

REPORT OF THE
AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE CONDITIONS OF WORK
FOR FACULTY WOMEN AT AMHERST COLLEGE

Amrita Basu
Frederick Griffiths
Stephanie Sandler
David Sofield (Chair)
Marguerite Waller

October 1984

INTRODUCTION

E

This report is the effort of five faculty members selected by the Committee of Six to answer nine specific questions formulated by the Committee and assigned to us at the beginning of November, 1983. Our own committee, handed a graceful and prepositional official title--The Ad Hoc Committee To Study the Conditions of Work for Faculty Women at Amherst College--is composed of two junior women, one senior woman, and two senior men. None of us is yet fifty and our years at the College range from nineteen to two. No one of us is a mathematician or natural scientist; indeed, four of us are scholars and teachers of literature. We do not presume to have achieved definitive answers to the questions posed. Each of us drafted one or more sections, but we are all responsible for the completed report.

The questions (they will be repeated at the head of each section) are as follows. We will respond to them in the order in which the Committee of Six put them, combining the second and third of the Committee's questions in our II and subsuming the Committee's eighth question (here placed in parentheses) in our discussion of I, V, and VI.

- I. Are women faculty disproportionately burdened with committee and advising responsibilities? (Pp. 7-17.)
- II. Do women faculty lack full access to the informal collegiality that nurtures scholarly development and encourages full participation in the life of the College?

What, if any, are the consequences of the uneven distribution of women faculty across the departments of the College and among ranks? Have women been disproportionately appointed to visiting faculty positions? (Pp.18-30.)
- III. Do students bring different assumptions to their evaluation of the competence of male and female faculty? Do faculty? (Pp.31-37.)
- IV. Is the absence of a separate women's studies program perceived as a signal that scholarship on women is less valued? (Pp.38-44.)
- V. Are the regularly accepted practices of the College predicated on a model of the one-career family with spouse's support? (Pp.45-54.)

- VI. Has the College adequately recognized the demands of childrearing as well as childbearing? (Pp.55-58.)

(Does the coincidence in time of traditional professional development [as reflected in tenure decisions] and of a woman's reproductive years pose special difficulties for women faculty?)

- VII. In addition, the committee should review current College policies designed to accommodate women's life patterns (maternity leave, provision for regular part-time appointments), and it should review other policy issues which may affect the recruitment and retention of women faculty. (Pp.59-66.)

We did our work by interviewing individually eleven present and past members of the faculty and administration, by meeting with twelve groups of faculty, varying in size from two to nine persons, by meeting with about twenty-five resident counselors, and by analyzing in camera the results of a questionnaire we wrote. We received sixty-two completed questionnaires, having sent out about two and a half times that number--a return we are astonished and gratified by. All women on the faculty in the AY 1983-84--regular full-time and part-time, visiting full-time and part-time--were invited to talk with us and with but one or two exceptions they accepted. In addition we interviewed as many former faculty women as we could, ten as it turned out, and heard from two others, as well as two men formerly on the faculty, by letter. We invited all male department chairs to one of two conversations and slightly fewer than half accepted. All in all it seems to us that enough people gave us their time to make it possible to draw conclusions based on substantial evidence. We are grateful to everyone who answered our call, as we are to the Office of Institutional Research for supplying us with data and the Office of Administrative Services for typing. The information presented applies to the year in which we gathered it and in which we drafted most of the report, 1983-84. What was not available to us were confidential letters from faculty and students regarding particular tenure and reappointment cases. Furthermore, we did not make a study of faculty salaries,

such a study having been undertaken independently at the behest of the Committee of Six by Professor Ralph Beals. That report was shared with us and we confirm what it demonstrates, that there is no evidence at the College of systematic salary discrimination by sex.

In what follows we do make certain specific recommendations to the administration, to our colleagues, and to the Committee of Six. We hope they will be considered carefully. We would emphasize here, though, that we hold the discussion undertaken question by question to be as important as the recommendations proper. It is our impression that some of the problems encountered in their work by women faculty at the College are not much amenable to the topical treatment of this or that symptom. Nor have we been surprised at this, certain problem-conditions lying too deep and having existed too long for anything other than a systemic solution to be promising. And yet nothing is harder to formulate, for certain unconstructive aspects of the conditions of work here are ones that exist in society itself, hardly being restricted to this or any educational institution. Our thoughts, then, about such matters occur in the general discourse page by page. What a good deal of it comes to is a plea for a broader and more flexible appreciation of differences (to appreciate: to understand, be sensitive to, be grateful for). That such pleas are often made does not diminish the urgency with which we issue this one.

Some of us find ourselves surprised that we concluded the year of learning and writing feeling as strongly as we do about how serious the problems are and how important it is for certain almost unconsciously held attitudes to be altered. What cheers us, if anything does, is a belief in the rational good will of our colleagues and of the administration. What also cheers us is the notion that since certain problems appear to be in part generational, fifteen or twenty years from now some attitudes may shift in the faculty as a whole. Responses to our

questionnaire suggest that, generally speaking, male junior faculty are closer in their assumptions to female junior faculty than to their older male colleagues. This is not to say that tenured men at the College would consciously make work difficult for women faculty; it is to say that a younger generation may simply find it easier and more natural to make the conditions of work for everyone more open, more tolerant, and more democratic. It is not clear that anticipated improvements will come about primarily through an imminent large increase in the number of women on the faculty. Given a frozen FTE figure and a chiefly middle-aged faculty tenured at a rate of about seventy per cent, it is not likely that any dramatic change in the proportion of women to men on the faculty will soon be achieved. We do indeed hope for the appointment--brought about by the vigorous application of the principles of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action--of more women, at senior as well as junior ranks. As will be seen, in some areas of the College there are notably few women faculty even now.

Were we to put a single name on the condition most faculty women at Amherst find themselves in, it would be the one these women apply to themselves: marginalization. Virtually every woman we talked with felt in one way or another on the periphery. If her sex alone did not place her there, and usually it did and does, a woman faculty member might consider herself marginalized by her age, sometimes by her race, by her field, by her often new area within an established field, by her feminist approach to that field, sometimes even by where she lives. The opportunities, then, for finding oneself in double- or triple-bind situations are plentiful and will be noted passim in the report. Some of us began by being skeptical of the words "marginalization" and "tokenism," but the more people we talked with, men no less than women, the more real the phenomena those words name became to us. Increasingly it has seemed to us that the model of analysis applicable to Amherst in the early 1980s, as to many small colleges, is that of a

more or less paternalistic family. With all the rights and privileges--of power and the lack of it--pertaining thereto. There are, to be sure, various families, complete with father-figures, in the College: the administration, most of the departments, many of the staff courses within departments, many of the committees. Individuals live out their complex fates under the eye of a father who on the whole wants very much that others in the family become independent and productive. It is precisely this good will that may obscure from those who possess it that the "family" structure is itself not divinely ordained. Moreover, when those not in a paternal role are asked in terms set by those who are to be unwaveringly loyal, then the independence all profess to be desirable may be difficult to achieve. Women faculty, it has to be said, have been put in positions in which asked-for kinds and depths of loyalty have proved to be impossible. One egress here may be the very act of recognizing that the nature of these relationships is as it is.

As most people know, and as we have learned once more, not everyone (including a father or two) aspires to be a father. By definition women cannot be fathers, and it matters largely that they cannot be. Put another way, and returning to the first figure, many on the periphery do not aspire to the center as they see it functioning. Time and again the testimony we heard and read valued the marginalization of faculty women, for the center may be, and should be, instructed by how the circumference sees it as well as by how it sees itself. We would add that the role the Committee of Six (and the President) put our committee in is itself ambiguous: we mediate between the Committee, a group that is and imagines itself to be at the center, and the women colleagues it has asked us to study because it saw them as disempowered. We have, with whatever political realism we possess, often felt ourselves to be closer to the periphery than to the center. Perhaps that has helped us both to appreciate more what those not at the center

mean to the welfare of the College and to be sympathetic to how lonely and anxious it is out there. It is dangerous to live thus exposed too long, to have to feel simultaneously responsible for one's own well-being and for that of the College in its various incarnations as faculty, administration, and students. For that reason it is incumbent on all to make it less difficult to be a woman on the Amherst faculty--or, for that matter, to be black, or to be untenured. It is possible that the truest measure of the health of an institution is how the majority within it treats, as necessarily it must treat, the minority within it.

7

I. Are women faculty disproportionately burdened with committee and advising responsibilities?

When in the academic year 1981-82 the Dean of the Faculty, Catherine Bateson, had a preliminary study done of the distribution of committee work between male and female tenure-track faculty members, she discovered and announced to the faculty that 110% of the women held positions on College committees (some women are on more than one committee) while 60% of the men did. In a given year, then, women were almost twice as greatly represented on committees as men. The reasons for this disproportionate representation seem fairly simple. It is perceived as important that women, as they become included in the faculty numerically, also be included in the collective thinking of the College. It is also perceived as important that the nearly half of the student body who are women have at least some faculty counterparts among the various committees involved with academic standing, distribution of fellowship funds, admission, disciplinary matters, and so on. But the actual consequences and implications of the practice, as it has emerged, of distributing women faculty members, one each, among as many committees as possible have not been as obvious. Nor does the ratio 110:60 tell the whole story. The following figures, calculations, and recommendations do not pretend to exhaust the question, but provide a strong indication of how the committee system, among other practices, has operated to make the working conditions of women faculty members at Amherst significantly different from those of men faculty members.

It is important, in assessing the time spent on committee work and the impact of committee work on one's scholarly and teaching career, to consider how early in that career committee work begins and what pattern it takes over the course of several years. If the figure 110:60 points to the problem of sex-based inequity, the fact that women tend to be appointed to committees sooner after their arrival

I

at the College compounds the inequity. This disproportionate burdening is compounded a second time when, as has happened so far, the majority of men find their committee responsibilities leveling off or even decreasing, while women unanimously (in our sample) find them increasing the longer they remain at the College.

To illustrate the first point, that women are assigned to committee work earlier, take the case of the seven women and ten men who, as tenure-track appointees, began teaching at Amherst in 1974. By the academic year 1975-76, three of the women and none of the men were on committees. More recently, of the seven women and twelve men hired in 1981-82, four of the women and five of the men were on committees by June of 1983, already an unequal distribution. Further, though, one of these women was on two committees, while three of the men were untenured associate professors or advanced rather than beginning assistant professors (i.e., due to come up for tenure in fewer than six years). Thus first-level tenure-track female assistant professors hired in 1981 had by 1983 two and half times as many committee assignments as their male counterparts. And there were more of those counterparts to begin with.

It might be added that one female assistant professor serving on two committees, one very demanding, in June 1983, held a half-time appointment. Also that, generally speaking, women, whether half-time or full-time, are far more likely to be appointed to the major, more time-consuming committees earlier in their careers than men, and that their inevitable representation on ad hoc committees constitutes, for this small population, a further burden.

