

Proposal to fund a Mentoring Workshop for Early-Career Women in Research-heavy University and College Positions in the U.S.

Proposal Steering Committee: Louise Antony, University of Massachusetts Amherst;
Ann Cudd, University of Kansas

Abstract

We seek funding in order to conduct a mentoring workshop for early-career women in philosophy. This will be the second workshop in what we project to be an ongoing project, with workshops offered biennially. The workshop matches cohorts of five early-career women with a senior woman mentor. At the workshop weekend, the cohorts meet for intensive discussions of each mentee's work, and for plenary panel presentations and discussions of issues confronting women in the profession. Mentors continue stay in touch with, and provide guidance to their mentees after the workshop weekend.

Our plan is based on a proven-effective mentoring program developed by women in the American Economics Association to address the demographic problem in their field. Early indications suggest that our program may be similarly effective in helping early-career women achieve their professional goals and so improve the gender ratio in philosophy.

I. Purpose: Addressing the "Philosophy Exception"

Philosophy as a discipline has a gender problem. Although data about the race and gender makeup of its membership is not routinely gathered by the American Philosophical Association, a recent reliable estimate of the professoriate in U.S. philosophy departments is that 21% are women.¹ In the top 20 departments, that number falls to 19%.² Related to this is the fact that women do not publish articles at high rates in the top journals of the field. A recent study of the top seven journals of the field counted only 12% of the authors as women. None of the editors of those journals is women, and only 17% of the advisory boards are women.^{3,4}

Philosophy is unusual among the humanities fields in its skewed gender ratio. English, History, Linguistics, and Foreign Languages and Literatures boast percentages of women nearly equal to or greater than percentages of men in their professor ranks. In this regard, Philosophy is like Economics, which is unusual among the social sciences for its severe gender imbalance. While the gender imbalance in the natural sciences and

1

<http://www.apa.udel.edu/apa/governance/committees/women/Women%20in%20the%20Profession%20CSW.pdf>

² Sally Haslanger, "Changing the Ideology and Culture of Philosophy: Not by Reason (Alone)," *Hypatia*, Spring 2008.

³ *Ibid.*, appendix 1.

⁴ Brian Weatherson, formerly editor of *The Philosophical Review*, speculates that the rate of *submission* by women to major journals may be very low. See his discussion at <http://tar.weatherson.org/index.php?s=women+submission>

engineering has long been recognized, and serious funding is available to help address the problem at all stages of the pipeline, little effort or funding is aimed at the humanities or social sciences.

Recently, the Economics division of the National Science Foundation and the American Economic Association has taken note of the gender imbalance within the field of Economics, and, through the efforts of a small group of committed senior women scholars, has begun to make changes. Scholars in this group have designed a mentoring workshop for women assistant professors working in research-heavy positions, and are conducting a controlled experiment to compare professional progress among women who participate in the mentoring program with women who do not. Preliminary findings show significant improvements in publishing, publishing in top journals, and federal grant awards⁵ among women in the mentored group, compared with the controls. These results have been described as “staggering.”⁶

The exceptional gender imbalance in Philosophy has recently come under scrutiny by researchers within and outside of the discipline.⁷ The situation is now referred to as the “philosophy exception” among some psychologists interested in the effects of implicit bias and stereotype threat on minority groups. Philosophy blogs such as “Pea Soup”, “Leiter Reports: A Philosophy Blog,” “X-Phi,” and “Feminist Philosophers” have entertained discussion threads about the problem. In August 2009 a group of women philosophers, led by Sally Haslanger, a philosopher at MIT who has documented the nature and extent of the philosophy exception, met to discuss the issue and related issues of women’s status and future in the profession. Out of this meeting several initiatives were proposed, including one to begin formal mentoring of young women philosophers to achieve greater success.

II. Plan of Action: Mentoring Junior Women in Philosophy

A. General Description and Funding Plan

As executors of the mentoring initiative proposed at the meeting described above, co-directors Professor Louise Antony of the University of Massachusetts Amherst and Professor Ann Cudd of the University of Kansas initiated a Mentoring Project for early-career women in Philosophy, modeled on the economists’ project. The longterm goal of the Mentoring Project is to achieve a critical mass of women philosophers within the profession. In the shorter term, we aim to assist the participants in our Mentoring Workshops (described below) to publish in top journals and to either achieve tenure in their current positions or to move into tenured positions in higher-ranked philosophy departments. The plan is to hold these workshops biannually if they prove to be

⁵ Blau, Francine D., Janet M. Currie, Rachel T.A. Croson and Donna K. Ginther. 2010. “Can Mentoring Help Female Assistant Professors? Interim Results from a Randomized Trial.” (forthcoming 2010) *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*. NBER Working Paper W15707, January 2010.

⁶ Claudia Goldin, in her oral discussion of the previously cited study at the 2010 Allied Social Science Association meetings.

⁷ The situation has even received comment in the *New York Times*: <http://ideas.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/10/02/a-dearth-of-women-philosophers/>

successful. In order to evaluate and document the efficacy of the program, we will assess the success of workshop participants annually over a ten-year period by asking participants to submit annual updated CV's at regular intervals after the workshop. We will then devise measures to test whether our goals have been achieved. We expect to look at the following indices: quantity of publications, rank of publication venue (journal or press, as appropriate), success at achieving tenure, and rank of tenuring department. If, as we expect, our program shows the same degree of success as the program for women in Economics, we expect to see evidence of this success by year four or five.

We conducted the first workshop in June of 2011, at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, where one of us is a tenured full professor. The workshop was partially funded by a grant from the APA of \$5000. By all available measures, the workshop was a resounding success. [For a description of the 2011 Workshop and its results, please see two of the attached documents: "Report to the APA on the Mentoring Workshop," "The Mentoring Project" from *Hypatia* give details, and "Self-reported Achievements by 2011 Mentees"] We therefore propose to hold a new edition of the Mentoring Workshop in June of 2013, and are applying, once again, for APA support.

As was true in 2011, the co-directors have secured the support of several successful, high-status women philosophers whom we can count on to participate as mentors in the workshop. We will aim to accommodate as many applicants to the Workshop as possible, given availability of mentors, and economic constraints on the size of the program. (Our budget plan is designed to provide us with this flexibility.)

We are requesting an APA grant to fund the travel, meals, and lodging of the mentors, all of whom will be APA members. The University of Kansas has agreed to support the participation of Co-Director Cudd. The Department of Philosophy at the University of Massachusetts Amherst has agreed to contribute \$750 to cover the Keynote Speaker's honorarium. Co-director Antony is consulting with her dean at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, and also with faculty and administrators at area colleges and universities to raise additional funds, both for the short and the long term.

For the short term, the co-directors are hopeful that the University of Massachusetts Amherst will agree to pay the cost of meeting space, and provide the salary for a student assistant to help with clerical and logistical matters before and during the Workshop. We also hope to secure pledges equal to at least \$5000 from other area institutions, so that we can expand the Workshop as needed in order to accommodate as many applicants as possible. (Funds needed would be primarily the cost of travel, meals, and accommodation for additional mentors and additional meeting space, and possibly honoraria for invited experts to serve on panels.) For the long term, the co-directors seek to establish a consortium of colleges and universities who will agree to pledge a certain amount of money every other year to run the Workshop. (See attachment: "Proposal for a Mentoring Project for Philosophers.")

As before, participants in the workshop ("mentees") will be asked to seek funding from their home institutions to cover travel, lodging, and meals. Mentors will

not be paid beyond reimbursement of travel expenses.⁸ If enough funds are raised for the short-term, it may be possible for us to offer stipends to prospective mentees who cannot secure institutional support. (The provision of such support would be a goal for the envisioned consortium.)

B. Workshop Plan

The workshop will be conducted over a three-day period. Mentors and mentees will be housed together at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. (Mentors will be accommodated at the Campus Center Hotel. Mentees will have the option of accommodation at the Campus Center Hotel, or in dormitory housing.) Meals will be taken together at the Campus Center.

