to 100% because of no answers and don't know categories.

SURVEY RESULTS Ph.D.'S IN PLANNING SINCE 1980

Demographics

Three hundred and four questionnaires were sent to Ph.D. graduates in Planning since 1980. The respondents represent all but two of the Ph.D. granting institutions in planning. There were 120 respondents, representing 39 percent of those we attempted to contact. Of the letters which were deliverable, 201 or 71 percent were male and 82 or 29 percent were female. Of the respondents, 42 or 35 percent are women and 78 or 65 percent are men. Four percent, or 5 individuals, of the total are women of color while 8 percent or 10 are men of color. Seventy-eight percent are U.S. born, 16 percent are non U.S. living here, and 10 percent are naturalized citizens. One hundred and three respondents (86%) are white, 12 percent are people of color; 5 percent are of Hispanic heritage.

Current Employment

One-third of the respondents have one to three years of full-time teaching experience while a little over one-third have no teaching experience. Eighty-eight percent are employed full-time (71 men and 34 women). Sixty-eight percent are employed in academic institutions. Of those not in academia, only 10 percent said it was because a teaching position was not available while 25 percent gave the reason that there were more attractive career options. Thirteen percent never applied for a teaching job and 12 percent applied but weren't hired.

Twenty-nine percent were employed in academia in the past. Only 2 percent left because they didn't get tenure, another 2 percent said their reason for leaving was because they didn't feel welcome by colleagues, 2 percent didn't like the location, and 10 percent left for a better job. Almost everyone (88%) feels welcome in their current department or firm.

Of those in academia, 15 percent are already tenured and another 26 percent hold a tenure track position.

RESPONDENTS EMPLOYED IN ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS N=70

FACULTY RANK			NONFACULTY RANK		
	n	%		n	%
Prof	5	4.2	Research	9	7.5
Assoc Prof	12	10.0	Other	3	2.5
Asst Prof	33	27.5			
Instructor	3	2.5			
Researcher	3	2.5	TOTAL	12	10%
Other	2	1.7			
TOTAL	58	58.4%			

"Academia is sexist and racist relative to other fields and in addition it pays poorly."

Importance of Ph.D.

Fifty-eight percent indicate that the PhD was essential to getting their jobs, 30 percent said it was helpful and 11 percent said it was unimportant.

Job Searches

For those who had sought employment in a planning program, factors which were influential to their first job searches were:

- 54% indicated availability of the job
- 29% said they liked the geographic location
- 22% indicated the prestige of the program
- 21% said they wanted a collegial faculty
- 17% said someone recommended them

Factors influencing subsequent job searches in a planning program were:

- 35% said availability of the job
- 22% said they liked the location
- 21% said prestige of the program
- 12% said someone recommended them
- 11% wanted a collegial faculty
- 10% said they wanted to be less culturally isolated
- 10% said they considered if their partner was employable at the location

Discrimination in the Interview Process

1. The Interview

Fifty-three percent felt they were interviewed because of race, ethnicity, or gender at some point in their career, but 59 percent indicated that they didn't think race, ethnicity, or gender or place of birth was a factor in getting their position. Forty-seven percent indicated that where they were refused a position, the reasons weren't related to race, ethnicity, or gender.

Twenty-three respondents or 19 percent felt that they had experienced refusals due to race, ethnicity, or gender.

Respondents were asked to discuss the positive and negative aspects of their interviews. Only a small number took the time to do so. The following are the aspects in rank order they mentioned more than once.

POSITIVE ASPECTS OF THE INTERVIEW

1. Friendly, felt warm and welcomed
2. Genuine interest was shown to my ideas
3. Knew people on the faculty and had advance support
4. Really impressed by department chair

NEGATIVE ASPECTS OF THE INTERVIEW

1. Tended to be too mechanical, had to meet too many people
2. Poor salary or uncomfortable salary negotiations
3. Vagueness about job responsibilities
4. Poor junior faculty facilities
5. Unreasonable demands on junior faculty

"It is difficult, as you know, to pinpoint why you are refused an academic job. However, one does notice when 1) there are no minorities on the hiring committee 2) no minorities on the faculty and 3) no emphasis on cross cultural issues or perspectives."

"I have been on interviews where it was clear I was there so they could say they spoke to a woman."

"I don't believe there are opportunities in planning schools for blacks. I think the entire profession needs to change/improve its views on minority faculty."

"They stated outright that the department needed more minorities."

"In some interviews I was made to feel unwelcome. Statements such as "we are top heavy," "you will add color to the department," and "we are looking for fresh graduates" left me feeling that I was being interviewed for affirmative action purposes only."

"Most schools are especially closed minded about hiring Asians especially because they are not targeted minorities under Affirmative Action policies."

"I was ignorant of concerns regarding fairness in the selection process for new faculty. Now, with experience, I find that most white male faculty members do nothing to promote affirmative action in the process. They, of course, seem to hold liberal views towards racial and gender biases but they don't act on such views."

"I was asked many illegal questions about my marital/family status and, at one interview, about whether I was/was not a feminist."

"The school I chose had the only woman department head in the U.S. when I was hired and she chose me (a woman)."