In those first few years of an assistant professorship, when male and female faculty members alike are engaged in designing and teaching new courses, in establishing the rhythms and priorities of their research careers, and, in some

I

cases, in starting a family, time for oneself is, of course, particularly valuable. The fact that the committee service expected of women is most radically discrepant from that expected of men during these crucial years may have particularly heavy consequences. Both research and childbirth have tended to get postponed. This situation is certainly inconsistent--in complicated as well as obvious ways--with the College's often-voiced policy of equal opportunity for male and female faculty members.

The consequences of this practice for female faculty morale have, in fact, been negative. Although it might happen that inclusion on a major committee would give a female assistant professor a sense of participation and belonging, the differential in rank between her and her committee colleagues, and her isolation from other women--constant features of the current practice--have tended to have the opposite effect. Junior and senior women faculty members alike have found their position in the committee system not empowering but tokenizing: their presence is said to be necessary in order to make committees representative, yet they are recurrently told that they are on committees because of their femaleness (not their competence), and their contributions and perspectives are too often treated as peripheral, biased, and unimportant.

During our interviews many women also spoke strongly to the effect that their voices on committees are not heard, or that when their ideas are taken up, these ideas are credited to male committee members. One senior woman, upon being asked if she had seen an improvement in the way she was heard over the past several years, stressed that she had neither experienced nor observed any. Women have only rarely been given leadership positions on committees, and two women who had been committee chairs felt that their time and efforts had been simply wasted. Their reports, both of them dealing with important matters of policy and personnel, were never answered, acknowledged, or acted upon. Both women reported that when

subsequent male chairs made similar reports, these reports were responded to and acted upon.

Women also feel that their committee service does not count for much during tenure evaluation, that their time would have been better spent on research and publication. Junior women have thus found themselves placed in the ironic situation of being encouraged to spend their time on service to the College and then being criticized for not having spent enough time doing research.

The problems of disproportionate burdening and tokenizing do not disappear after tenure and promotion. Some senior male faculty members are also heavily burdened, but there is far less range overall in the styles of commitment available to senior women. Tenured women are constantly in demand, whether they feel themselves to be gifted and effective committee workers or not, whether or not they have large research projects to attend to, and whether or not they have particularly demanding family responsibilities. There is little year to year systole and diastole in their working lives, whereas several male faculty members mentioned the welcome relief of being on no committees currently after an overburdened period in the past. Senior women faculty members feel the further pressure of knowing that if they refuse a committee assignment, the assignment may fall upon a junior woman. In fact, they are repeatedly told as much. Thus their loyalties are torn in new ways. The attempt to be supportive of junior women by reducing their committee burdens may result in putting senior women in a worse position from which to serve as scholarly mentors and intellectual role models for their junior colleagues. Junior women, in turn, looking forward to this proliferation of double binds and demands on their time in their own futures may think twice about trying to build a scholarly life at Amherst.

A further word should be said about the experiences of women (and men) with young children. Some faculty members, many or most of them women, have been

heavily pressured to compromise their responsibilities to their children in the face of inflexible committee demands. In one case a committee felt that it could not reschedule its meetings to accommodate a senior female faculty member with a small infant, but did feel it should do so to accommodate the athletic schedule of a student. The faculty member made every effort to find a mutually agreeable time to meet, but was told that other committee members "did not want" to meet at the one other time they were all free. She was also told that she could not be replaced on the committee "because she was a tenured woman." Apparently no one noticed the contradiction involved in theoretically needing her perspective, but refusing to make possible her participation in the committee by acknowledging the demands of her schedule.

The committee feels that measures need urgently to be taken to alleviate this set of pressures related to committee service for faculty women. It appears unlikely that these pressures will diminish of their own accord. From the present perspective, it does not look likely that the number of women on the faculty will increase very substantially within the next five to ten years, while committees have been, and may go on, proliferating at an alarming rate. Between 1966 and 1983 the number of faculty committees increased from eight to twenty-four. Twenty-seven of the forty-seven male faculty members responding to our questionnaire themselves reported that committee work has been unduly compromising of their teaching, their research, or both.

We recommend that the committee structure be pared down and streamlined, therefore, and that the assigning of faculty members to committees be democratized. All faculty members should be called upon to serve roughly equally. Both to ensure an equitable distribution of committee responsibilities, and to provide faculty members with a more secure upper limit on the amount of time they are expected to devote to committee work, we recommend that no more

than, say, three years of committee service (to be prorated in the case of faculty members on shorter tenure time-tables) be assigned to any faculty member before tenure, and that a comparable provision be made for senior faculty (four out of six years, for example). In the interests of making committee work more efficient, effective, and rewarding, committee tasks should be made more delimited and the institutional mechanisms for reporting and enacting the results of committee deliberations should be more clearly and adequately put in place. The faculty presence on some committees could probably be smaller (Faculty Housing, Student Fellowships, Admissions, Computer), and faculty members should be invited, via a questionnaire sent out prior to the Committee of Six meeting at which assignments are made, to indicate where they feel their particular expertise and interests might best be used. Faculty should also be invited to inform the dean which years within a given period of years it would be easiest and most convenient for them to serve on committees. By the same token, we feel that it should be made easier to refuse a committee assignment which is deemed inappropriate or badly timed. Currently, it sometimes happens that women who have chosen to teach half-time, specifically in order to hold the job within boundaries while they care for infants, are called upon to serve on one or more committees, while many teaching full-time are serving on none. Women have, at times, also been told that they are uncollegial when they try to arrange schedules that will be consistent from week to week. We surmise that using the computer to match information from faculty members with committee assignments would be relatively simple. More than one former member of the Committee of Six has testified to us that the current method of nominating people as they occur to members of the Committee, without always checking to see what other committee assignments they already hold and what other responsibilities already impinge upon their time, is clearly inadequate. Ironically, a member of our own committee had to request that she be relieved of

another committee assignment in order to pursue our project, even though our charge implied that the Committee of Six was concerned, at least in principle, about overburdening. No steps were taken to spare our colleague either the overburdening that would have resulted had she not objected, or the anxiety and potential disapprobation involved in resigning from or refusing a committee assignment. The goal in systematizing committee assignments would be to make committee work more purposeful and equitable and less time-consuming for everyone.

The actual costs in tokenism, isolation and overwork of having one woman on each committee seem far to outweigh the imagined benefits. Rather than asking women to pay this price for past sex discrimination, would it not be preferable to face the problem of there being too few women to go around? We further hope that with a more equitable distribution of committee assignments would come the possibility of women working with women on committees. This might prove an especially fruitful and "morale-boosting" experience for female faculty members teaching in otherwise all-male or predominantly male departments who rarely have the opportunity to work with members of their own sex, an opportunity that male faculty members can, of course, take for granted.

The College also needs to rethink its traditional and habitual expectation that faculty members be "on call" without regard to childcare responsibilities. Late afternoon meetings, for example, are most awkward for parents with young children, according to our interviews and questionnaires. Under no circumstances should the activities and responsibilities of childbearing and childrearing be regarded as unprofessional or illegitimate—not only for the sake of the children and parents involved, but also for the sake of our students. The College clearly assumes that the women and men it educates will have careers and, very likely, families. For the College to fail to accommodate the efforts of the women and men

on its faculty to work out the new living patterns which this combination of commitments requires would be notably inconsistent with its educational mission. Not every committee need avoid late afternoons. Children grow up, and not all committees are composed of parents with small children. But there is a strong feeling that if, in general, faculty members could hold formal meetings to within the hours of reasonable and consistent on-campus days, the felt conflict between work and family would be greatly reduced.

Advising

Traditionally at Amherst, because of its size and the emphasis it has placed upon teaching, the role of advising has been very important. Close and strong bonds of friendship and mentorship have often been established between students and their advisers which last for years after a student has graduated. Students are customarily treated as individuals; conversations often become quite personal. It might have been anticipated that when women began to be included on the faculty, the traditional paternal image of the faculty adviser would undergo some diversification, and that on the way to this diversification, some stress might be felt by students and female faculty members alike. When women were included in the student body, the possibilities for and the necessity of even further diversification in the student/adviser relationship might have seemed all the more inevitable. Yet there seems to have been very little discussion of these changes. We hope now to help remedy that situation as we report the experiences of faculty and students in the advising situation as we have heard about it this year.

At first glance female faculty members do not appear to be overburdened with respect to their male colleagues in their role as advisers. Among the respondents to our questionnaire, the number of advisees ranged from zero to thirty-five, but without there being any particular link to the gender of the

adviser. In our sample (in which female faculty are mostly represented by assistant professors and male faculty by full professors), the average number of advisees for women is 10.6 and for men 14.6. This difference may be explained by a number of facts: the proportion of junior women to junior men is much higher than that of senior women to senior men; first year faculty are not given advisees; departmental majors tend to choose senior faculty as advisers.

Interestingly, however, the average amount of time spent per week on advising is more for women by an hour. Women report they spend an average of 4.8 hours a week advising while men report an average of 3.7 hours a week. Even more suggestive is the contrast between the percentage of that time spent on personal matters. The women spend an average of about 40% of their advising time on these more personal matters, while men report spending half as much.

We surmise that a good deal of stereotyping underlies this pattern, and we are concerned about the consequences of this stereotyping for those women faculty who widely commented upon the pressure they feel from students to be warm, caring, more friendly, less aggressive than their male counterparts. One woman recalled a woman student coming to her in a highly emotional state over course work and then speaking to the male teacher in the same course as if she had no problems whatsoever. The difference in what students consider appropriate behavior with a female as opposed to a male professor may, in other words, make the hours that female faculty spend with students highly stressful. It may also confuse communication between colleagues who may see the same student presenting her- or himself in entirely different ways. In some cases, the credibility and professionalism of female faculty members have been questioned. Several women reported being spoken of disparagingly by their colleagues because of the preference shown by students for going first to women faculty for extra help, counseling, and reassurance. Sometimes a student's comment in a tenure letter

about how nice a female teacher is has been read by colleagues as a negative quality, as if intelligence and niceness were incompatible.

Some women further report that if and when they try to resist student pressure to play the more maternal, supportive role, they encounter deep resentment and harsh criticism. At the same time students sometimes equate supportiveness with a lack of intellectual rigor. In short, the stereotyping that is inevitably imported into the College from a still sexist society has acted to put women faculty in a (we submit) predictable double bind which has had subtle, various, and far-reaching effects on how women faculty are allowed to perform and upon how that performance is evaluated.

The consequences of such stereotyping are further complicated by the commitment many women faculty members feel toward the 700 or so women students at Amherst whose experiences and needs, by the very fact of their being in a formerly all male and still largely male-run institution, are likely to be different from those of male students. Many students, male and female, and some male faculty members continue to regard such needs and experiences as "special," peripheral, or in some way not completely legitimate. The time and energy spent by female faculty members on these concerns is, in practice, often discounted as lying outside the institutionally sanctioned patterns of socialization. Even the most activist feminist students (and others who feel themselves marginalized by the dominant culture) seem to perceive the role of women faculty in their lives in terms of personal rather than educational needs. Thus women faculty members, who perceive themselves as responding to, and following in the tradition of, Amherst's emphasis on the advising role, may not be receiving the institutional recognition, respect, and support they deserve.