Applicants for the Workshop will be required to submit an abstract of an article-length work-in-progress. Those who are selected to participate in the workshop will be assigned to mentoring groups based on their areas of specialization. Successful applicants will be required to submit a complete draft of the abstracted paper, which will be circulated to the mentor of, and to the other participants in the mentoring group. (There will be a strict deadline for the submission of the complete draft. Anyone who fails to meet this deadline will be replaced by an alternate.)

The Workshop program will follow the plan established last year. That is, it will consist of working sessions (with participants organized into pre-assigned mentoring groups), interspersed with plenary sessions focused on various aspects of professional development and work/life issues.

A mentoring group will consist of approximately five workshop participants and one mentor. Each participant will serve as a presenter in one workshop, and as a “lead critic” in another. Other members of the working group will have read each paper in advance. The lead critic will open the discussion with 10 minutes of commentary on the paper. The author of the paper will have 5 minutes to reply, and then the floor will be open for discussion. Mentors will serve as facilitators in the working session discussions, and will provide feedback in the session along with the other members of the working group. This structure mirrors that of paper sessions at most professional conferences in philosophy. Our aim is to provide each participant with the opportunity to engage both with a senior member of the profession and with a peer, and to be involved both as an author and as a commentator in a philosophical exchange.

⁸ Last time, we did end up paying mentors a small honorarium. We did this because we found ourselves with a small surplus. Co-director Antony investigated possible ways of saving this surplus for the next edition of the Workshop, but there appeared to be either logistical barriers or inordinate administrative costs to keeping the money. It thus seemed both practical and fitting to pay out the surplus in the form of honoraria to our mentors. (Antony and Cudd did not take honoraria.) If the envisioned consortium can be formed, we will be able to set up a suitable financial instrument to collect funds and carry over surpluses.

Plenary sessions will involve the senior women recruited as mentors, and – funds permitting -- other professionals with pertinent expertise and experience to share. This might include representatives from granting agencies, philosophy journal editors,⁹ publishers, bloggers, and consultants on work/life issues. Last year, our outside experts were exceedingly generous: Prof. Sally Haslanger came to the Workshop at her own expense to participate in a panel on professional visibility, and Ms. Fran Sepler of Sepler Associates offered a presentation on sexism in the workplace, and waived her fee and expenses charge. Next year, we would like to be able at least to reimburse our outside panelists and presenters for their expenses.

SCHEDULE

DAY 1:

Arrival

4 PM: Keynote Address

6 PM: Welcome dinner (with keynote speaker).¹⁰

DAY 2:

8:30 – 9:30: Working session (broken down by mentoring groups)

9:40 – 10:30: Presentation -- “Strategies for Efficient and Effective Teaching”

10:40 – 11:40: Working session

11:45 – 1: Lunch and Panel: “Teaching/Research Balance”

1:15 – 2:15: Working session

2:30 -- 3:30: Presentation – “Publishing”

3:45 – 4: Working session

4:10 – 5:30: Presentation – “Professional Visibility”

6:00 – 6:30: Wine and cheese, socializing, or free time

6:45: Dinner

DAY 3:

8:30 – 9:30: Working session

9:40 – 10:30: Presentation – “Getting Tenure”

10:40 – 11:40: Working session

11:45 – 12:20: Lunch

12:30 – 1:30: Working session

1:40 – 2: wrap-ups; development of plans for follow-up

2 – 3: Plenary session: reports from working groups on follow-up plans, general discussion and evaluation

C. Timeline

November 2012: Co-directors Antony and Cudd will announce the dates for the 2013 Mentoring Workshop, and issue a call for applications, with a mid-January

⁹ Both co-directors, Antony (*Noûs* and *Philo*) and Cudd (*Hypatia*) have served or are serving as editors of philosophical journals.

¹⁰ Last year, Christine Korsgaard was the keynote speaker.

deadline. Antony will begin making arrangements for meeting space and accommodations. Cudd will begin assembling materials for the “virtual notebooks” provided to each mentee.

January 2013: Antony and Cudd will review applications, and organize potential mentoring groups, by area of interest. Depending on the number of such groups, and the areas of interest represented, Antony and Cudd will secure commitments from senior women to serve as mentors; and will organize panels and presentations.

February 2013: Within the first week of this month, the mentoring groups will be finalized, and all accepted participants will be notified. We expect between 30 and 45 participants, with 6 – 9 mentoring groups. Antony will finalize local arrangements.

March 2013 – May 2013: Mentees will have this time to work on their papers. Deadline for submission of final drafts will be in early May. Antony will distribute final drafts to members of mentoring cohorts and to mentors. Cudd will distribute virtual notebooks to all participants.

June 2013: Workshop will be held on the campus of U Mass Amherst.

July 2013: Antony will solicit preliminary evaluations of Workshop experience from Workshop participants (mentors and mentees).

September 2013: Antony and Cudd will collect updated CV’s from all mentees participating in the 2013 Workshop.

III. Budget

The University of Kansas will fund the travel and expenses of Cudd to the Workshop, as it did last year. The co-directors are donating their time and expertise to run the workshop. Antony will pay for her own meals during the Workshop, through her individual research account. As in 2011, we will ask the mentors to donate their services and time for the three days of the workshop. Expert panelists who might charge fees will be added only if additional funds can be secured. The Philosophy Department at U Mass Amherst has committed \$750 to cover an honorarium and expenses for the Workshop’s Keynote Speaker.

We request \$5,000 in funding from the APA to cover the following: travel, lodging, and food for five mentors; meeting space; and incidental expenses. Based on last year’s actual expenditures, we estimate travel costs and local expenses for mentors to be, on average, \$600. Meeting space, on the assumption that we have 35 mentees, will cost \$1550.

The attached table summarizes projected expenses and funding sources. (We do not list expenses for Co-directors Antony and Cudd, as these will be covered either by their respective institutions, or through their individual research accounts.)

IV. Fiscal Agent:

Mr. Tom Maxfield
Budget Officer, College of Humanities and Fine Arts
University of Massachusetts Amherst
209 South College
Amherst, MA 01003
business@hfa.umass.edu
413-545-6696

V. Additional Funding

As explained above, we hope to be able to accommodate everyone who applies to the Workshop. For that reason, we have built flexibility into our budget. If numbers exceed 35, then we will need funds additional to those we have requested from the APA. As explained above, Co-director Antony is consulting with philosophy faculty and administrators at area colleges and universities to secure pledges for that additional funding. (There is good reason to believe that these pledges will be forthcoming.)

In future years we are hopeful that we will be able to secure a permanent base of funding in the form of a “Mentoring Program Consortium,” as described above.

VI. Advertising

We will advertise the workshop through the Proceedings and Addresses of the APA, through the APA website, through philosophy blogs (e.g., FeministPhilosophers and Leiter Reports), through Facebook (Women in Philosophy Task Force), and through a variety of electronic listservs (e.g., the Society for Women in Philosophy, Feminist Association for Ethics and Social Thought (FEAST), the Society for Philosophy and Psychology). We will also send email announcements to chairs of philosophy departments throughout the U.S. asking them to bring this to the attention of their untenured women professors. Interested parties will be referred to our Website (see below) for downloadable application forms and for more detailed information about the workshop and the Mentoring Program.

VII. A website for the Mentoring Project was created and is being maintained by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Kansas:

<http://www.philosophy.ku.edu/mentoring-project/> Updated information for the 2013 Mentoring Workshop will be posted as soon as funding is secured.

There are links to the site from the Department of Philosophy at U Mass, and from the personal websites of co-directors Antony and Cudd. We will encourage former participants and other supporters to add links to the Project website from their own or their departmental pages, as appropriate.

Mentoring Workshop for Women in Philosophy

June 9 – 11, 2013 (Tentative)
University of Massachusetts Amherst
Co-directors: Louise Antony and Ann Cudd

Budget

EXPENSES

Travel, Room, and Board 5 mentors	\$ 3,000.
Meeting Space Per estimate	\$ 1,550.
Keynote Speaker Honorarium & Expenses	\$ 750.
Incidentals (Name Tags, photocopying, local transportation costs, etc.)	\$ 450.
TOTAL	\$5,750.