2. Ascertaining the Departmental/Institutional Climate

An open-ended question probed how (and if) the candidates decided whether or not there was an openness to racial and gender diversity in the departments with which they interviewed. The most frequent answers are listed below for those who indicated they did do it and they cared about it. Most of the white male respondents didn't do it. Some indicated, more disturbingly, they "didn't care."

"I looked at and for minority faculty and asked questions relating to retention, tenure, number of existing faculty women and of color on the campus etc. I talked to community people as well as other minority faculty and students."

"I tried to judge the attitudes of faculty and students through their language, questions etc."

"I was very concerned about their reputation but I was geographically bound."

"I assumed almost all schools were basically sexist and I avoided places other female faculty said were really bad."

"I interviewed only at traditionally black schools as I wasn't granted interviews elsewhere."

I was concerned about maternity policies. At _____ I had to return to the classroom when my baby was four days old."

3. Reverse Discrimination

Eight of the respondents felt they had experienced reverse discrimination in the hiring process. Some indicated it had been explicit, i.e. they had been told not to bother to apply for various jobs.

The data regarding the "eligible pool" of applicants is not available. However, seventy percent of all hires since 1980 have been of men, 63 percent of white men. Of all men hired, 94 percent were white. Only 30 percent of hires have been of women with 5 percent being women of color. Of all women hired, 19 percent were women of color.

It is difficult to counter charges of "reverse" discrimination. However, the experiences of women and people of color, as evidenced by this survey, points to a significant problem of discrimination.

"In general, most places seem falling over themselves to hire qualified women and minorities. I was happy to get an interview. As a white male, I was a beggar. And beggars can't be choosers."

5. Sexual Orientation

Several respondents mentioned that we should have asked questions regarding discrimination based on sexual orientation. A few mentioned they felt they had not been hired because of their homosexuality and/or their research interests which concerned the gay and lesbian population.

"I am gay, but did not feel comfortable discussing my personal life during the interview, even though there were equal opportunity considerations surrounding the job I was interviewing for."

Mentors

Seventy-five percent indicated that they had a special mentor in their career and 55 percent indicated the mentors were male. Fifty-seven percent of the mentors were in the planning field.

Nearly half of those without a special mentor felt that it was detrimental in their career development.

"Role models are extremely important in learning how to play the game, academically and politically. A mentor can also help a student develop a niche in the field, a much more difficult task without the sage advice and experience of a mentor."

"Most importantly, I had a minority mentor. Even though he wasn't in my own department, without him I never would have finished even though I had a high GPA and an excellent reputation."

"I felt that faculty members did not mentor me because of a lack of common ground coupled with concerns about a male mentoring me, being construed to be more than a mentoring relationship."

"Not having a mentor has been detrimental. I have seen mentors make cold calls on behalf of other individuals which have helped them get hired, published, etc."

"The one man that started out serving in a mentoring role tried to seduce me and I ended the relationship."

Isolation

Twenty-seven percent of the respondents feel isolated in their job. The three major reasons given were: 1) they work in a field peripheral to planning; 2) there weren't enough people to relate to in the community; and 3) they have nothing in common with colleagues.

"I feel culturally isolated as well as isolated by having different attitudes."

"I feel isolated. Many of my colleagues are sexists, most are unsupportive and unfriendly to each other as well as to me. It's an "every person for themselves" environment."

Curriculum

Regarding content in current curriculums, over 50 percent indicated that there is not enough material about gender, disability, or international issues while 46 percent said there is a lack of material about race.

Of those who teach, 42 percent include materials about race, 33 percent include materials about gender, 17 percent include materials about disability, and 38 percent include materials about international issues.

Seventeen explicitly stated they don't include gender issues, 7 percent don't include race issues, 30 percent don't include issues concerning disability, and 13 percent don't include material about international issues. One professor commented:

"My students are all able-bodied men."

Value of Ph.D.

Only 62 percent would earn a Ph.D. in planning again while 29 percent reported they would not. Twenty-three percent indicated they would earn a Ph.D. in another field. Most of the fields they named were "hard" fields, i.e. economics, geography, real estate, business, etc.

More than three-fourths of the respondents indicated they would advise women and people of color to consider a Ph.D. in planning.

Opinions

Respondents were asked whether or not retirements among planning faculty during the next 10 years would increase opportunities in the field for women and people of color. Sixty-seven percent think opportunities will increase for women to enter planning in academia, 59 percent think opportunities for people of color will increase, 43 percent think opportunities will increase for non U.S. citizen faculty, and 38 percent said opportunities will increase for other.

Thirty-five percent think that women are receiving preferential treatment in hiring done by schools of planning, while 14 percent feel that is not the case. Thirty-three percent feel that people of color are receiving preferential treatment in hiring while 23 percent do not. Only 6 percent feel people from other countries are receiving preferential treatment in hiring by schools of planning while 45 percent feel that is not the case.