We hope that by making such patterns of behavior and perception available for discussion, the evolution and assimilation of a healthy variety of styles and

I

roles can proceed with less ill-feeling. As is the case in so many of the issues raised by the presence of women faculty at Amherst, we need to bear in mind that our students will soon be encountering similar issues in their own working lives, and that these stresses and strains, if imaginatively treated, can play an important part in their education.

II. Do women faculty lack access to the informal collegiality that nurtures scholarly development and encourages full participation in the life of the College?

What, if any, are the consequences of the uneven distribution of women faculty across the departments of the College and among ranks? Have women been disproportionately appointed to visiting faculty positions?

We have merged these questions because the structure of the faculty so decisively shapes the kinds of collegiality available to women and men. The first appointment of a woman to the Amherst faculty occurred in 1962; in the next dozen years eleven more women were appointed; larger numbers of appointments began in 1974. Given the tendency here to hire at junior levels and to promote from within (something we do not propose to alter significantly), the College has, not unexpectedly, integrated women into the senior faculty slowly. The statistics are fairly telling: 96% of the full professors, 87% of the associate professors, and 65% of the assistant professors (for 1983-1984) are male. The lower the status the greater the number of women. Visitors in our community are perceived to have the least status (with the exception of some senior, distinguished visitors who have been almost uniformly male),¹ and it is worth noting that women constitute a majority of these: of the women hired from 1981 to 1983, in no year were more women hired to tenure-track positions than to visiting ones. We shall have more to say about the recent trend toward hiring women as visitors below, but we think it important to note here the statistical association between gender and rank in the Amherst faculty, and to discuss the consequences for academic life in some detail. (Observations about social life, to the extent that it is separable from academic life, appear in section V).

¹In 1983-84, eight senior visiting faculty, both part-time and full-time, were appointed to the College; one of these was a woman, an associate professor. Of the seven men, six were full professors and one was an associate professor. By contrast, at the assistant professor level, equal numbers of men and women were appointed: four women and four men.

The distribution of women across ranks gives a powerful message to our students. They come predisposed to take women less seriously as teachers and advisers, an impression then reinforced by finding so many young women at the lower ranks. Even if they do not know that 67% of the women, as opposed to 20% of the men are untenured, they will, as does society at large, associate status with age. So long as its hiring patterns remain so rarely flexible the College strengthens the stereotype.

Within the faculty, some similar consequences can be seen. Women serve often on committees, as we note above, yet rarely do they chair them. And then, because one must be a full professor in order to serve on an ad hoc personnel committee, women are almost never involved in the final stage of a search to hire at the senior level. That in a recent search specifically to hire a specialist in women's studies there was no woman on the ad hoc committee is an irony. The differences in rank also make women even less privy to the kinds of information that the College prizes than would the already existing "handicap" of gender. Few on the faculty ever work in a department, committee or office in which women are in the majority. One consequence of their being so rarely in positions of authority is that when women have chaired departments and committees or been senior administrators they have often worked twice as hard to dispel the belief that they will not be able to do the job or that they will find it difficult without the historical perspective that is so often valued in College discussions. In many interviews, women faculty told us that the frequent invocation of what has happened in the College in the last twenty, thirty or forty years seemed to them a reminder that there was an exclusive body of inevitably male knowledge that those who were newcomers could not immediately share. It is not "their" history, as it is not the history of those who are not white. Women here have felt at times that their opinions or values are not only not shared but are largely irrelevant.

Of the many channels for transmitting a historical perspective, academia has traditionally relied on mentoring. We use this somewhat awkward term to describe a teaching relationship between a senior and junior colleague, not necessarily of the same discipline or gender, but one which imparts to the junior colleague information and guidance in professional advancement. It is for "unfamiliar" groups, of which women constitute one, that mentoring is both most necessary and least likely. At least one study noted that such relationships are crucial to the well-being of faculty women.² Though women deserve as much as men from the protégé system, it is not at all clear to us that mentoring as we have understood it solves the problems one might expect it to solve.

Two questions present themselves: what access do women have to mentoring, and what benefits can they expect to derive from the mentoring system as it now exists? At Amherst women benefit from mentoring relationships less than one might hope both because there are far too few senior women at Amherst College to meet the demands of incoming women faculty and because there is a fear that being mentored by a man will be misunderstood. We cannot, then, simply recommend that we as a community strive for some idea of equal access to mentoring. Mentors are in short supply for women, to be sure, but the entire notion of acculturating, informing and advising in groups of two where one person is older and wiser seems not altogether appropriate to our increasingly diversified faculty. We would all benefit from wider attempts at collegial relations in which power figures less decisively, where information is exchanged more than received, where one can learn as much from peers as from superiors.

²Roberta M. Hall and Bernice R. Sandler, "Academic Mentoring for Women Students and Faculty: a New Look at an Old Way To Get Ahead" (published by the Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1983), p. 5.

Several women preferred as much. A female faculty member who had been denied tenure commented that much of the mentoring she had received, though well intentioned, was extremely paternalistic. She felt that her colleagues had been anxious to shape and mold her work and were naturally disappointed when they found that they had failed to do so. Others described the informal gatherings that women faculty used to organize (and which have begun again in the Fall of 1984, we note with pleasure) as fostering collegial relations among female faculty. Yet they felt that some members of the academic community were uneasy about women's gatherings. Along with the possibility of women working together, we hope to see an increased awareness of women and men sharing ideas about research, teaching and College life. Several women mentioned to us the infrequency of conversations about writing or research at the College, and many have indicated a desire to talk more about their writing or other interests than is now normally possible. Faculty seem to share ideas about students or College politics more readily than about their own research; were we to alter this no doubt difficult to alter habit, we might make it that much easier for those new to the College (who will certainly be able to speak about their writing more easily than about Amherst's internal politics) to feel that they can converse as equals, rather than as new-comers. Thus, alongside attempts to strengthen informal networks among female faculty, we believe that the College can openly encourage conversations about scholarship. The Red Room talks presented in the summer of 1983 by three faculty members who discussed their current research were but one instance of how this might work; small, not necessarily all-College gatherings to read together or discuss someone's ongoing research would also be welcome. Because the College's traditions have not vigorously promoted such conversations, wanting to assume that the protegé system will take care of them, we hope that, at least initially, senior administrators will become involved in facilitating such efforts.

tenure decisions were themselves granted tenure, misapprehensions about the process and those involved in it can arise. Individual meetings with the Dean of the Faculty, perhaps as often as once a year, might produce some anxiety, but we hope that these (optional) meetings would allow questions to be asked and would create the feeling that the ways in which faculty and administrators make personnel decisions are not entirely secret, not confined to public (and often bland) statements, and not something that might prove surprising at the time of tenure or reappointment. Other purposes might be served by these meetings as well: we recommend a rationalization of the committee appointment system in Section I; were there to come about a pattern of regular meetings with the Dean, committee assignments could be reviewed at that time. In addition, junior faculty members should be reminded of the other avenues of inquiry open to them. Each departmental chair is required by faculty legislation to have an annual discussion with untenured members of his or her department. We became aware that these conversations often do not occur and, when they do, sometimes seem timed to coincide with moments of greatest anxiety, just after re-appointment decisions and before tenure. One last thought: some junior faculty members have access to present or former members of the Committee of Six either in their department or through friendships they have formed. Further demystification of the tenure process would occur were present and past members of the Committee of Six more generally available, not so that they could reveal confidential information, but so that they, too, could answer questions about procedure and strategy.

We turn next to the uneven distribution of women across departments in the College. In 1983-84, of the twenty-seven departments and programs in the College which offer majors, there were no women faculty in five and only one woman in each of another ten: in the case of two of those ten departments, the women faculty were

What does exist at the College is a polarization of the kinds of discourse available within the faculty. Either we meet as a faculty in what some of our questionnaire respondents described as hopelessly formal gatherings (complete with cameo appearances) where an agenda can be followed but the exchange of ideas often inhibited. Or else we resort to gossip, to those private exchanges of secret information where women, because their access to information is seldom uncomplicated or vast, remain disadvantaged. We still lack possibilities for conversation somewhere between these self-consciously public performances and the often unreliable modes of private talk. No one answer can, or should, suffice; rather, we hope for several kinds of gatherings, small and large, formal and less so, where work can be discussed, news exchanged, plans for co-teaching or visiting lecturers formulated. Such meetings as the Little Three Colloquium, where members of our faculty join with colleagues from Williams and Wesleyan, need not be restricted to yearly events.

Finally, to conclude the subject of mentoring, there are certain kinds of information or advice, once conveyed privately and rather haphazardly, the absence of which has left at a loss those outside the College's somewhat mysterious communication network. To take an extreme example, one female colleague recalled a chance encounter (over the Library xerox machine) which yielded invaluable information about the tenure process. Since those without tenure will inevitably have questions about the formal procedure and about the often unspoken assumptions investing it, we think it very important that senior administrators take on the responsibility for thorough discussions with each new appointee, both in the orientation meetings and in additional individual conversations, about the ways of advancement within the faculty. Given the ever-increasing length, complicatedness, and formality of the tenure process, as well as the somewhat different conditions under which most of those who now make

visitors who are not in the College in 1984-85.³ With the exception of European Studies, there were in 1983-84 no more than three women in any program or department at the College. The unevenness in the distribution of women is even more evident among the (as until recently defined) divisions of the College. There are sixteen women and fifty-two men in the Humanities; eight women and forty-three men in the Social Sciences, and four women and thirty-five men in the Natural Sciences.⁴

Consider once again the consequences this disproportion has for students. More female students take courses and major in the Humanities than in the Social Sciences, and in the Social Sciences than in the Natural Sciences, in part because the distribution of female faculty in the three divisions conforms to this very pattern. This has not only perpetuated a traditional sex-typing of roles among students but has also made it difficult for some female faculty, above all in the Natural Sciences, to gain the respect of students.

The uneven distribution of women by department and division within the College often erodes women's sense of efficacy. Many women feel that they neither speak nor are heard as much as would be the case were other women present. Nor, as the responses to our questionnaires indicate, do female faculty consider themselves as active as their male colleagues in department meetings. This is unrelated to.

³In this listing of twenty-seven departments and programs, we have included Neuroscience, Asian Studies and European Studies but excluded Legal Studies and Education. The figures we have used, which are drawn from the 1983-1984 College catalogue, include visiting faculty of all ranks other than "instructors." In some cases, of course, faculty members are cross-listed in more than one department or program.

⁴These figures are drawn from a memorandum from Jane Robinson to Acting Dean Richard Fink on October 25, 1983.

differences in the rank of the respondents: a third of the tenured women, and more than a third of the untenured, would like to participate more often and actively than they do (perhaps curiously, all of the tenured male respondents claimed to be satisfied with the extent and forms of their participation).

The isolation which many women experience is often compounded by their expertise in fields which have traditionally been considered marginal to their disciplines. Several women who resigned or were denied tenure or reappointment, and whose teaching or research concerned nontraditional, new, or politically marked fields, felt unable to share their scholarly interests with most of their colleagues. One of these women commented that she not only had to prove herself as a woman but also had to convince skeptical colleagues of the importance of her field of research. Other women, in predominantly male departments, spoke of the pressure they feel to represent the "female perspective." But one woman noted that, when she did so, she was often accused of "knee jerk feminism."