INCOME

APA Grant	\$ 5,000.
U Mass Philosophy Department	\$ 750.
TOTAL	\$5,750.

LOUISE M. ANTONY
Curriculum Vitae
June 2012

EMPLOYMENT

Professor of Philosophy, University of Massachusetts Amherst
352 Bartlett Hall, 130 Hicks Way
Amherst, MA 01003-9269
413-545-2316
Email: lanton@philos.umass.edu
Webpage: <http://www.umass.edu/philosophy/faculty/antony.htm>

EDUCATION

Harvard University, Ph.D. in Philosophy, 1982
Syracuse University, B.A. Honors in Philosophy, summa cum laude, 1975
Bedford College, University of London (special student), 1973-74

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

Philosophy of Mind	Phil. Issues in Cognitive Science	Epistemology
Feminist Theory	Philosophy of Religion	Philosophy of Language

BOOKS

Philosophers Without Gods, edited and introduced. (Oxford University Press, 2007)

Chomsky and His Critics, edited and introduced with Norbert Hornstein. (Blackwell Publishing Company, 2003).

A Mind of One's Own: Feminist Essays on Reason and Objectivity, edited and introduced with Charlotte Witt (Westview Press, 1993). 302 + xvii pp.

----- 2nd Edition. Expanded, with new introduction (Westview Press, 2002). 443 + xix

RECENT ESSAYS

1. "Different Voices or Perfect Storm? Explaining the Dearth of Women in Philosophy" forthcoming in *Journal of Social Philosophy*, special edition on Implicit Bias, guest editors: Margaret Crouch and Lisa Schwartzman.
2. "Why Not Not Believe? The Failure of Moral Arguments," forthcoming in *Debating Christian Theism*, ed. Chad Meister (Oxford University Press).
3. "Against Langton's Illocutionary Treatment of Pornography," forthcoming in *Jurisprudence*.
4. "Concepts: Useful for Thinking" in *Millikan and Her Critics*, ed. Dan Ryder, forthcoming from Blackwell Publishers.
5. "The Openness of Illusions" *Philosophical Issues*, special issue on Direct Realism, ed. by Berit Brogaard, 2011.

COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH

Implicit Bias & Philosophy: IN 058 The Leverhulme Trust: International Networks
Research Partners: University of Sheffield (England), MIT, Harvard University, Hunter College/CUNY, University of Utah, University of Washington, and University of Massachusetts

RECENT PRESENTATIONS AND INVITED LECTURES

“Bias: Friend or Foe?” Workshop on Implicit Bias and Epistemology, Sheffield University, Sheffield England, April 20, 2012

“Atheism, Materialism, and Nihilism”

- Invited Lecture: “Class of 1970 Lecture”, Rutgers University, March 8, 2012
- Paul Kurz Prometheus Lecture, SUNY Buffalo, Oct. 20, 2011

“Different Voices or Perfect Storm: Why are There So Few Women in Philosophy?”

- Yale Group on Gender and Philosophy, Nov. 11, 2011
- Tufts University Colloquium, Oct. 28, 2011
- Keynote Address, *Feminist Philosophy and Bias*, conference, Humboldt University, Berlin, Germany, Aug. 25, 2011
- Keynote Address, British Society of Women in Philosophy Annual Conference, Cardiff University, Cardiff, Wales, Nov. 27, 2010.
- WOGAP (Workshop on Gender and Philosophy), MIT, Cambridge, MA., Oct. 14, 2010

“From Causes to Reasons: On the Possibility of Empirical Knowledge,”

- Tufts University Colloquium, Oct. 28, 2011
- Presidential Address, Society for Philosophy and Psychology/European Society for Philosophy and Psychology Joint Meeting, July 7, University of Montreal, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

PERTINENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AND MEMBERSHIPS

Co-director (with Ann Cudd), Mentoring Program for Junior Women in Philosophy
First Biennial Mentoring Workshop, June 19-21, 2011, University of Massachusetts Amherst

Founding Member, Women in Philosophy Task Force

Society for Analytical Feminism

Executive Committee, 1994-1997

American Philosophical Association

Executive Committee, Eastern Division, 2006-2009.

Committee on the Status of Women, 1988-1991

Society for Philosophy and Psychology

President, 2010-2011

Editor, *Philo*; Editorial Board: *Notre Dame Review of Philosophy*, *Noûs*, *Philosophical Psychology*

Ann E. Cudd
Resumé for APA Grant Application
30 June 2012

CURRENT POSITION: Associate Dean for Humanities, University Distinguished Professor of Philosophy, University of Kansas.

RESEARCH:

Areas of special interest

Social and Political Philosophy, Philosophy of Social Science, Feminist Theory, Decision Theory, Philosophy of Economics, Empirical Philosophy

Selected Research Grants and Awards:

University Distinguished Professorship, University of Kansas, awarded June 2012

KU Women's Hall of Fame, inducted March 2008

KU Woman of Distinction, 2005-6

Hall Center for the Humanities Research Fellowship, Spring 1997

Sabbatical Leave, U. of Kansas, Fall 1996, Fall 2003, Spring 2012

General Research Fund Grant, Univ. of Kansas, FY-1991, -95, -96, -97, -98, 2001, -03, -05, -07

National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Research Stipend, 1992

Selected publications

Capitalism For and Against: A Feminist Debate (co-authored with Nancy Holmstrom), Cambridge University Press, Jan. 2011.

Analyzing Oppression, New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Feminist Theory: A Philosophical Anthology, co-edited with Robin Andreason, New York: Blackwell Publishers, 2004.

Theorizing Backlash: Philosophical Reflections on the Resistance to Feminism, co-edited with Anita Superson, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002.

Editor, Virtual Issue of *Hypatia Essays on the Place of Women in Philosophy*, Wiley-Blackwell.

Editor, Special Issue of *Hypatia* on the topic of *Analytic Feminism*, **10:3**, Summer 1995, co-edited with Virginia Klenk.

"Comments on Charlotte Witt, *The Metaphysics of Gender*," *Symposium on Gender, Race, and Philosophy*, vol. 8, no. 2 (Spring 2012): 1-7.

"The Mentoring Project," *Hypatia*, **27**(2012): 461-468.

"Resistance is (Not) Futile: Feminism's Contribution to Political Philosophy" in *Out from the Shadows*, edited by Anita Superson and Sharon Crasnow, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp.15-31.

"When to Intervene: Atrocity, Inequality, and Oppression" in *Evil, Political Violence and Forgiveness: Essays in Honor of Claudia Card*, edited by Andrea Veltman and Katherine Norlock, Rowman and Littlefield, 2009: 97-114.

"Revolution vs. Devolution in Kansas: Teaching in a Conservative Climate," *Teaching Philosophy*, **30**(June 2007): 173-183.

"Sexism," (co-authored with Leslie Jones), in *Blackwell's Guide to Applied Ethics*, Ray Frey and Christopher Wellman, eds., Blackwell Publishers, 2002, pp.102-117.

“When Sexual Harassment is Protected Speech: Facing the Forces of Backlash in Academe,” *Theorizing Backlash: Philosophical Reflections on the Resistance to Feminism*, Anita Superson and Ann Cudd, Rowman and Littlefield, 2002, pp.217-243.

“Multiculturalism as a Cognitive Virtue for Scientific Practice,” *Hypatia*, **13**(1998):43-61.

“Oppression,” *Encyclopedia of Philosophy and the Social Sciences*, Byron Kaldis, ed., forthcoming. (2000 words)

“Sexual Harassment,” *International Encyclopedia of Ethics*, Hugh LaFollette, ed., forthcoming. (2000 words.)

Selected Presentations

“Women’s Experience in the Philosophy Profession: A Frank Discussion,” Philosophy Department, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Feb. 11, 2011.

“Backlash,” Iowa State University Women’s Studies, Ames, Iowa, Nov. 13, 2003.

“Adaptations to Oppression: Preference and Resistance,” Social Psychology proseminar, Feb. 3, 2012.