CONCLUSIONS

While the majority of current women faculty, faculty of color, and women and minority Ph.D. graduates concur with the white male majority that planning education is offering increasing opportunities for women and minorities, there is still much work that needs to be done. When two-thirds of current minority faculty and women faculty acknowledge incidents of discrimination throughout their career and over a third say they have/are experiencing that discrimination in their current departments; that is a clear message that attitudes and departmental climates are not as welcoming as they should be.

With 29 percent of faculty retiring in the next ten years, there will be ample opportunities to enhance the presence of under represented groups on planning faculties. To do so, it is clear that attention must be paid to recruiting and mentoring students of color to complete Master's and Ph.D. level work in Planning. For women students, the numbers completing doctorates need to be increased and they, too, need to see the relevancy of entering academia. In both cases, it is a task which requires major change in the ways (often subtle) that they feel under encouraged and discriminated against as students and as junior faculty.

In Fall 1989, ACSP President Carl Patton appointed the first ever standing committee of ACSP. This new Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Women and Minorities in Planning Education has the task of setting an agenda for change in the coming years. It will address the question of specific ways that ACSP, as an organization, can encourage cultural diversity in member schools. However, whatever the organization can do, the bottom line is what occurs in each individual school. Women and faculty of color are not going to accept (or more importantly keep) jobs in institutions where they do not feel valued and respected.

The number of women and people of color being hired in Planning Academia is slowly increasing. However, as stated earlier, women still made up only 30 percent of the total hires since 1980 and people of color only 14 percent. Their overall presence is even smaller. The first hire of a woman of color did not even occur until 1975. More disturbing, while the percentage of women faculty hired seems to be increasing (17.5% of the total faculty but 30% of new hires), the number of hires of people of color is decreasing (14% of current faculty, 10% of new hires).

It is fair to say that women faculty and faculty of color are still very much pioneers in Planning Academia. For many of them, the environments they work in are hostile at the worst and non-welcoming and non-supportive at the best. Yet, women are half the population of the country and people of color are the majority in many urban areas. Planning schools should be on the forefront of teaching future practitioners how to work in the pluralistic metropolis. This cannot be accomplished without the perspective of a culturally diverse faculty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Banks, William M. 1984. Afro-American Scholars in the University. *American Behavioral Scientist* 27(3):325-338.
- Bernard, Jessie. 1964. *Academic Women*. New York: New American Library.
- Exum, William H. 1983. Climbing the Crystal Stair: Values, Affirmative Action, and Minority Faculty. *Social Problems* 30(4):383-399.
- Exum, William H. and Menges, Robert J. and Watkins, Bari and Berglund, Patricia. 1984. Making It at the Top: Women and Minority Faculty in the Academic Labor Market. *American Behavioral Scientist* 27(3):301-324.
- Galindo, Yvette and Welch, Mary Beth and Wirka, Susie. 1987. Accepting the Challenge: Gender, Race, and Disability in Urban Planning Education. *Report to ACSP Executive Board Meeting*.
- Gray, Mary. 1988. Academic Women and Salary Differentials. *Academe* 74(4):33-34.
- Greer, Marsha. 1990. *Planning Education: Recruitment and Retention of Faculty Women and Faculty of Color*. Unpublished Master's of Urban Planning Terminal Project.
- Grigsby, J. Eugene III 1988. *Minority Education in Planning Schools*. Unpublished Report. Hill, Edward. 1990. Increasing Minority Representation in the Planning Profession. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 9 (Winter): 139-142.
- Menges, Robert J. and Exum, William H. 1983. Barriers to the Progress of Women and Minority Faculty. *Journal of Higher Education* 54(2):123-144.
- Moses, Yolanda. 1989. Black Women in Academe: Issues and Strategies. *Washington D.C.: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges*.
- Ross, Catherine L. 1990. Increasing Minority and Female Representation in the Profession: A Call for Diversity. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 9 (Winter): 135-138.

- Impson, E.E. 1978. Scientific Paradigms and Social Values: Wanted--A Scientific Revolution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 36: 1332-43.
- Sandler, Bernice R. 1986. The Campus Climate Revisited: Chilly for Women Faculty, Administrators, and Graduate Students. *Washington D.C.: Project on the Status and Education of Women.*
- Simeone, Angela. 1987. *Academic Women: Working Towards Equality.* South Hadley, Massachusetts: Bergin and Garvey Publishers Inc.
- Spencer, Mary L. and Bradford, Eva F. 1982. Status and Needs of Women Scholars. *In Handbook for Women Scholars: Strategies for Success.* Eds by Monika Kehoe. San Francisco, CA: Americas Behavioral Research Corp.
- Spender, Dale. 1980. Learning to Create Our Own Knowledge. *Convergence* 8(1-2): 14-22.
- Suinn, Richard M. and Witt, Joseph C. 1982. Survey on Ethnic Minority Faculty Recruitment and Retention. *American Psychologist* 37(11):1239-1244.
- Thomas, Susan and Spencer, Mary L. and Sako, Margine. 1982. Conversations With Minority Women Scholars. *In Handbook for Women Scholars: Strategies for Success.* Eds Monika Kehoe. San Francisco, CA: Americas Behavioral Research Corp.
- Waters, Amy and Harris William M. 1987. *African American Participation in Planning: A Quarter Century View.* Unpublished Report.