Some women are alienated by the style of interaction among male members of their departments, a style they describe as abrasive, competitive and conflictual. A senior female faculty member commented, "there is the sense that bright people are abrasive and less bright people are nice." Another woman felt that intellectual toughness was often assumed to be inextricably linked to personal toughness. Yet a female assistant professor noted that women are not simply expected to assimilate stereotypical male behavior, for "there are two conflicting demands on women: to be silent and decorous and to perform." It is difficult if not impossible for women to meet these contradictory expectations and demands; moreover, when women are isolated in an all-male (or nearly so) work environment, the pressures are intensified and the support scarce.

One of the most attractive features of Amherst College to those who fear isolation within a department has been its long tradition of interdisciplinary

teaching. In response to our questionnaire, women indicated a somewhat greater desire than male respondents to co-teach, particularly in non-departmental staff courses. Why? First, men, on the average having been at the College longer, have already taught a broader range of extra-departmental courses than have women. A larger proportion of male than of female faculty report having co-taught courses other than ILS.

Second, interdisciplinary teaching provides many women with an opportunity they otherwise lack to share their intellectual interests with colleagues. Many women, as we have remarked, find themselves marginalized in their departments not only because they are women, but also because they teach or do research in women's studies and other fields of little interest to many of their colleagues. This problem particularly concerned several of the women who decided not to stand for tenure or were denied tenure. One of these women told us that in her department the staff-taught introductory course was premised upon assumptions which were contrary to her theoretical and pedagogical approach. Although her colleagues offered her some space in the syllabus, she believed that to subsume her material within their structure of assumptions would result in form of "curricular tokenism."

Third, the forms of co-teaching which most faculty engage in--staff-taught departmental courses--are often particularly stressful for women. In contrast to the male faculty we interviewed, several tenured and untenured women spoke of the difficulties they experienced in teaching with male departmental colleagues who dismissed or disregarded their contributions. A number of women felt strongly enough about this to tell us (though they would not always tell their own departments) that they would prefer to teach interdisciplinary courses with colleagues outside their departments. We are aware that opportunities to teach outside one's department vary. Particularly in small departments or in those with

large demands for staffing core courses, colleagues may find little time left over once required courses are covered. As the faculty moves to raise the FTE ceiling, we urge administrators and departmental chairs to remember the College's commitment to interdisciplinary teaching and to attempt to staff every department so that all faculty will be able to teach one course outside the department every year, as was once openly held to be a desirable goal in faculty recruiting. We particularly urge this commitment to interdisciplinary options in order to make it easier for women isolated in departments where there are few or no other women to form collegial relations with women and men outside their department.

We turn now to the Committee of Six's question about women in visiting positions. Alarmed by the decline in the number of women on the faculty, from thirty-three to twenty-seven between 1979 and 1980, the Dean of the Faculty made a concerted attempt to correct for unsatisfactory progress in recruiting women to tenure-track positions by recruiting more women to visiting positions. Partly as a result of her efforts, of the total number of women hired in 1981, 70% (seven out of ten) were visitors; in 1982, 67% (four out of six) were visitors; and in 1983, 80% (four out of five) were visitors. Of the total number of men hired, in 1981, 75% (nine out of twelve) were visitors; in 1982, 56% (nine out of sixteen) were visitors; and in 1983, 53% (ten out of nineteen) were visitors.

The Dean had hoped that the increased presence of female visiting faculty would be beneficial to students and faculty and would encourage some departments to hire more women. She, along with other faculty whom we interviewed, later felt this to have been a mistake: it created the illusion of a larger and more enduring female presence on campus than in fact existed. While one department has hired three women as of 1984-85, because these are all visiting appointments there may be no women in this department the year after. We have heard the fear expressed that appointing women to visiting positions obscures the unwillingness of some

departments to appoint them to regular positions. One administrator commented, "Many departments prefer short term risks to long term commitments when hiring women." A few faculty members reiterated this view. We learned finally that many of the two and three year visitors whom we interviewed properly considered themselves disadvantaged in having to share or annually change offices, being left for last, regardless of rank or years at the College, in the housing lottery, and not being given lab set-up money.

While many visiting faculty, then, feel that they are treated as "less than full colleagues," they also feel overburdened by the College. Several two and three year visiting faculty whom we interviewed said they were expected to participate in College and departmental advising, in committees, and in job searches, some of which work they had been spared in their first year. Visitors who hoped that their positions might be made tenure-track felt especially obliged to undertake these responsibilities. One woman described this extended probationary period as "a long interview in which your peers become judges." These faculty had little time to devote to the research and writing which would largely determine their professional advancement at Amherst and elsewhere.

The problems described above, which stem from the temporary nature and often the uncertain future of visiting appointments, concern more female than male visitors, for many more male than female visiting faculty are tenured elsewhere. By hiring disproportionately large numbers of women as junior visitors, the college in effect reinforces the imbalance in regular appointments listed above. Consider for a moment the very connotations of the terms "regular" and "visiting" faculty. For male faculty tenured elsewhere the term "visitor" might be considered an honor; for untenured female visiting faculty it simply means that they lack regular appointments.

For many reasons, therefore, we recommend against the practice of hiring a

disproportionately large number of women to visiting faculty positions as the College did in 1982-83. Appointing women on a temporary basis should not be a substitute for the appointment of women to tenure-track positions. We also urge the College to appoint more female visiting faculty at the senior level, for they would experience less vulnerability and uncertainty than junior visiting faculty. By hiring women tenured elsewhere to visiting positions, the College could also enhance the image many students have of women faculty. Again, this is not a substitution for the continuing efforts to hire senior women with tenure.

We recommend too that the College exert itself to make visiting faculty feel that they are full members of the community. Visiting faculty should be provided with research funds and facilities: we learned of unhappy cases where they have been withheld. And the orientation sessions held in the early fall should include information which is relevant specifically to visitors, to those for whom information about the tenure process is by definition beside the point. When orientation sessions focus, at least rhetorically, more on how to get tenure at the College than on how to work here productively, whatever one's term of appointment, a double message is sent, insulting those who will never stand for tenure and intimating to those who will that the tenure decision is practically the only moment of their lives at the College that counts.

One could argue that for visitors to be "full" members of the community, they should share in all responsibilities of the faculty. We do not completely agree. The salient issue here is committee and advising assignments, an area in which all women have been overburdened because they are women. We should not exploit the predominantly female group of visiting faculty for opportunistic relief of this local problem. If the College policy remains that visitors are not routinely assigned to committees (or given many advisees), then exceptions should not be made for women because they are women. Exceptions should be made, however, on the

basis of individual desire. If, as we recommend in section I, the committee assignment system is changed to one which takes into greater account information solicited from faculty members about their preferences in committee work, then visitors should also get a letter of inquiry, perhaps one which specifies that they are not expected to serve on any committee at all, but may, if they wish to.

Finally, visiting faculty should be given the most accurate and complete information possible about the likelihood of their positions being made into regular positions for which they could apply. There is a real danger that visitors will serve on committees, advise seniors and teach independent study courses, etc., in the hope that they will become tenure track appointees. If this change in status is unlikely or impossible, they should be told so explicitly at the time that they are hired so that they can use their time at Amherst College to their best advantage. We serve ourselves and those who visit here when we make the visitors' experience as professionally productive as possible.

III. Do students bring different assumptions to their evaluation of the competence of male and female faculty? Do faculty?

The questionnaires and our conversations with colleagues and students (resident counsellors) consistently indicated that the two sexes attain authority as teachers and respect as colleagues by different routes that may predetermine the formal evaluations made. That is, different assumptions about men and women shape careers long before votes are taken about their continuation. By a factor of two-to-one on the questionnaires faculty women saw significant differences between the sexes in the evaluation of competence; by the same margin, men did not--an asymmetry that in itself suggests a problem.

We concede from the outset that the attitudinal issues here confronted do not lend themselves to precise or comprehensive summation; if this report dealt with no other topic, it would leave us still groping for a beginning. We did not have access to the confidential letters written by students and faculty to advise reappointment and tenure review. As elsewhere, the differences between male and female get obscured by parallel distinctions between seniority and youth, conventional and new fields. Professorial "competence" in itself entails a range of sometimes discontinuous functions: as intellect, as role model, as one who speaks for the institution, as gossip, as fixture. Though intellectual respect is the official currency of pedagogical and collegial interchange, careers may depend more on the receipt of attention, encouragement, and inside information.

Students

Students arrive at what may well have been their father's school, but necessarily not their mother's. The tradition of good teaching to which they subscribe in electing Amherst seems regularly perceived as a male tradition newly augmented with appropriate purveyors of the "women's viewpoint." One colleague reports the

following observation from a freshman: "I had a lot of women teachers in high school; I expected something better at Amherst." Male students often feel justified therefore in taking women faculty less seriously; female students may exert particular pressures for the women to serve as role models. Different teaching environments shape these expectations variously: highly interactive teaching (e.g., foreign language instruction and athletic coaching) can surmount initial prejudice particularly easily. Fields where ideology constantly figures (e.g., concerning politics and aesthetics) may put female instructors at a continuing disadvantage, since the skills to be demonstrated and the results sought remain endlessly controversial. Where the presence of women is particularly anomalous (e.g., the natural sciences) women students often expect women faculty to embody professorial style in a traditional and rigid way, while the men may expect lower standards or more sympathy. Some of the popular teaching styles are relatively unavailable for women or unwanted. To quote one respondent: "The predominant teaching style (in my department), established by men, is brash, showy, sarcastic, rough, challenging, witty. It's not clear that alternative styles are accepted fully." Several of our women colleagues reported that Amherst had attracted them because of its reputation for seminars and common inquiry, but that in practice a less formal or confrontational approach often gets mistaken by students and colleagues alike as a sign of laxness or incompetence. Extensive interaction in office hours got perceived as mothering rather than as teaching. "Colleagues seem unable to decouple intellectual and personal toughness in a teaching style."

Faculty

In evaluating disciplinary competence, we found considerable effort in all quarters to be even-handed, though some colleagues argued that women candidates

had to provide more "concrete evidence" to attain tenure, perhaps, one observed, "because they are perceived as unknown entities, the qualities of whose minds it is difficult to judge." Even departments find themselves in the familiar dilemma: to credit a tenure candidate's contribution to the community as a woman is to imperil her chances of being taken seriously as a professional; not to do so is to deprive her of credit for the very advantages that her perspective as a woman has offered the community and for the demands put upon her by virtue of her sex. Such is the pattern of confidentiality in the College that only the Committee of Six and the administration can judge their own impartiality in these judgments.

Whatever the institutional commitment to equity, it is not matched by a sufficient sense of the complexities that equity might entail. The arrival of women at Amherst coincided with diversification into new areas (e.g., the third world, new ideological perspectives, dance and studio art). Many of the women hired therefore have found themselves doubly marginalized--as we have remarked more than once--by the unfamiliarity of their fields as well as of their gender, and saddled with a burden of proof on both counts that makes them wonder why they were hired in the first place.