“Inclusive Teaching Strategies,” Scholarship of Diversity Symposium sponsored by the Office of Diversity and Equity, Univ. of Kansas, March 2011.

Editorships and Editorial Boards

Co-editor for Value Theory, *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*, 2010-2013.

Hypatia, editorial board, 2007-present

SERVICE:

Selected Professional Service Activities

Co-director with Louise Antony, The Mentoring Project Workshop, June 22-24, 2011, UMass Amherst, (mentoring workshop for junior faculty women in Philosophy)

APA Committee on Lectures, Publications, and Research, 2010- 2013

Chair: APA Book Prize Committee (2011); Gittler Prize (2011, 2012); Frank Chapman Sharp Prize Committee (2012).

Women in Philosophy Task Force Steering Committee (Founding member), 2008-present..

Co-Chair, Advisory Committee on the Status of Women in Kansas, Institute for Women’s Policy Research, 2001-3.

Member, APA Committee on the Status of Women, 1998-2000

Selected University Service

Mid-career faculty mentoring workshop organizing, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, 2010-2011

Mentoring Junior Faculty study, 2009-2010

Director, Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Program, 2001-2008.

October 3, 2011

To: David Schrader, Executive Director
American Philosophical Association
From: Louise Antony, University of Massachusetts Amherst
Ann Cudd, University of Kansas
Re: "The Mentoring Program for Junior Women in Philosophy"

Last November, the APA awarded Ann Cudd and myself a grant in the amount of \$5,000.00 to administer a Mentoring Workshop for junior women in philosophy. The aim of the workshop was to establish mentoring relationships between senior women in the field, and women in the early stages of their careers, and to offer the junior women practical advice on professional development. Following a highly successful model designed by women in economics, Prof. Cudd and I designed and implemented a two-and-a-half day workshop featuring intensive, small-group working sessions focused on papers submitted by the participants, panel presentations on topics of interest, and informal socializing and networking. Prof. Cudd and I had taken on this project at the behest of the Women's Philosophy Task Force, convened by Sally Haslanger of MIT in the summer of 2009.

The workshop was held at the University of Massachusetts Amherst from June 19 to June 21. Professor Christine Korsgaard opened the Workshop with a public address, followed by a reception, and a dinner for Workshop participants. The second day's schedule consisted of three working sessions interspersed with panel discussions on writing and publication, getting tenure, and balancing teaching and research, and a presentation by Ms. Fran Sepler of Sepler Associates on gender in the workplace. The third day's schedule consisted of two working sessions and a panel discussion on professional visibility.

Prof. Cudd and I advertised the Workshop through listservs (SWIP, FEAST, Collegium of Black Women Philosophers, Women in Philosophy Task Force), blogs (FeministPhilosopher, Brian Leiter's Blog, the Symposium on Gender, Race, and Philosophy, and others), fliers at APA Divisional Meetings, and targeted individual mailings. We had a total of 54 applicants. We had originally planned to admit only 30, but because of the strong response, we decided to try to enlarge the program. With additional funds provided by the University of Kansas, we were eventually able to accommodate 42 women. Participants were divided by area of interest into 9 cohorts; each cohort was assigned a senior woman as a mentor. The mentors were Linda Alcoff (Hunter College/CUNY), Louise Antony (U Mass Amherst), Ann Cudd (U Kansas), Elizabeth Harman (Princeton), Jennifer Nagel (U Toronto), Anita Superson (U Kentucky), Lisa Shapiro (Simon Fraser University), Jennifer Uleman (SUNY Purchase), and Charlotte Witt (University of New Hampshire). Panel discussions were staffed by the mentors, with the addition of Prof. Sally Haslanger for the panel on professional visibility.

The workshop appears to have been a very positive experience for mentors and mentees alike. Twenty-nine of the 33 respondents to our evaluation survey rated their “overall experience” as “extremely positive” (24/72.7%) or as “positive” (5/15.2%). 31 listed “getting feedback on [their] work” as their most important goal in attending the Workshop; 22 of those said this goal was achieved to a “great extent”, and 9 said it was achieved “to some extent.” The next highest listed goal was “networking with senior women,” with 30 respondents listing this as first or second. Ten of these respondents said that this goal was achieved to a “great extent,” and 20 said it was achieved to “some extent.” The matter of fit between mentor and mentees was somewhat problematic: only 10 respondents “strongly agreed” that there was a good fit with their assigned mentors, and 5 said that there was not a good fit. The other main complaint was that there was not enough time for informal socializing, and that the main program was too fast-paced. (On the other hand, there was little support for increasing the number of days for the Workshop, and many suggestions for additional panel topics!) One consistent complaint was about the quality and cost of the food.

Challenges

The main challenge for future installments of the Mentoring Workshop will be arranging for good matches between mentors and mentees. When Prof. Cudd and I initially contacted senior women to see if they would be willing to serve as mentors in this project, the response was uniformly positive. But in the event, when we discovered the distribution of interests among our mentees, we saw that the range of expertise among the mentors we had lined up did not conform to the range of areas in which our applicants were working. Prof. Cudd and I did manage to persuade several prominent senior women to take on the substantial burden of serving as mentors at very short notice, but the fit between mentors and mentees was sometimes tenuous. Prof. Cudd and I are thinking about this problem and hope to have a better method for matching mentors and mentees, and giving mentors advice about what kinds of feedback mentees are looking for in the Workshop’s next installment.

Another challenge is securing continuing funding. It was clear to us from the response to this first installment of the Workshop that the perceived need for mentoring among our junior women is enormous. We therefore plan to continue offering the Workshop on a biennial basis for the foreseeable future. Obviously, we will need some committed and continuing source of funding. Prof. Cudd and I are investigating foundation and institutional sources, in consultation with our institutional development professionals.

A significant, but relatively easy challenge is to improve the logistics of the workshop. We would like to provide better amenities, especially food, at a lower cost, and we’d like to streamline transportation to and from the U Mass Amherst campus. We are confident that we’ll be able to achieve these goals now that we have the benefit of last summer’s experience.

Finances

In addition to the \$5,000 provided to us by the APA Grant, we initially received \$1,500 from the U Mass Philosophy Department. From these funds we had planned to

pay for travel, room and board for four mentors (Cudd was funded by her home institution, and I was on site), an honorarium for our keynote speaker, and meeting space for the two-and-a-half day workshop. When we decided to enlarge the workshop, we were fortunate in being able to secure an additional \$5000 from the office of the Associate Dean for Humanities at the University of Kansas. These additional funds allowed us to add three more mentors, enlarge the meeting space, and pay the expenses of an ASL interpreter to assist one of our participants, who is Deaf. Indeed, we ended up running a small surplus, which we paid out as honoraria to our mentors, who had all signed up with the understanding that they would be volunteering their services. (I had attempted to “bank” the additional funds for the next Workshop, but I discovered that the administrative costs and the logistical difficulties involved in doing so were prohibitive, given the small amount that would be left available.) I must note that Fran Sepler waived her standard consulting fee; because she was (fortuitously) on campus at U Mass Amherst during the days of the Workshop, she also refused our offer to pay for her room and board.

Mentees were required to pay their own expenses for travel, room, and board. There was no charge for participation in the Workshop. Prof. Cudd and I announced the expectation that mentees’ home institutions would cover the costs of their attending the Workshop, and in most cases, mentees were able to get reimbursed for travel and housing expenses. Many reported that they would not be reimbursed for the cost of food (which they found excessive – see above).

Prof. Cudd and I are exploring possibilities for securing longterm, continuing funding for the Workshop. We are hopeful, however, that the APA will be able to help us with funding in the short term, and plan to submit another grant application in 2012.

Summary

Prof. Cudd and I are confident that the Mentoring Workshop for Junior Women in Philosophy provides an important service to the profession in fostering the development of junior women scholars. We are very grateful to the APA for providing such generous support for the Workshop in its first installment.

MUSINGS

The Mentoring Project

LOUISE ANTONY AND ANN E. CUDD

I. ORIGINS OF THE MENTORING PROJECT

Readers of this journal are well aware of the underrepresentation of women in the profession of philosophy: in its journals, its most highly regarded programs, and in the top ranks of the professoriate (Haslanger 2008; Gines 2011; Wylie 2011). In these ways, philosophy is to the other disciplines in the humanities as economics is to those in the social sciences; it is sometimes referred to as “the philosophy exception.” Periodically over the past several decades this problem has reemerged in the consciousness of the profession, and various solutions have been pursued.¹ Although each has been important for many individual women philosophers’ careers, they have reached only what has been called the first tipping point: the point at which the presence of women as a group is noticed but resisted, which occurs when women become 20% of the workforce. None have met with enough success for the profession to reach the second tipping point, the point at which a change has enough momentum to no longer require extraordinary, externally imposed measures to sustain itself. In this case, when a tipping point is reached the forces of implicit bias and outright sexism are unable to keep women out of the profession. With regard to ending sex segregation and bias in the workplace, that point seems to be around 40% (Committee on Maximizing the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering et al. 2007). We are now in a time of heightened awareness of the low representation of and implicit bias against women in philosophy. In 2007 Sally Haslanger presented her study of the problem in philosophy, “Changing the Ideology and Culture of Philosophy: Not by Reason (Alone)” at the Central APA meeting, then published it in this journal (Haslanger 2008), and its claims have become the subject of much discussion in departments and on blogs in the English-speaking philosophical world. In 2009 Haslanger organized the first meeting of a group that has come to be known as the Women in Philosophy Task Force. This group focuses on solutions to the specific problems of implicit bias,

sexual harassment, and underrepresentation of women in philosophy department faculty and student bodies, as well as underrepresentation of women's work in conferences and journals.

There are broadly two kinds of solutions to the problem of underrepresentation of women in a profession: either fix the institution (that is, make changes to the profession and the process by which people are accepted into its ranks) or fix the women (that is, change the behavior of the excluded to more precisely mimic that of the included). The task force agreed that both should be pursued, and various initiatives have resulted, such as gathering data to using blogs for discussing the problems widely and calling out bad behavior, such as the "Gendered Conference Campaign" (Feminist Philosophers 2009) and the "What Is It Like to be a Woman in Philosophy" blog (What Is It Like), and disseminating information about solutions, such as the "What We're Doing about What It's Like" blog (What We're Doing). During the initial task-force meeting, the authors of this Musing agreed to work together on what came to be known as the Mentoring Project: a mentoring workshop for junior faculty women in philosophy. In this Musing we describe how we designed the mentoring workshop, its aims, what it accomplished, and what we have learned about this kind of effort.

II. AIMS AND DESIGN OF THE MENTORING WORKSHOP

A great model for a philosophy-mentoring workshop was presented at the task-force meeting by the University of Kansas economist Donna Ginther. Economics as a profession, as was mentioned, is similar to philosophy in the numbers of women (around 23% of the professoriate). To address this underrepresentation, the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP) started a mentoring program in 2004 with funding from both the American Economic Association and the National Science Foundation. As good empiricists, they treated the program as an experiment by randomly choosing only half of the applicants for the program, while keeping the other half as a control group. The resulting study has recently been published by Francine Blau, Janet Currie, Rachel Croson, and Donna Ginther (2010). The results are very impressive: by three years after the intervention, workshop participants were 20% more likely to have a top-tier publication, and they had two more publications than controls did. After five years the treatment groups had 3.2 more publications on average, and were 17% more likely to have an NSF or NIH grant.

The key aspect of the economists' workshop has been its focus on the work of the participants, as opposed to the facts of exclusion or bias. There is neither mere complaining nor wishful thinking that if they just do their best and ignore gender issues, parity would somehow be reached. The economists are not trying to change ("fix") their profession in order to make it more friendly or accommodating

to women; rather they are trying to teach women the attitudes, networking techniques, and work habits that have worked for those women who have become well-respected, senior members of the profession. The point of focusing on the work is that taking the participants' work seriously and engaging in good, hard critique among peers will presumably have good effects for both the participants and the work that they present. The mentees will be more likely to publish the particular work and also have greater confidence about the value of their work because it has been taken seriously by senior mentors and improved through critique. The rationale behind the economists' mentoring workshop design involves two other basic assumptions that are made very explicit: 1) networking is teachable and important, and 2) there are unwritten rules that mentors can share. Mentors were thus chosen for their abilities to network and their willingness to examine and teach their techniques, as well as their high-quality work as professors of economics.

The economists were able to host two types of workshops: one for assistant professors in research-heavy institutions, and the other for assistant professors in teaching-oriented institutions. The study just cited came from the former type of workshop. Since we in the task force were more concerned with the issues of research visibility and success in research-heavy, highly visible institutions, and because we were limited in the resources (financial and human) we had available to us, we decided to implement a workshop that would focus on research.

The workshop plan divides the mentees into cohort groups according to field and assigns a senior woman mentor to each one. The cohort groups exchange papers; first and second readers are assigned for each one in advance of the workshop meeting. During the workshop an hour is devoted to discussion and critique of each paper within the cohort group, including discussion of where the paper should be submitted for publication and what needs to be done to tailor the paper to that journal. Between paper discussion sessions are panel discussion sessions for the entire assembled workshop group, in which groups of mentors speak about important topics for career development in the field. Informed by a survey of participants taken before the workshop, we organized panels on: professional visibility, getting tenure, research and publication strategies, and workplace balance (that is, balancing teaching and research). We also organized a presentation by a human-resources consultant. Fran Sepler, who specializes in gender climate issues, presented a session entitled "Gender and the Workplace," which discussed ways to reduce gendered bias in academia, including ways to deal with sexual harassment and complaints about sexual harassment by students. The entire workshop was kicked off by a keynote speech from Christine Korsgaard the first afternoon. There were organized dinners both evenings, and during the lunches people were to sort themselves to discuss suggested topics: teaching strategies (for research-heavy vs. teaching-heavy institutions) one day and strategies for future communication with their cohorts the next. The group stayed fairly close

(sessions and meals in the campus student center with accommodations either in a dormitory or the campus hotel located in the student center) for the entire meeting (beginning at 4pm on Sunday and ending at 1pm on Tuesday), with very little opportunity for a break, which was by design.

We advertised the Mentoring Project with flyers at the 2010 Eastern APA, and then through listservs and blogs. We sent out emails to our networks of colleagues around the country, asking them to spread the word. Applications required a cover letter explaining the applicant's career stage and needs for mentoring, a CV, and an abstract for a paper that would be critiqued at the workshop. We received 54 applications by the deadline, and immediately set about selecting and sorting them into cohorts. Although we had budgeted for only 30 participants, the evident need for the workshop led us to expand the numbers to accommodate as many of the applicants as we could. Given the applicant pool, and the fact that we wanted groups of five mentees in each group, we classified the cohorts as follows: agency/autonomy, Aristotle/Descartes, ethics, continental, history of modern, Kant, philosophy of mind, philosophy of science/decision theory, and political philosophy. For some of these groups, the papers had less in common with one another, and the matches between mentees and mentors were less than ideal because there was quite a bit of difference in the literature that the papers were addressing and that mentors and mentees were knowledgeable about. One of the accepted applicants, who did not fit well into her group, withdrew just before the workshop. (Unfortunately, this was a point at which it was too late to replace her with someone who had not been accepted to the workshop, and so that cohort had one fewer member.) Also, there were a few applicants whom we could not place into cohorts because they were the only one or two in their field among the applicants, and the field was, we judged, too far from others to be workable. In the end, 42 mentees participated in the workshop (including one who had to come late and one who had to attend via Skype for last-minute personal or health reasons).

We had tremendous success recruiting senior women in the profession to be mentors for the workshop, despite the fact that we offered only to cover their expenses, and we invited them less than two months before the workshop was held.² We thought it important to match mentors to the cohorts that we assembled, and given that the mix of fields did not match our preconception, that was the right strategy. The timing of the meeting in late June seemed to be especially convenient for the mentors. The workshop was held at the University of Massachusetts–Amherst, where one of the co-directors is a senior faculty member; the Philosophy Department generously contributed to the workshop and lent logistical and moral support for the efforts. The website was hosted by the Philosophy Department of the University of Kansas, where the other co-director is a senior faculty member and associate dean. Kansas also provided considerable financial support for the workshop. After the workshop was over, we followed up with a detailed survey of the mentees.