In departmental, committee, and teaching situations, women have frequently found themselves as the single bearer of the "women's perspective," which they were obliged either to represent or, to gain credibility, strenuously avoid, while on the same issues their male colleagues enjoyed impartiality as a birthright. With some regularity, and again we deliberately repeat ourselves, women colleagues reported to us that they are interrupted more than their male colleagues and quoted in the minutes strangely little. In all interchanges, the women are further shackled by the problem of having problems, that is, of belonging to a group feared to be alienated. Male faculty, unless in minority groups, are not subjected to the same concern about whether they are "happy here" and the lurking

expectation that, if not, they should leave. As one former colleague, a woman, reports: "I was told repeatedly that I was unhappy at Amherst because I belonged at a university and in a city. If one felt strongly about something or wanted to speak loudly, one only got told that the place is too small for that."

In the political arena, women find themselves more or less permanently barred from speaking for the College at large in the way that some of their male colleagues can. Even a very eloquent, experienced, and influential voice can still be perceived to be speaking for women at Amherst rather than for "Amherst." With some frequency, women colleagues witnessed to the sense of being interlopers, of having no expectation of ever being fully a part of the place.

In an institution given to highly ritualized informality, collegial respect may express itself most credibly and useably in the gift of confidential information. It is with such intimacies that newcomers first feel themselves "included in" and taken seriously. Here women, like any minority, find themselves comparatively excluded from the central networks and judged harshly for having their own. They forego thereby the self-esteem and prestige of being someone to whom others turn for information and advice, as well as the insulation against rumor, overreaction, and paranoia that is provided by accurate information.

Like any community, the College assimilates newcomers on the basis not just of talent and energy, but also of timely passivity. More than many institutions the College traditionally has shaped its junior faculty as it does its students and preferred to keep those who wear the imprint best. Even today an observation such as "this writing shows that _____ has spent the last six years at Amherst" can serve as a decisive kind of praise. While the molds that men can fit are (for better or worse) clear to all, women here lack even a well-defined path of least resistance, let alone established models of attainment. Though the covertness and subtlety of these expectations prevent judgments about how much they help or hurt

particular women, it is clear that, as men do not, women confront an element of stressful unpredictability in the judgments made about their docility. One woman reported friendly advice from an established colleague: "Try to look as if you have always been here." Women are at a considerable disadvantage in attaining that aura of inevitability. Within the community values they are being asked to internalize lurks a degree of hostility to their very presence here.

A final source of the discomfort women at Amherst experience may be a traditional, and perhaps once creative, paradox in our collegial identity: we tend to trust each other more in the classroom than out of it. Repeated opposition to curricular requirements, for instance, often presents itself as our faith in each other's ability to teach without artificial restraints. Most of us enjoy great latitude in designing our own courses and in bridging disciplines beyond what other institutions would allow. But as if to guard that freedom from abuse we have been quite orthodox in our expectations about each other's private lives and work habits: that is, about living uprightly and within walking distance, sacrificing Tuesday evenings without demur, letting committee service take what evenings and weekends it will, keeping our most serious doubts to ourselves and our complaints within accepted bounds of innocuousness, and suggesting by gesture and implication that the College is the most important thing in our lives, as for many it seems to be. There is a powerful sense that without these rituals of loyalty education at Amherst will disintegrate. But with them, and the homogeneity they reinforce, that education risks becoming irrelevant to the fuller population it now hopes to serve. Such contradictions are not easily resolved; we hold up this traditional mirror only so that the reader might take notice of what he or she sees.

Given the range and complexity of the problems at hand, are we making

progress? The number of women who have taught here grows and should in itself militate against stereotyping. Yet more have left than remain, and the current numbers have not shown steady growth. The women faculty in service will therefore long remain outnumbered by those who have left bitterly and overshadowed by the traditions sprung of that exodus. At Amherst, where success is our most important product, these uncharacteristic failures have consolidated themselves into myths that shape perceptions of current realities. Two types emerge: one is the saint/superwoman--a reproach to us all--who shows that it can be done and who would not want us to brood about the price she has paid. Women who do not measure up to that ideal should not blame the institution. They belong to the larger and highly elastic category derived from the tradition that "we hired the wrong ones." As one former colleague observed, "Any perceived alienation led to the assumption that you belonged elsewhere." Those at tension with the institution are thereby invited to feel themselves among this surprisingly large group of aberrations who had no business coming in the first place and failed their gender as well as the College. We lacked these myths a decade ago and cannot yet grasp how much damage they will ultimately do. Experience accumulates, but we have learned how not to learn from it.

This area does not lend itself to particular recommendations. We cannot legislate values. We can only point out that as long as the formation of those values is left virtually altogether to the medium of private conversation, they will evolve peculiarly. It is not just that prejudice thrives in covertness, but that victims of the current situation are left to suffer and react in isolation. A commonplace, but always moving, aspect of our interviews was that our colleagues had not previously encountered public discussion of issues that so shape their work here. Maladjustments perceived as personal failings turned out with some frequency to be so commonplace as to suggest their origin in institutional

structure. Within our interviews colleagues frequently expressed their pleasure at discovering a form of institutional discourse that was less hierarchical and procedural than faculty meetings. Given the community's great distrust of special-interest caucusing, the administration would do well to foster continuing discourse on these issues above the level of gossip and private reaction.

IV. Is the absence of a separate women's studies program perceived as a signal that scholarship on women is less valued?

The question thus framed would seem to focus on morale; our colleagues suggested much else. Does the College even support the feminist modes of inquiry central to a women's studies curriculum? Can feminist research be fairly evaluated at the times of tenure and reappointment? Can students find their way easily to current women's studies offerings and what kind of message do they get from the institution's relative neglect of this area? Will first-rate feminist teachers and scholars come to a college without a formalized program? Will first-rate students?

Prior even to these issues is the desirability of any institutional commitment to women's studies. A central part of the intellectual history of our time involves increased awareness of the significance of gender and all that follows from an insight into sexual inequality. Throughout the social sciences and humanities, new attention to ideologies of sexual subordination have refocused long-standing debates and led to entirely new questions. Women whose activities were left out of conventional histories are being discovered. The very notion of history as a record of public (and usually male) achievement is being challenged. In literary studies, beyond the ongoing critique of canon formation, the prevalence of a feminine readership in the modern period has been examined. We have come to acknowledge the possibility of a feminine language, how hard it is to say what is feminine, and, most of all, the relationship between language and empowerment. Just as critics have asked why women are inevitably written "about" or "to," art historians and film theorists have tried to imagine a visual practice in which the viewer is not inevitably male, and the object, not inevitably female.

In sociology attention has turned to the coercive ideologies that make family life normative, while anthropologists have long observed how varied sexual and

childrearing arrangements can be. Political scientists have discovered the gender gap, activists and theorists are debating the relationship between pornography and rape. Economists have asked how women's domestic labor supports the public economy; some have tried to define the material bases for a political system seen as male-dominated. In the natural sciences, historians of science have uncovered the contributions of earlier women scientists despite hostile working conditions; to study theories of sex differences, sex roles have been analyzed in the contexts of biology (what difference does it make that women bear children) and psychology (and that in most cultures, they rear them). In all cases, the perspectives of feminist women and men on a mode of thinking that has excluded them has made it possible to see how this thinking is neither natural nor incontestable. Women's studies projects have, at least recently, tried to be particularly sensitive to issues of race, class and ethnicity, enabling further debates about the possibility of any "mainstream" academic inquiry which does not marginalize someone. These debates demonstrate that those engaged in women's studies see it functioning both interdisciplinarily and within existing disciplines. None of this is to suggest that there is certainty or closure about what feminism is or what it entails in scholarship. What can no longer be denied is the significance of feminism itself as an object of inquiry.

This is by no means an exhaustive summary of contributions made by feminists in recent memory; it could be observed, however, that even this short list of concerns finds its way into the Amherst curriculum largely by luck or accident. Our questionnaires and interviews clearly attested to the difficulties in teaching courses at Amherst College that were either focused on women or dependent on feminist methods of inquiry. Untenured women in particular felt little encouragement in that direction and suspected considerable risk. Women feared that their credibility might be at stake; as many men as women assumed that such

"radical" work could only be considered by those with tenure. That a few departments support feminist inquiry makes the College's general lack of organized response to this area look all the more glaring.

As a result, the grass roots efforts that have been traditionally relied upon to create a program or department are thwarted. The evidence suggests that there is a fair amount of interest in women's studies but little research and teaching in the field and even less hiring. Only one-fourth of the respondents to our questionnaire answered that they taught either small units on women or used feminist methods of inquiry in their seminars. Just over half of our respondents are in departments that have considered hiring someone with expertise in women's studies, but only one search to date has both specified and ultimately hired such a candidate. The numbers of courses offered are about what one would expect: in 1984-85, the women's studies section of the catalogue will list a record number of courses, twelve, eleven of which will be given (out of some 400 courses offered in the College as a whole). In past years, the women's studies courses have been reasonably popular--an achievement, considering the scant encouragement offered students to take such courses and the haphazard manner in which they are coordinated. There is no coordination, to speak of, as evidenced by the imbalance between fall and spring courses (for example, in 1982-1983 there were four courses in the spring, none in the fall; in 1984-1985, there will be three fall courses, eight in the spring).

In order that we serve our students' needs better, that we not allow our curriculum to become obsolescent, and that we better attract and retain feminist scholars, we believe that the time has come for some structure that can support and further the aims of women's studies. Amherst College has a strong tradition of interdisciplinary studies; it is completely appropriate, as it is overdue, that in a more formal and more extensive way women's studies be a presence on our

campus. The "negative signal" created by the lack of this structure needs to be ended: it will be easier to hire and keep scholars in women's studies when we have a program or department that can either jointly or fully appoint them, and which can work with existing departments to ensure a hospitable environment for feminists when they are interviewed and when they begin to work here.

How, then, to effect what we believe should be effected? We recommend that the President and the Committee of Six appoint a committee to design a proposed Program or Department of Women's Studies. Their proposal, we hope, would be reviewed by the Committee on Educational Policy and the Committee of Six and voted on by the faculty. We suggest that this committee be created because it seems clear that evidence of support for women's studies from the senior administration and the Committee of Six is essential and because it is important that the proposal then go through regular channels for approval in order to ensure its credibility throughout the community. Not everyone will favor the new department or program, to be sure. Nor should one assume that the staff is meant to be co-extensive with the population of female professors at Amherst or that it would be restricted to women.

The first task of the new women's studies entity is co-ordination of existing women's studies courses and planning for new offerings. We urge that an introductory women's studies course be added as soon as possible and that a fuller curriculum be designed in consultation with the CEP and with as many interested members of the community as is possible. Current differences among departments need to be considered carefully and additional appointments sought: some fields are adequately covered while others are severely neglected. Of immediate concern are women's history, gender and science, feminist social theory, and women in the arts.