III. HOW IT WENT

To say that the workshop went well is a complete understatement. Qualitatively it was, for us and for many of the mentors and mentees with whom we spoke after the event, a great experience of philosophizing, networking, and exchanging ideas like the best of philosophy conferences. Statistically, of the 33 survey respondents, 73% said the experience was extremely positive, and another 15% said it was positive. Anonymous comments gathered after the conference indicated that it was “deeply helpful,” “wonderful,” “phenomenal,” and “awesome.” One said, “I am so thrilled that I got to participate. I finally feel like I am part of a real philosophical community.” Another said, “This was definitely the best, most inspiring philosophy event I’ve ever attended.” Still another said, “I really really really needed many of the different things I took away from this workshop.”

Although there were no negative overall comments, there were some aspects of the workshop that were not as satisfying for some of the participants. With the exception of only one of the respondents, the participants stated that they most wanted feedback on their work, and second, they wanted the opportunity to network with senior women and peers in their field. Although we recruited outstanding mentors in their own fields of research, we were limited in our ability to exactly match each one of the mentee’s fields with cohorts specialized enough to have a deep familiarity with the literature and journals with which they were engaging. All in, 11 of 33 respondents expressed some dissatisfaction with the feedback they received on their work (9 saying that this goal was achieved only “to some extent”). It is not clear how to solve this problem, since it is unrealistic to think that all mentees can be precisely matched with a mentor, but it would be better to communicate the fact that some mentors may not be conversant with the precise literature of all the members of their cohort. Networking with senior women was also problematic: only 10 said this was achieved to great extent, 20 to some, 3 not achieved. The comments suggested it was because each mentee had only one mentor and not much time to socialize with the others. This situation could be improved with a greater amount of time for the workshop in which mentees could meet with other mentors, and perhaps, as one person suggested, having the panel discussions run as smaller roundtable discussions, allowing participants to interact with more of the senior women in small groups. However, any lengthening of the workshop timeframe would be more costly both financially and time-wise, and the potential benefits must be weighed against those costs.

All of the panels were reviewed favorably overall (that is, they all received a rating of at least 1.6 on a 5-point scale, with 1 as “extremely helpful”), with the one that focused on strategies for publishing rated the highest. One panel excited a somewhat heated debate about whether the advice for raising one’s professional

visibility should be the same for everyone, regardless of their type of institution or career goals. During the conference a few topics for which we had not planned panel discussions arose as crucial for at least some of the mentees. One was the issue of how to combine childbearing and rearing with a successful career. Another was the issue of finding jobs for both spouses in dual-career couples. These were issues that we did not think were of primary importance for the majority of the participants, but could have been included in an additional panel or replaced one of the existing panel discussions. Yet another unsatisfied desire was more information about how to handle hostility, bullying, or just plain politics in one's department. Although there was one session on harassment, it was focused more on sexual harassment, and could be tweaked to include other forms of bad behavior by colleagues and department chairs. Some of the mentees were interested in strategies for finding better second, or in a couple cases even first, jobs. There was also some disappointment about the way that teaching was relegated to the background in the discussions; the panel on balancing teaching and research was entitled "Finding Time for Research," and the panel discussion on "Getting Tenure" focused on the research requirements at research universities. Finally, some wanted more problematizing of the profession itself in light of sexism and other forms of exclusion and marginalization in the profession. These comments make clear that we did not communicate the aims of the workshop clearly enough. Given our original choice to focus on "fixing the women" and on doing so by giving them advice designed to help them publish in high-status venues in the profession, the workshop was not well equipped to advise those who did not have employment at an institution where they were expected to publish in such venues, whether that was because they were at a teaching-oriented institution or they did not yet have a tenure-stream position. We might also have limited participation to those who were in tenure-track positions at research institutions, but after considering that possibility, we rejected it as too paternalistic. But of course the best way not to be paternalistic is to supply the potential participants with full information so that they can make an informed decision about whether to participate. Furthermore, although we did have one session on sexual harassment, it focused more on how to work within the existing systems rather than on how the philosophy profession might be transformed.

IV. WHAT WE SHOULD CONSIDER FOR NEXT TIME

The most important consideration, then, is whether to limit the scope of the workshop to those who wish to be mentored to succeed in the profession as it currently exists and as success is currently defined. That is, should we continue to produce a mentoring workshop to help women to publish in the top journals, as currently defined, and to achieve professional visibility through presentation

of their work at conferences, colloquia, and on the Internet? The answer, it seems to us, is clear. There is a place for such a workshop, and provided that it achieves its aims, it is worth continuing. We also think that there is a place for discussing the scope of philosophical work, for working to widen that scope, and for transforming the field in ways that may be friendlier to women and minority philosophers as well as discussing work on gender, race, disability, and other topics that are currently marginalized in the profession. But given the origin of the Mentoring Project in the Women in Philosophy Task Force and in the concerns about the underrepresentation of women in the top departments and top journals of the field, this is its most appropriate aim.

A second very important consideration is funding. We sought and received funding for this project from the APA, but those funds had to be greatly supplemented by our own institutions. For this to be sustainable in the future, the Project will require longer-term institutional support. The APA has made it clear that it is not prepared to award larger amounts of money in any given grant request, and that a repeated event will need to seek other sources of funds. We shall again be seeking institutional and foundation support to conduct a second workshop in 2013.

NOTES

1. The Society for Women in Philosophy was founded in 1972, “to promote and support women in philosophy” (Society for Women in Philosophy). The APA Committee on the Status of Women was founded in 1970 (Lopez McAlister 1994).

2. We are pleased to acknowledge, with thanks, the mentors: Linda Martín Alcoff, Louise Antony, Ann Cudd, Elizabeth Harman, Jennifer Nagel, Lisa Shapiro, Anita Superson, Jennifer Uleman, and Charlotte Witt. Sally Haslanger, while not a mentor for a cohort group, participated as a discussant in the workshop and was an important informal mentor.

REFERENCES

- Blau, Francine D., Janet M. Currie, Rachel T. A. Croson, and Donna K. Ginther. 2010. Can mentoring help female assistant professors? *Interim results from a randomized trial. American Economic Review* 100 (2): 348–52.
- Committee on Maximizing the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering, National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine National Academy of Sciences. 2007. *Beyond bias and barriers: Fulfilling the potential of women in academic science and engineering*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.

- Feminist Philosophers. 2009. Gendered Conference Campaign. <http://feministphilosophers.wordpress.com/gendered-conference-campaign/> (accessed September 30, 2011).
- Gines, Kathryn. 2011. Being a Black woman philosopher: Reflections on founding the collegium of Black women philosophers. *Hypatia* 26 (2): 429–37.
- Haslanger, Sally. 2008. Changing the ideology and culture of philosophy: Not by reason (alone). *Hypatia* 23 (2): 210–23.
- Lopez McAlister, Linda. 1994. On the possibility of feminist philosophy. *Hypatia* 9 (3): 188–96.
- Society for Women in Philosophy. <http://www.uh.edu/~cfreelan/SWIP/> (accessed September 30, 2011).
- What Is It Like to Be a Woman in Philosophy? <http://beingawomaninphilosophy.wordpress.com/> (accessed September 30, 2011).
- What We're Doing about What It's Like: Making Things Better for Women in Philosophy. <http://whatweredoingaboutwhatitslike.wordpress.com/> (accessed September 30, 2011).
- Wylie, Alison. 2011. Women in philosophy: The costs of exclusion. *Hypatia* 26 (2): 374–82.

Mentoring Workshop 2011 Preliminary Report on Mentee Achievements

Co-directors Louise Antony and Ann Cudd have begun compiling information about the professional achievements of women participating as mentees in the 2011 Mentoring Workshop during the year following the workshop. We remind the reader that we have not been conducting a controlled study, and thus have no comparison class for this cohort of mentees.¹

Still, we consider that the accomplishments reported by our mentees, together with their own testimonies about the value, for them, of the workshop weekend and the ongoing relationships with their mentors, provides good reason to continue the program.

The following data are self-reported by veteran mentees.

Caroline Arruda

Here are the relevant updates to my CV:

Refereed Conference Presentations:

- 1) April 2012 .“Ideal Agency and Minimum Agency,” American Philosophical Association (APA), Pacific Division Meeting, Main Program, Refereed Symposium Session, Seattle, WA
- 2) August 2012. "Can We Choose not to be Agents? Should We?". Poster Presentation, Rocky Mountain Ethics Congress (RoME), University of Colorado Boulder.

Grants Received:

- 1) Caroline Arruda (PI). Fiscal Year January 1, 2012- Dec 31, 2012 (Funding Period January 1, 2012-Aug. 31, 2012). University Research Institute Grant, The University of Texas at El Paso. Requested and Approved: \$5,000. Project Title: Are Non-Human Primates Agents?.

Sonya Charles

¹ The co-directors came to this decision for two reasons: first, the data from the study run by the women of the American Economic Association indicated so clearly the value of their program that we felt it would be both unethical and unnecessary to attempt a replication of their study instead of simply offering mentoring to all women in philosophy who wanted it. The second reason was that neither of us is trained in social science; to run the program as a study would have required the help of a paid consultant or collaborator.

I have had two more articles accepted by journals:

“The Ethics of VBAC,” *Hastings Center Report*, forthcoming.

“On the Immorality of Lying to Children about their Origins,” *Philosophy in the Contemporary World*, 18 (Fall 2011): 22-33.

I have also been asked to write a chapter titled "Ethics, Pregnancy, and Childbirth" for the *Encyclopedia of Human Biology* 3rd edition.

Shortly after my application to the Mentoring Project, I received an NEH Grant for \$24,000. Here is the information on that:

NEH Enduring Questions Grant, “What would an ideal society look like?” to run May 1, 2011 – December 31, 2012

With this grant I will create a new honors course (PHL 225H: Utopias, Dystopias, and Human Nature). I will teach the course twice during the course of the grant. It also allows some money to take students to appropriate cultural activities related to the course.

Last, but not least, I was awarded tenure this Spring! All-in-all, a good year.

Lisa Fuller

Here is the update since last summer for me:

New published:

“Priority-setting in international non-governmental organizations: It's Not as Easy as ABCD” *Journal of Global Ethics* 8, 1 (2012), pp. 1-17.**This was the piece I worked on at the workshop!

“Burdened Societies and Transitional Justice,” *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*. DOI: 10. 1007/s10677-011-9300.

“International NGO Health Programs in a Non-Ideal World: Imperialism, Respect & Procedural Justice,” in J. Millum and E. Emanuel (eds.) *Global Justice & Bioethics*. (Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 213-240.

“Knowing Their Own Good: Preferences and Liberty in Global Ethics,” in T. Brooks (ed.) *New Waves in Ethics* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 210-230.

Also one commentary and one upcoming conference presentation:

Upcoming: "Gender and Economic Injustice: An Institutional Approach," 2012 Association for Political
Oct. 2012 Theory Conference, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

April 2012: Commentator on "*Fact of the Matter: Political Ideals and Democratic Consensus*" by
Jeremy Neill as part of a larger colloquium on democracy; Pacific
APA, Seattle, WA.

Laura Franklin-Hall

I'm writing with the requested update.

1. The paper I presented at the workshop has been conditionally accepted. I'm working on my revision now.
2. I haven't received any other official acceptances since the workshop, though I have received a flood of invitations to have work published in invited collections, including Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Biology and Philosophy, and the Oxford Handbook for Philosophical Methodology. Paper for those venues are well underway, and so I should have a good deal of new work out soon.
3. I've received a number of invitations to speak as well, at Cornell, Temple University, among others.
4. This is not that notable, but I passed my Third Year Review this spring. The paper I presented at the workshop was among the five I offered my committee.

I had a great experience at the workshop. In addition to simply getting helpful comments on my paper, I think that the presentation on publication strategies was particularly good. I benefited from hearing more about how rejections are simply to be expected, that even senior people receive them frequently, etc. All of that made me less hesitant to send my work off for review, and also perhaps less devastated and discouraged when I received back anything short of an acceptance.

Also, though this is hard to be that specific about, in general I felt less 'alone' in the discipline as a result of the meeting...

Shelley Weinberg

Here are some very good things that have happened since the 2011 Workshop:

1. Received an ACLS Fellowship for the calendar year 2013. Will be a "visiting scholar" at Rutgers for one semester of it.
2. Received Univ of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign "Humanities Released Time" (an internal teaching release fellowship, Fall 2012).
3. Conference acceptances -- "Locke's Reply to the Skeptic": South-Central Seminar in Early Modern Philosophy (Texas A&M; Nov. 2011); Pacific Division of the APA (Seattle, April 2012). "Locke on Knowing our own Ideas": Mid-Atlantic Seminar in Early Modern Philosophy (Princeton, April 2012); Locke Workshop at St. Andrews (June, 2012).
4. I was asked to contribute to vol. 4 ("Identity and the Enlightenment") of the Edinburgh Critical History of Philosophy.
5. I completed my "third year review" as part of the tenure and promotion protocol at the Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. They see me as "on track" for tenure.
6. "Conditional Acceptance" from *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* for "Locke's Reply to the Skeptic." (I hope to have the revisions in by the end of next week.)

Lara Buchak

Books

1. *Risk and Rationality* (tentative title). Oxford University Press. Forthcoming.

Articles

1. "Decision Theory." In *Oxford Handbook of Probability and Philosophy*, Oxford University Press. Forthcoming.
2. "Free Acts and Chance: Why the Rollback Argument Fails." *Philosophical Quarterly*. Forthcoming.

Talks

1. "Risk and Tradeoffs," Peking University, Beijing, China, June 2012.
2. "Risk and Tradeoffs," Formal Epistemology Workshop, LMU, Munich, Germany, May 2012.
3. "Belief and Credence," Epistemology above the Arctic Circle, Oslo Center for the Study of Mind and Nature, Lofoten Islands, Norway, May 2012.
4. "Risk Aversion and Diachronic Preference Consistency," Northwest Workshop on Time and Rationality, Leavenworth, WA, April 2012.
5. "Risk and Tradeoffs," University of Pittsburgh Center for Philosophy of Science, Conference on "New Science – New Risks," March 2012.

6. "Risk and Tradeoffs," Group in Logic and the Methodology of Science, UC Berkeley, Dec 2011.
7. "Risk and Tradeoffs," University of Toronto (metaphysics and epistemology group), Nov 2011.
8. "Faith, Belief, and Evidence," Amherst College (public lecture series on rationality and religious belief), Nov 2012.
9. "How Faith Makes Rational Action Possible," Baylor, Notre Dame, Georgetown Phil Religion Conference, Oct 2011.
10. "Commitment and Belief," Northwestern Epistemology Brownbag Series, Sept 2011.
11. "Risk and Representation," Carolina Metaphysics Workshop, UNC Chapel Hill, June 2011.

Upcoming Talks

1. Symposium on my "Can it be rational to have faith?," Association for the Philosophy of Judaism, online symposium, Aug 2012.
2. University of Missouri (colloquium talk), September 2012.
3. Workshop on the Nature of Belief, Harvard University, September 2012.
4. Oxford Jowett Society, October 2012.
5. 8th Annual Philosophy of Religion Conference, Baylor University, March 2013.
6. Pacific-Mountain Division of the Society of Christian Philosophers (keynote speaker), University of Colorado, Boulder, March 2013.
7. Formal Epistemology Festival, University of Toronto, June 2013.

Clair Morrissey

I am proud to report that I have, together with my collaborator and un-official mentor Rebecca Walker, two new publications this academic year:

C. Morrissey and R. L. Walker (2012) "Funding and Forums for ELSI Research: Who (or What) Is Setting the Agenda?" *American Journal of Bioethics Primary Research* 3(3): 41-50.