Second, it is equally important that the new program or department be reliably staffed. The College has invited, if unconsciously, the widespread impression

that feminist scholarship does not get fairly evaluated. Since the institution's own rules of confidentiality prevent it from dispelling whatever may be false in this impression, it should pursue all the more vigorously the positive steps open to it in supporting feminist scholarship. One action that cannot help but improve the atmosphere is to ensure that feminist scholarship is evaluated at least in part by those who believe in its positive values. It matters that all members of the faculty feel a sense of confidence that their work will be judged on its merits, particularly given the very sensitive history of tenure cases involving research about women and feminist methodologies. A women's studies department or program that can participate actively in the tenuring of its members is much needed. The committee on women's studies should keep firmly in mind the advantages of a department that votes on the hiring and tenuring of its members versus a program which, under current faculty legislation, does not.

Third, the women's studies entity should be well-funded and generously supported from the start. An adequate budget, secretarial resources, and office and lounge space are essential. There is foundation money available to encourage development of women's studies programs, as other area colleges have demonstrated, and outside funding should certainly be sought. We judge it necessary that Amherst College commit some of its own money, partly for reasons of morale, but more importantly to ensure that a women's studies effort not become perpetually underfunded and dependent on the shifting fancies of granting organizations.

Finally, a women's studies department or program, should one come about, would need to steer between the equal dangers of becoming isolated from the rest of the curriculum, or of becoming entirely assimilated. If fully "mainstreamed," those in the program or department might feel a need to blunt the critical edge of their courses to make them conform more readily to the general curriculum. The choice between program or department should be addressed with these issues in mind,

though much more is at stake. Our research indicates a strong preference for jointly appointed faculty in women's studies; all "studies" departments in the College now have their members jointly appointed with another department. Were women's studies to follow this model, as we hope it will, its faculty will have ample opportunity to teach with their colleagues in departments, including the two that have appointed them. The creation of a department or program in women's studies cannot be seen as relieving the rest of the curriculum of all responsibility to confront feminist methodological and substantive challenges. We believe it to be the fear that women's studies faculty would be nothing if not thoroughly marginalized that has kept some of the very colleagues who work in women's studies from actively campaigning for a program or department capable of supporting them.

There is, then, a large network of issues that a women's studies program or department will address. But how women's studies relates to the curriculum as a whole is too complex to be dealt with solely by the introduction of a new program or department. We also recommend the establishment of a comprehensive program of faculty development in women's studies. As a way to encourage continuing integration of women's studies courses into existing departments, we suggest that new funds be made available for summer and sabbatical grants for investigations into feminist scholarship or into research about women. One possible model would have small grants (around \$3,000) to be disbursed over the next ten years, several each year, with some distribution for rank, age, and gender among the recipients.

In addition, the Bruss Readership could profitably be expanded to more than one appointment per year so that its provisions for course release time and faculty re-education would benefit more members of the faculty. The delay in appointing the first Bruss reader and the decision to seek a readership rather than an endowed professorship have been seen by some as

indications of the College's low level of commitment to women and to women's studies. By expanding the program, rather than cutting it, the College can begin to change that impression. It is important that women's studies be made a priority of the institution in all ways, including financial ones. Finally, we recommend that extra travel money be made available for all members of the faculty wishing to attend women's studies conferences. As in any rapidly developing field, communication with scholars on other campuses is particularly useful, all the more so while women's studies is at an early stage. The travel allowance is now barely sufficient to cover the expenses of attending conferences in one's traditionally defined discipline; we think it important that colleagues not be required to choose between keeping up with fields they have always explored and turning to new areas of inquiry.

One colleague whom we interviewed said that the changes surrounding women's studies should not make anyone feel threatened, that people should be made "more comfortable." In a way, that is one thing that we hope for--that those doing research in women's studies will feel less "odd," less isolated in the community. But we also hope that the discomforts attending the changes that we propose, and surely there will be some, will be perceived as challenges worth meeting. The presence of a vital women's studies undertaking and the accompanying changes in existing departments will make our curriculum more responsive to the needs of those we teach, raise the morale of those of us who have seen such work discouraged or disparaged, keep us in touch with important developments in scholarship and, at the same time, contribute to making Amherst College the kind of educational institution that can attract and retain a fuller range of scholars and students.

V. Are the regularly accepted practices of the College predicated on a model of the one-career family with spouse's support?

This question is more than a little ungainly. Where to stop when making a list of "regularly accepted practices"? And are not all three of those words in one or another way problematic? Having picked and chosen, perhaps it is not after all surprising that we begin with tenure, a matter so long fetishized at Amherst that it would necessarily appear somewhere in this report, even though no question in our charge specifically speaks to it. To turn first to tenure may itself suggest something of a problem for women at the College. It is striking, in any case, that more than twenty years after the first tenure-track appointment of a woman, more than fifteen after the consistent membership on the faculty of two or more tenured and/or tenure-track women, and nine years after coeducation began at Amherst, a number of departments have yet to see a woman stand for tenure, much less be appointed with it. In not one of the departments of physical science or mathematics has a woman been appointed with or stood for tenure (the first to stand will do so in the fall of 1984), and the same is true of the second and third largest departments in the social sciences as well as the third largest in the humanities. It is not a happy record. The obvious solution is to hire more women faculty both with tenure and in tenure-track junior positions. This report addresses such a need in many places and in many ways, as it does the need to improve the conditions of work for women faculty who are and will be at the College. It is common knowledge that in case after case women have chosen not to stand for tenure, resigning for reasons of principle before, and sometimes long before, the year of decision. By our count, and as of fall 1983, at least eleven women on tenure-track appointments have resigned before the tenure decision, whereas only twelve women teaching faculty have been granted tenure in the twenty-one years women have been in tenure-track positions. Another group has not.

been given a renewal appointment, thereby eliminating by definition a chance at tenure. A number of men faculty fall into these categories, too, but in a proportion significantly less than that of women. Recent history demonstrates that about two-thirds of those hired with a chance of tenure do not receive it. Through both interviews and questionnaires we have found no subject generating more faculty thought and feeling than the tenure-review process itself, and in particular the tenure clock. The present practice appears to work, sometimes, to the disadvantage of women.

When, under the usual circumstances, the College requires a decision earlier than some of its peer schools--in the sixth year--it has to assume a life in the main free from certain "distractions" such as childbearing and/or being responsible for childrearing. So to assume was not unreasonable when in the standard pattern of American professional life faculty, nearly all of whom were men who lived at or near the College, did not have primary responsibility for raising children. Many were not married, some who were married had no children, and most, married and with a child or children, had wives who did the bulk of the childrearing. Now that a great many junior faculty at Amherst do not fit any of these patterns, it may be time to consider revising the tenure clock. We note that sentiment for doing so is strong among both sexes and across the ranks.

We recommend that the probationary period be extended to eight years; that for each childbirth a faculty member of either sex be allowed leave at 60% pay for one year or at 100% pay for one term, this leave not to be included in the eight-year period if the candidate so desires and not to count as leave when determining eligibility for a sabbatical; that the College normally commit itself to supplying a replacement when a faculty member is on maternity or paternity leave; that regular appointments during the probationary period be in four-year units (which might also better suit the current regular-leave policy) rather than three; and

that, with the concurrence of the department, a candidate be allowed to stand for tenure before the eight (or more) years have expired if he or she chooses. The faculty on whom we tried this set of proposals in interviews were enthusiastic about them all. Junior faculty generally thought that having the option of a longer probationary period was in their interest for a number of reasons: the increased reliance, observed by all, on published work in the tenure deliberations; increased committee assignments for junior faculty in the early years; the increased likelihood that spouses would be working as well as that one or both of the partners in a marriage would be commuting; and the knowledge that one's chances of a good job after Amherst, were tenure not granted here, would be increased if one has had more time in which to gain recognition in the national community of scholars. A majority of senior faculty seemed to approve for these very reasons and also because, like junior faculty, they know that it does indeed happen that tenure decisions are now sometimes made before those making the decision have as much information about a candidate as they feel they would want. The chief objection to this lengthening of the probation might be that unsuccessful candidates would be searching for the next position, if they searched, at an age that could put them at a further disadvantage vis-à-vis those coming out of graduate school. All junior faculty we talked with said they would readily accept this trade-off, especially if they had the option of a decision before the eighth year. The cost of a more liberal maternity leave policy and the introduction of a paternity leave policy (Stanford, incidentally, has both) would, we believe, be more or less offset by the slower promotion schedule an eight (and sometimes more than eight) year clock would entail. Again, those asked said they would willingly forego promotion, salary, and status for the longer probation. There is a perhaps inevitable danger that to increase the waiting period would increase the expectation of scholarly performance proportionately: once more, our

respondents would willingly accept that expectation. Another possible danger would be that the reappointment review in the fourth year could become tantamount to tenure review. Here, too, although we would like to see that review be more rigorous and would like to have its substance conveyed to the candidate more fully and more openly than is now the case, we would want it understood that reappointment would not constitute putative tenure. We considered one further possibility, that of not beginning the clock until the dissertation is finished--or at least delaying for as long as two or three years in such cases. In the end we thought, and so did those to whom we talked, that adding those years to the eight (plus) might constitute an exploitation of junior faculty that would ill become the College. But we hope that the Committee of Six would hesitate even more than it does now before it assigns to time-consuming committees faculty who have not finished their dissertations. Our belief is that the more liberal policy here put forward would be a significant factor in recruiting women (and men) junior faculty and then in retaining them. And there is no question that what is now a major anxiety among junior faculty would be somewhat relieved: the present tenure clock does cause people to delay having children, and not infrequently, by their own testimony, it prevents people from having them. No one would argue that that is a small price to pay.

We have one more recommendation in this area, one that will no doubt be resisted strenuously by some but one that we think would in certain cases work to the desired advantage of women (and men) junior faculty. We believe that it would be constructive were there to be present from the beginning of a departmental tenure or reappointment review proceeding a member of another department. This outside reviewer, who would have to be approved by the candidate and by the candidate's department, would ensure that the department followed all necessary procedures, but he or she would not independently evaluate the candidate's work

and thus would not have a vote. Our thought is that an outside reviewer could bring to the conversation a perspective that might make it more thorough and less biased (in whatever way) than it may on occasion now be. The reviewer could also ensure, as has not always happened, that the department give the candidate as complete and frank an evaluation as possible after the review. We realize that the procedure we recommend may often be unnecessary and may occasionally encumber departmental deliberations, but we believe that more would be gained than lost. It seems to us that, despite ILS and the infrequent colloquium, the College is in a period in which departmentalism has been carried about as far as is healthy. To reduce it even slightly in tenure and reappointment matters should be desirable. For example, although it may happen only rarely, there is reason to believe that when conducting a tenure or reappointment review a department can act in good faith and yet not altogether competently. Our sense is that if there have been occasional abuses in tenure or reappointment reviews, they have come usually not at the level of the Committee of Six or the President and Dean, but at that of the department. This is a perception shared by many, to be sure, and not merely by some disappointed candidates. Certain other schools do routinely have members of other departments present at such deliberations. This presence, we have been told over and over, would increase the confidence of candidates in the proceedings. The Committee of Six we hold to be the appropriate body to name such extra-departmental participants.