R. L. Walker and **C. Morrissey** (2012) "Charting ELSI's Future Course: Lessons from the Recent Past," *Genetics in Medicine* 14(2): 259-267.

I also wanted to pass along that I have been working at mentoring and encouraging young women to pursue philosophy in my little corner of the academic world (taking inspiration from the program and thinking about how I can do my part). Although not a direct result of the Mentoring Project, perhaps an indirect one: my student, Kelsey Palghat a rising *junior* at Oxy, has had a paper ("The Coherence of 'Moral Agency': Regan and Chimpanzees") accepted as a poster at the American Society for Bioethics and the Humanities conference this October.

Katia Vavova

Tenure-track job at Mount Holyoke starting Fall 2012

Invited presentations:

"Debunking Evolutionary Debunking" (the paper I presented at the workshop)

- University of Sydney
- Australian National University
- Wisconsin Metaethics Workshop*

*Pending a final review, the paper should be published in Oxford Studies in Metaethics.

"Irrelevant Influences"

- Symposium Paper at the Eastern APA Meeting 2012

"Confidence, Evidence, and Disagreement"

- Colloquium paper at the Pacific APA Meeting 2012

Robin James

Been tenured and promoted (Assoc Prof of Philosophy).

--> These publications have appeared in print:

James, Robin. "On Intersectionality and Cultural Appropriation: The Case of Postmillennial Black Hipness." *Journal of Black Masculinity*. Volume 1 Number 2 (2011).

James, Robin. "These Are The Breaks: Rethinking Disagreement Through Hip Hop" in *Transformations* special issue on "Ranciere: Politics, Art, and Sense." Issue 19, 2011.

http://transformationsjournal.org/TEST/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml .

--> These have been accepted:

James, Robin. "On Race and the Feminized Popular in Nietzsche and Beyond" forthcoming in *Hypatia*.

James, Robin. "Oppression, Privilege, and Aesthetics" forthcoming in *Philosophy Compass*.

--> And this one has been invited/commissioned but not completed:

James, Robin. Title TBA. In *How Does It Feel To Be A (White) Problem?* ed. George Yancy, Forthcoming 2013. (In Progress)

--> I've given these invited talks:

“Gender, Race, Music, and Lady Gaga” UNC Charlotte College of Liberal Arts & Sciences “Personally Speaking” lecture series, November 2011.

“Feminism Calling: Beyoncé, Lady Gaga, and the Politics of Popular Music,” Rhodes College, November 2011.

--> I've presented at these conferences:

“Re-Viewing Neoliberalism: European Theory, Transnational Feminism, and the Visual” at the College Art Association, February 2013.

“I've Lost Control: Negative Affect, Feminism, and Race” at Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy, November 2012. Selected for solo presentation with commenter.

“Sovereign Harmony & Biopolitical Frequency: Or, what LMFAO can teach feminists about neoliberalism” at philoSOPHIA: a feminist society, April 2012.

“Race and the Feminized Popular in Nietzsche and Beyond” at Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy, October 2011.

“Sound and Sensibility: Theorizing Race Beyond the Visual” at the California Roundtable for Philosophy and Race, October 2011.

--> And, I was selected to talk at Ignite Charlotte 4, a community-wide event:

“If You Hate Justin Bieber, Patriarchy Wins” at Ignite Charlotte 4, March 20 2012. Available at: <http://youtu.be/WxqNbEzmNtk>

Emily Katz

Forthcoming publications:

Katz, Emily Catherine. "Aristotle's Critique of Platonist Mathematical Objects: Two Test Cases from *Metaphysics* M.2." Accepted for publication in *Apeiron*, April 2012. Conference presentations:

“A Not Untidy Unity: Aristotle's *Metaphysics* M-N”. Canadian Philosophical Association National Congress, University of Waterloo, 2012.

“Aristotle’s Critique of Platonist Mathematical Objects: Two Test Cases from *Metaphysics M.2*”. 35th Annual Workshop in Ancient Philosophy, University of Texas at Austin, 2012.

Kris Sealey

The paper I workshopped has been accepted for publication (“Levinas, Sartre and the Question of (Black) Solidarity”, *Levinas Studies, an Annual Review*, Volume 7, September 2012, Ed. John E. Drabinski).

In addition, I’ve also gotten the following encyclopedia entry accepted - “Nationalism as an Anti-Racist Racism: A Critique of Paul Gilroy”, *Encyclopedia of Race and Racism*, 2nd edition, 2013.

My book manuscript, which has been under review at SUNY Press, just recently received a tremendously favorable referee report.

Suzy Killmister

I was offered a tenure-track position at the University of Connecticut (50/50 between philosophy and the Human Rights Institute), which I’ll be taking up in Fall 2013.

I’ve also had a publication accepted: “Autonomy and False Beliefs”, *Philosophical Studies*, online first.

Jada Strabbing

Publication:

Jada Twedt Strabbing. (May 2012) “Review of Andrew Sneddon’s *Like-Minded: Externalism and Moral Psychology*,” *Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews*.

Presentations:

- 1) “Understanding Attributability,” Conference on Responsibility, Agency, and Persons 2, University of San Francisco (Sept 2011)
- 2) “Comments on William Jaworski’s ‘Brain Science and Frontiers of Mind’,” Fordham Faculty Lecture (Sept 2011)
- 3) “Understanding Accountability,” Virginia Tech Colloquium (April 2012)

Elizabeth Schechter

Publications

“Partial unity of consciousness: Evidence and implications.”
In development. Forthcoming in D. Bennett and C. Hill (Eds.), *The Unity of Consciousness and Sensory Integration*. MIT Press.

“The unity of consciousness: Subjects and objectivity”
Forthcoming in *Philosophical Studies*.

“Intentions and unified agency.”
Forthcoming in *Mind and Language*.

Workshops and Presentations

Invited Presentation, “Self-consciousness and Psychological Subjects”
Georgia State University
Fall 2012

Invited Presentation, “Self-consciousness and Psychological Subjects”
PNP Colloquium, Washington University in St. Louis
Spring 2012

Invited Presentation, “Intentions and Unified Agency”
Philosophy Colloquium, Washington University in St. Louis
Spring 2012

Invited Commentary, “Evidence and Epiphenomenalism”
Online Consciousness Conference
Spring 2012

Invited Presentation, “Consciousness and Agency in Split-brain Subjects”
Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association
Winter 2011

Invited Presentation, “Co-consciousness and the Unity of Action”
Conference on the Unity of Consciousness, Brown University
Fall 2011

Awards & Honors

Summer Seed Money Grant, Washington University
2012

Susanne Sreedhar

Published a version of the workshop paper: "Hobbes on 'The Woman Question,'" *Philosophy Compass*

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

Diversifying the Field of Philosophy: Proposal for a Comprehensive Mentoring Program

General Rationale – Why Mentoring? XXXX

Funding Structure: Building a Philosophy Mentoring Consortium

Participating institutions will commit to contributing \$X.00 biannually to fund a 3-day workshop, structured along the lines of the 2011/2013 Mentoring Project for Early-career Women in Philosophy.

Operation:

A Board of Directors (to include, *ex officio*, the co-directors of the Mentoring Workshops) will oversee the planning and implementation of mentoring workshops. The Board will also monitor the demographics of the field of Philosophy, and will determine if and when workshops should be added, or the target populations altered. (See below.) The Board will evaluate the performance of the co-directors after each workshop. The Board will also be responsible for monitoring the financial foundations of the program.

The Workshop will initially be focused on women, but when and if the demographics of the profession change, the focus of the Workshop will broaden to members of other groups under-represented in the discipline of philosophy, and perhaps eventually to include any underserved member of the profession – that is, to anyone whose circumstances have made it difficult for him or her to acquire effective mentoring. Alternatively, the Board may decide to add Mentoring Workshops to serve members in these other groups.

The Board will, at its first convening, consider and issue a recommendation about ways to address students' and members' expressed needs for mentoring at other career stages, specifically during graduate study, and at mid-career.

.