Nearly everyone we talked with had something (strongly felt) to say about another "regularly accepted practice" of the College: the expectation that faculty live in or near Amherst. Responses to colleagues who commute are particularly complicated. (By a commuter we mean someone whose principal residence is, say, more than a half hour from the campus.) Among those who filled out the questionnaire, nearly all claim that they do not consider that commuting

colleagues "contribute less to the College than others." And yet at least half of these respondents think that "commuters are regarded by some as 'less than full colleagues.'" It is possible that none of those "some" replied to the questionnaire, but it is not likely. Rather, it looks as though few will admit to themselves conscious disapproval of commuting, but that a great many will attribute some disapproval, conscious or not, to others. We think the disapproval is much more common than is generally admitted, and we raise the subject because a number of commuters now are--and quite possible in the future will be--women. There are many reasons for choosing to commute, or for believing that in effect one actually has no choice in the matter if one is married to or committed to someone whose work is far from Amherst. (In what follows the words "spouse," "husband," and "wife" are used for convenience; we mean to imply nothing about the other forms of relationship which have not yet generated equally convenient terms.) Husbands still sometimes get established earlier in careers, which means that a house may be purchased near his place of work. Should the College disregard potential faculty members who did not get their careers begun before their spouses did? If the chronology is reversed--and it must increasingly be the case that women get the first or "better" job--then traditional modalities of deference may function to locate the couple near the husband's job, a tendency promoted by the fact that academic careers do tend to be more flexible than most others. And, irrespective of dual-career considerations, some faculty simply (or unsimply) want or need a more independent life than a small college in a not-very-large town can offer. It appears that, given the local job market in the professions, it has been and will remain only a lucky few couples in which both partners are able to find the work they want in this area. The College has responded ambiguously to this situation, with largely negative consequences for commuters. Some are told at the time of hiring that their commuting will not be a

problem, only to find that it is held against them as "uncollegial," a sign of a "lack of commitment," when they are being evaluated for tenure. Some are reassured by the administration that it is acceptable but told by departments that it is not. Others involved in dual households feel pressured by their departments to remain in town even on weekends, thereby throwing the burden of commuting on their mates. In other words, though commuting is often a matter of circumstance rather than of choice and is not directed against the College, this divergence from an older pattern is perceived by some as a form of rejection or attack. It is ironic that the extra time, expense, and effort taken on by commuters in order to teach at Amherst should be so perceived. We would add that some commuters mentioned feeling more isolated than need be: faculty appear to forget that commuting colleagues can be consulted by telephone.

It would seem that it is time Amherst openly considered whether or not it can make room for semi-residential and nonresidential faculty, and if not, fully to consider the implications of such a position in terms of its official support of the idea that women and men should have the same opportunities to pursue careers. The benefit to the College of having faculty who commute is that certain persons will join the faculty who, when commuting was as much as prohibited, would not have been candidates for positions here. Another is that commuters do bring to their work--of all kinds--experiences of the mind and of life generally that benefit colleagues and students alike. For instance, a non-metropolitan college may profit from what those who live in or near a major population center offer. Whether he or she lives in a place larger or smaller than Amherst, a teacher whose life is centered less on the day to day functioning of the College may provide a usefully different perspective to students. One positive action the College should take here would be to stop restricting the second mortgage policy to those who purchase residences within ten miles of the campus. That policy discriminates

against those who commute, it causes ill feeling, and we hope the College removes the mileage restriction altogether. Institutional self-interest, as we understand it, suggests as much. Other actions the College might take to make the lives of commuters easier to manage (once more we consciously repeat ourselves) involve scheduling: authorizing late afternoon and evening classes, being less insistent that a course in a given department not conflict with another in that department, and demonstrating more flexibility in the scheduling of staff and committee meetings. All these recommendations are based on the belief that the College should want to make as large as possible the group from which it selects its faculty. At times it does look as though "regularly accepted practice" sacrifices talent for loyalty and manageability.

Another matter, not necessarily dependent on gender or on whether one commutes, we would address here for lack of a more suitable place in this report. Often in our conversations with junior faculty we heard disappointment with how little is done to accommodate the spouses of faculty arriving at the College. Other area colleges do do more, and in an institutional way, for spouses. At the least, the College should make it possible for faculty spouses to have access to Five College facilities--especially library facilities--and it might consider providing some rudimentary information regarding employment, both academic and non-academic, in the Valley.

A last regularly accepted practice at the College may require more skepticism about the usefulness of the phrase itself than quotation marks can convey. When on the questionnaire we asked about faculty social life, we received any number of claims that it did not exist--or at least that the present atrophied version was so inconsequential compared with whenever it was as to make the question moot. But it is not felt to be moot by some of those who know better. It does exist (how could it not?) and if its primary embodiment is no longer a weekend dinner

party for seven or eight, there is no question that it continues to be marriage-and-family and near-the-College oriented. It would be foolish, of course, to ask for this or that alteration in patterns of informal, non-institutional socialization. It would be irresponsible, on the other hand, not to set down here the concerns we heard from colleagues, many of them women. Granting occasional prominent exceptions, those who are single or junior or do not live in Amherst perceive themselves as excluded from whatever is the main form of faculty social life. And the fact that Amherst is a small college in a middle-sized town tends to intensify this consciousness of what is felt as exclusion. More than one woman faculty member mentioned to us that they are thought by male faculty to have much more active and varied social lives than they do have. When one does not have it, when women faculty find it more complicated than do male faculty to have significant friendships with students, and when one is also marginalized as a teacher, one may not be at one's day-in, day-out best. How unfortunate this situation may be in a strictly professional sense is a question, for all faculty want to trust their colleagues to make the critical career decisions about others on prescribed intellectual grounds. In a less strict sense, it is no news to note that a teacher's non-professional life affects his or her professional life in the most important ways. The beginning of turning no news into good news may lie only in asking faculty not to be naive or unfeeling about the lives of others.

Perhaps what runs through all that has been addressed here--tenure, commuting, the treatment of faculty spouses, social life--are such large, deep, and complicated matters as socialization, mutual confidence, and its cognate, confidentiality. Some questions are more difficult to answer than others in a report such as this. If a general conclusion to this question were to be attempted it might be that in a small institution devoted to teaching and learning

it behooves everyone to be alert to the fact that in a number of ways the College is much less homogenous than it was as recently as twenty years ago. We rehearse the obvious, and for an obvious reason. That the lives of faculty differ more than they once did is a cause of strain often noted in these pages but also a sign of institutional health. To bring certain practices of the College more into line with the changed patterns of (some) faculty lives can only benefit the teaching and learning we do.

VI. Has the College adequately recognized the demands of childrearing as well as childbearing?

Several aspects of College policy suggest that the institution has attempted to meet certain major perceived needs of parents, including the availability of maternity leave and the establishment of tenure-track or tenured part-time positions. We have some policy changes to suggest, but would like to focus first on the unofficial aspects of College life that have made it difficult for women rearing children.

First, there is what sometimes looks like a negative attitude toward children, observed in the way we talk about them, that is at best ironic for an educational institution. What seems like hostility toward children may actually be directed toward their mothers, who are seen as not rearing their children full-time, as women of previous generations mostly aspired to do. The benefits of having children appear rarely to be discussed; instead, children are often perceived as a "conflict," particularly for women, as a responsibility that takes away from one's commitment to teaching and scholarship. There has seemed something vaguely unprofessional about a woman's decision to have children; one colleague recalled that her pregnancy surprised people, which caused her to conclude that it simply had never occurred to those who knew her professionally that she would want to have a child. Male faculty have not often had principal child care responsibilities and, when they have had them, it is clear that they are departing from the traditional parenting role sufficiently to arouse no thoughts that they have forgotten their jobs by becoming parents. Several women told of male colleagues who brought children to meetings or had to leave gatherings early in order to be with their families. In contrast, the same and other women spoke of their own reluctance to do likewise for fear of appearing unprofessional. One said that she had never tried to reschedule a meeting when her child was sick; she

would herself claim to be ill before she would do anything to remind her colleagues of her responsibilities as a mother. Another mother felt that her child care responsibilities meant all the more that she had to keep to a strict eight-hour work schedule on campus. We learned that in certain cases women who had not requested maternity leaves, even after they were instituted (which was not long ago), planned to give birth during vacations or sabbatical leaves. What necessarily results from such choices is the impossibility of devoting oneself full-time to scholarship during those periods specifically set aside for that purpose. What these conversations suggest to us is that women have internalized all too well the social judgments that mothering compromises teaching (or any other job), rather than potentially focusing and invigorating one's professional commitments.

One instance of the effect of this negative rhetoric comes to mind. Some faculty women reported being misunderstood as expressing anger or hostility when they left a meeting to nurse an infant or could not immediately agree to a meeting time because they needed to arrange babysitting first. A department may be supportive and enthusiastic in principle when one of its members becomes a mother and still, by habit, continue to schedule meetings at awkward times without stopping to consult her. Surely they can just speak up, one might think, and remind their colleagues of their needs to spend time with their children. But the socialization of women not to voice their needs, the fears of appearing unprofessional mentioned above, and the sense, discussed throughout this report, that they are somehow marginal in the institution--all these factors make such a simple solution quite complicated.

Ideally, there should be the greatest possible flexibility in class scheduling, committee assignments and advising loads. It is important, however, for these decisions to be made in the context of open and continuing conversations

with the women involved. For a department to "protect" a woman without asking if its actions are what she herself wants is to behave as if women were helpless. On the other hand, individual women cannot be expected in every case to remind their senior and administrative colleagues that their child care responsibilities come into play every time a meeting is changed or a new committee assignment introduced.

In addition, there are official College policies which should be changed. To offer maternity but not paternity leave to its faculty is to assume that only women care for children. The institution serves neither its faculty nor its students when it acts as if childbearing and childrearing affect only women. Our students can benefit from the example of a college that assumes that children may be reared by women and/or men, that something other than biology determines suitability for parenting. Another College option, that of part-time appointments, already makes this assumption. It remains an attractive choice for several of our colleagues and should certainly be continued for women and for men. Efforts are underway to alleviate the rather petty provisions in faculty legislation which pro-rate benefits for part-time members of the faculty (travel and entertainment allowance, among other things) and we encourage the administration to make these changes as soon as possible. Part-time faculty teach partial loads, but generally they are full-time members of the community, sharing in departmental, advising and committee responsibilities equaling those of their colleagues. But teaching part-time is not the only way to free up time for one's children and, indeed, for those who cannot live on a part-time salary, it is not a choice at all. It is certainly not possible for most single parents. The College cannot conclude that by offering the option of part-time teaching it has adequately dealt with the issues surrounding childcare.

There is official action that could be taken. We strongly recommend that a

day care center be created. The effort to institute such a center has already been begun by some faculty and staff members who met during the spring of 1984 and certainly the lack of such a facility was a frequent topic of discussion during our interviews. The questionnaire data suggest that most families with children thought that they would use such a facility and that its absence now limited their involvement in professional activities. Though there are several day care centers in the area, much is to be gained from the convenience of having one on campus. The creation of such a center would be a welcome signal of institutional awareness that faculty (and staff and students) have children whom they are not always available to attend. To provide affordable, convenient, and effective day care, would benefit the College generally, not only those parents of young children who would be its actual users.

It is the arrival of women as members of the faculty which has made the issue of childrearing an important one on campus. There is a danger that we will see children as a "women's issue," that women will continue to be treated as the "normal" providers of child care. But for the many reasons discussed above, it has been harder for women than for men to balance their lives as mothers and as teachers and scholars. There is no easy answer to the tensions that may arise among these roles. We hope that the College will assume a greater responsibility for allowing its faculty and staff a fuller range of choices as to how they will mix professional and personal lives.

VII. The committee should review current College policies designed to accommodate women's life patterns (maternity leave, provision for regular part-time appointments), and it should review other policy issues which may affect the recruitment and retention of women faculty.

In order to address this part of our charge, which we take to be a request further to interpret our findings and the situation that prompted the formation of our committee, we supplemented the information provided by current faculty members with extensive conversations with faculty members (male and female) who have left the College over the past ten years. We were distressed by the voluntary departure rate among women faculty members and interested also in the experiences of others who had been denied tenure or reappointment. As is common knowledge, there has been a troubling series of decisions not to stand for tenure in and of resignations from a wide range of departments, including American Studies, Biology, Black Studies, Chemistry, Classics, Dramatic Arts, Economics, English, Fine Arts, Political Science, and Romance Languages. In addition, according to the Office of Institutional Research, a lower percentage of women than of men standing for tenure has been granted permanent appointments. In the past six years 58.8% of the women and 67.6% of the men standing for tenure have been granted it. We also note that the recruitment of women faculty in tenure-track positions declined in recent years. In 1981, four women and four men were hired; in 1982, three women and eight men were hired; in 1983 one woman and nine men were hired.

It would be difficult to do justice to the variety, insight, and thoughtful concern of the responses we received, but we did find significant consistencies which we believe help to illuminate the issue of women's working conditions at Amherst. To understand what many women faculty at Amherst now feel about their lives as professional teachers and scholars, it may be necessary to listen to what some of those no longer here, as well as those who are here, have told us about the past. Some women faculty who read this report may not feel that their own

experiences accord with the ones we recount. Nonetheless, worst cases are revealing, and we are convinced that learning of and from them is necessary. We will focus chiefly on what it has been and is like for women faculty once they are here, but the experiences women have had as candidates and as departmental participants in recent job searches have also emerged as a significant problem. We consider that all of what we address here speaks to the large--there may be no larger--question of morale.

We begin with the matter of appointments and recruiting, anecdotal accounts of which corroborate the statistics to the effect that the College's commitment to Equal Opportunity is sometimes problematic in practice. Women faculty members from two departments reported instances in which women candidates refused offers explicitly because of the way they were treated during their interviews. A third instance was reported in which discussion of a woman candidate's physical size and soft-spoken manner were assessed as negative attributes even though the candidate had excellent qualifications. In two more cases candidates themselves reported that they did not feel they were being given serious consideration, that in fact the job had already been earmarked for someone else. Several women from various departments have been told that their departments have "enough" women, that they have filled their quota. One department felt that it could not and should not have two women teaching in the same large subarea of its discipline even though it had two positions in that field. One woman was told by a senior colleague that he feared the department would be "overrun" with women if it hired any more. An interestingly complex version of a similar position was encountered by one of the faculty members who resigned in 1979. During the public meeting she and two of her colleagues held to explain their resignations, she was asked how recruitment of women might be done more affirmatively. When she replied that the department might advertise in the journals in that field focusing particularly on scholarship

about women, the response was, "But we don't want that kind of woman." Statements and implicit policies like these could, as perhaps too great a part of the community is unaware, provide grounds for legal action. But more important to women candidates and faculty members themselves is the chilling effect that such comments have on their sense of collegueship. If Amherst is to be a place where women can participate on an equal footing, male faculty members must realize how deeply their conscious or unconscious arrogation of proprietorship undermines this possibility.

The sense women faculty members sometimes have that they are allowed at Amherst only on tolerance rather than included as professional colleagues permeates many facets of their working and even their personal lives once they are here. An overwhelming majority of the women who spoke with us stressed the continuing phenomenon of their lack of "credibility" in a number of Amherst contexts. The women hired in the early to mid seventies experienced this phenomenon in perhaps its most extreme forms. Coming from prestigious graduate schools (Stanford, Chicago, Yale, etc.) where they were also in nearly all-male environments, but where they felt they were listened to and taken seriously, they saw themselves as capable, well-trained and professionally committed intellectuals. At Amherst, they felt they were regarded instead with suspicion and disrespect. The memories are diverse and telling. Astonishing as this may seem, they remember never being asked in detail about their own work. Very little mentoring evidently took place. A distinguished former visitor, here for more than one year, recalls Amherst as "a diminishing environment compounded of prejudice against pedagogical nurturance and disapproval of those women who became overworked in trying to respond to a largely unnurtured student population." As another woman states, "The College had an image of us to which we did not want to conform and we had an image of ourselves which the College was not willing to

acknowledge." It was, of course, undermining continually to experience the inability of colleagues to see them as competent or to see them at all. In retrospect it appears that there may have been a clash of cultures at work, not fully perceived by either side. The women felt that they knew the academic world well. Some male faculty members seem to have perceived them as outsiders. Translated into individual terms, this marginalization was felt painfully by many of the women, most of whom had not been led by early experiences to anticipate it.

There seems to be little mystery, then, to the resignation of a group of these women in 1979 and to several subsequent resignations, though there continues to be both a great deal of interest in and a certain amount of mystification concerning such departures. The three women who held a meeting in 1979 to explain their leaving concurred that the question for them was not why they were resigning, but why they should stay. The day to day disparagement they encountered showed no sign of abating after six years, colleagues outside the institution proved far more interested in and supportive of their research than those inside, the institution consistently reiterated its belief in and commitment to a more or less single view of itself and the world which would brook few variations and alternatives.

Academic women are, of course, encountering problems at many institutions. In the course of our investigation, we became aware of committees with charges similar to ours at Smith, Yale, the University of Massachusetts, and the University of Wisconsin, to name a few. But the particular Amherst ethos was cited by several women who now have the perspective of more recent experiences elsewhere as figuring greatly in the way these problems have been felt and dealt with here. There seems to be a kind of sacramental aspect to life at Amherst which casts criticism, no matter how concerned and committed, as a species of desecration. Certain faculty members, then, engaged in imagining how things might

be thought of or done differently have felt themselves discounted as, to continue the religious metaphor, infidels. Too large a proportion of the respondents (men as well as women) to our questionnaire remarked that they did not feel their contributions to be welcome in faculty meetings, and that there was a particular style to these meetings which dampened discussion. A further oddity remarked upon was the fact that the content of suggestions for change did not seem to matter as much as the person making the suggestion. An insider/outsider psychology seems to prevail even at the senior level, putting both sides on the defensive. It is perhaps due to this psychology that attempts to make room for a greater range of voices are treated by some as attacks upon the very foundations of the institution.

These are but a few speculations. The fact remains that some bewilderment and much dissatisfaction felt by women and, no doubt, by others over the past ten to twelve years have arisen from the discrepancy between the College's stated ideals (of openness, diversity, intellectual adventurousness) and its practices. One woman commented that because Amherst began hiring women and including Third World fields simultaneously the women in these fields (of whom there have been a substantial number) have labored under a double burden of proof. They are "different" because they are women and "different" again because their work unsettles traditional conceptualizations in and of their fields. The same double burden has sometimes been felt by women who use nontraditional approaches in traditional fields. Senior women observers agree that it has been harder for women whose work is perceived as in some way nontraditional to get tenure. Further evidence that this has been the case is provided by the instance of a national organization which delayed its acceptance of Amherst College as a member, questioning, in light of the way the College had evaluated two nationally respected junior scholars, our seriousness about the field.

A very recent instance of the kind of discrepancy between policy and practice that lowers morale is the appointment of the Dean of the Faculty without an Affirmative Action search, either national or internal, even though the Dean himself vigorously registered his discomfort with this procedure. We feel that it is unfortunate in terms of the signal so given to advocates and opponents alike of Affirmative Action that the position of the person charged with overseeing the implementation of Affirmative Action in faculty hiring was in this case itself made exempt from Affirmative Action procedures. One wonders if it might not in fact weaken the Dean's hand in performing this aspect of the job. We hope not. Furthermore, during the debate at the Commencement faculty meeting, it became apparent that not all faculty members were conversant with the College's Affirmative Action policy. It was argued, for example, that certain other positions, such as that of College Treasurer, were exempt from Affirmative Action guidelines, even though the College's published statement of its Affirmative Action policy does not exempt such positions.

Much of the history of the Affirmative Action Committee reflects institutional resistance to that policy. After two initial years without a tenured member, the chair had to resign to make good the Committee's request that one be appointed. For half a dozen years it petitioned in vain that someone other than the Personnel Officer be appointed Affirmative Action Officer so as to avoid a conflict of interest and a lack of authority over faculty-related matters. Its other recommendations found little response; it took eight years and three different chairs to obtain the information necessary for a study of male and female staff salaries. Though an advisory body to the President, it has not been regularly consulted in a meaningful way, even at moments (e.g., the appointment of the Dean of Faculty) when the College's commitment to Affirmative Action is seriously questioned by the faculty. Yet for all its powerlessness, the Committee

encounters suspicion worthy of a potent and destructive intrusion into the College's autonomy.

Many of our women colleagues reported a similar disparity between official policy and daily experience. After being recruited and sometimes elaborately courted by the College, they found themselves on arrival as part of what was perceived by some as a threatening invasion. Growing numbers did not ease the pressures, but excited more irritability and defensiveness. Two or three women colleagues were merely an oddity; a dozen became a phenomenon; two dozen, to some, a threat. We are reminded of public school integration in the fifties and sixties, when enrolling a handful of black students occasioned self-congratulation, but then proportions of twenty or thirty percent triggered conflict. The resistance women encountered here struck many as civil but incurable--that is, a resistance that is emotional, tonal, and stylistic (rather than expressive of different opinions) and one therefore ironically immune to the critical analysis and open debate by which the academy aspires to guide itself. As a result of this resistance women faculty have been placed in certain contradictory situations. To let one critical example, spoken of elsewhere, stand for many: some women in new fields have found the academic specialization for which they were hired to be a liability.

In the end, two points seem worth making, or making yet again. First, the testimony of the women with whom we talked, although it varies in emphasis and detail, supports this conclusion: all faculty women at the College consider, and precisely because they are women, that their professional and private lives have been made unnecessarily and unduly difficult. The report suggests a number of specific institutional changes that we believe would make those lives, and thus the lives of everyone who teaches at and administers the College, less anxious and more productive. The report speaks in another way to what is not strictly

institutional, to those attitudes, so long held by those who hold them as to seem the inevitable way of the world, that have troubled a great many faculty women. Second, hoping to end with pieties so conventional and bland that no reader would take us to have written a word to which exception might be taken, we tried to find a committee "we" that could discourse on loyalty to the College. It proved impossible. In defining its subject each predicate appeared to exclude one or another valid conception of loyalty. This brought us to the tamest and least tame of all pieties, the one underlying each section of the report: dedication to the College not only can but should take a variety of forms. To acknowledge--indeed, to honor--that variety will make Amherst a stronger, a more democratic, a more vital college.

