

**EVALUATION OF THE WOMEN FACULTY MENTORING PROGRAM
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON**

Jennifer Sheridan¹, Deveny Benting, & Christine Maidl Pribbenow
WISELI Researchers and Evaluators

July 27, 2004

This material is based on work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 0123666. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

¹ Direct all questions and correspondence to: Jennifer Sheridan, WISELI Research Director (608) 263-1445, sheridan@engr.wisc.edu.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
<u>EVALUATION DESIGN</u>	1
WOMEN FACULTY BASELINE INTERVIEWS	1
FACULTY WORKLIFE SURVEY	2
Survey Response Rates: Overall	3
Survey Response Rates: Women Tenure-Track Faculty	3
<u>WOMEN FACULTY MENTORING PROGRAM BACKGROUND</u>	6
<u>WOMEN FACULTY MENTORING PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS</u>	6
PARTICIPATION RATES	6
REASONS FOR PARTICIPATION	8
<u>“VALUE” OF THE WOMEN FACULTY MENTORING PROGRAM</u>	10
OVERALL VALUE	10
BENEFITS	11
SOME LIMITATIONS	12
<u>EFFECTS OF WOMEN FACULTY MENTORING PROGRAM PARTICIPATION</u>	13
<u>DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS</u>	15
<u>APPENDIX I: FACULTY WORKLIFE SURVEY</u>	18
<u>APPENDIX II: WOMEN FACULTY INTERVIEW PROTOCOL</u>	30
<u>APPENDIX III: DIVISIONAL INFORMATION</u>	35

INTRODUCTION

The Women in Science & Engineering Leadership Institute (WISELI) is a research center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF), with a mission to promote the participation and advancement of women in science and engineering by transforming the University of Wisconsin-Madison through the creation of new programs, and by continuing to support current campus-wide initiatives.

In their initial proposal to the NSF, the Directors of WISELI—Professors Jo Handelsman (Plant Pathology) and Molly Carnes (Medicine)—committed to evaluating a number of campus-wide programs designed to increase the access of women to higher-level positions in science and engineering on campus with the intent to provide the leaders of various programs with data that they may find useful. One of these programs is the Women Faculty Mentoring Program (WFMP).

EVALUATION DESIGN

We used two sources of data to inform the evaluation of the Women Faculty Mentoring Program (WFMP). First, we interviewed 26 women faculty in the biological and physical sciences to collect baseline data about their experiences at the UW-Madison.² We then used the results from these interviews to develop a faculty worklife survey, which was administered to all UW-Madison faculty in 2003. Both the interviewees and survey respondents were asked specific questions about the WFMP.

In this report, we describe the methods and response rates of the two data sources. Next, we briefly outline the history, purpose, and implementation of the WFMP at the UW-Madison. Using data from the interviews and surveys, we address three main questions:

1. *Participation.* Who participates in the WFMP, and why?
2. *Value.* What do WFMP participants value in the program? What features of the program are less valuable?
3. *Effects.* Does the WFMP have any significant effects on the worklife of women faculty who participate in it, compared to women faculty who do not participate?

Finally, we conclude with a summary of our main findings, and suggest areas where future improvements to the program might be made.

WOMEN FACULTY BASELINE INTERVIEWS

The WISELI Research & Evaluation Team (RET) conducted interviews with 26 women faculty members at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. . The purpose of the interviews was threefold: 1) to serve as a baseline from which to measure changes in women's experiences on campus following the completion of the grant; 2) to inform the development of a baseline survey that would be distributed to all faculty on the UW-Madison campus; and, 3) to help the WISELI staff

² For a further discussion of the methodology of the women faculty interviews conducted by the WISELI Research and Evaluation Team, please see: Maidl Pribbenow, C., Lottridge, S., & Benting, D. (2004). *The climate for women faculty in the sciences and engineering: Their stories, successes, and solutions*. Madison, WI: WISELI.

as they make decisions about areas of further study and the development of WISELI-sponsored programs on campus.

The interviewee population was defined as those faculty members who: 1) were not clinical faculty (and thus on the tenure track); 2) who claimed one of the biological and physical sciences divisions as their disciplinary home;³ 3) who had larger than 0% appointments; and 4) who were female.

The sample was generated by first determining the number of women to be selected from each college, and then randomly selecting the women in each college. The numbers in the sample for each college were intended to be roughly proportional to those in the population. Table 1 shows the distribution of the sample across colleges.

Table 1: Distribution of Population, Sample, and Sample Percentage of Population by College

UW-Madison College or School	Population	Sample	Percent
College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALS)	39	7	18%
College of Engineering	13	2	15%
College of Letters and Science	42	8	19%
Medical School	72	7	10%
School of Pharmacy & School of Veterinary Medicine	13	2	15%
Total	179	26	

Within the numbers of each college, an effort was made to select women from different departments, titles (Assistant, Associate, Full, Distinguished), divisions, years at UW, and number of appointments. A random process was used to select participants; however, when two women from the same department were inadvertently selected, the second one was replaced.

The interviews were semi-structured and open-ended (see Appendix I for interview protocol). The interviewers did not necessarily follow the order of the protocol; rather, they followed the “train of thought” of the participant and referred back to the protocol to ensure that most topics were covered. The interviewers were not able to ask all of the questions that appeared in the interview protocol; no effort was made to follow up with participants to answer unasked questions. While the large-scale findings from the worklife survey (described below) give us a picture of the entire faculty, the interview findings reflect individual experiences and often complement the findings from the survey.

FACULTY WORKLIFE SURVEY

In 2003, WISELI implemented a campus-wide mail survey (the *Study of Faculty Worklife at the University of Wisconsin-Madison*, see Appendix II), developed from the interviews with 26 women faculty in the biological and physical sciences described above. In order to evaluate the campus-wide impact of the WFMP, the survey instrument included questions about mentoring in

³ All faculty members choose one of the four divisions on campus as their disciplinary home. The divisions that deal with promotion and tenure are: Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences, Social Studies, and Humanities. For those faculty who were hired very recently and had not yet chosen a division, a decision was made based on information found on the Internet about their research.

general, and about the WFMP in particular. The survey was primarily designed for faculty (male and female) in the biological and physical sciences at UW-Madison, but just before it was to go into the field the survey was expanded to include all faculty at UW-Madison.

SURVEY RESPONSE RATES: OVERALL

The *Study of Faculty Worklife* questionnaires were mailed to a total of 2,254 faculty (including 38 clinical faculty in the School of Veterinary Medicine). Of these, 33 surveys were non-sample cases (undelivered with no forwarding address; away for the duration; or not eligible respondents), leaving a total sample size of 2,221. A total of 1,340 faculty and clinical faculty returned surveys, giving an overall response rate of 60.3%. Faculty and clinical faculty have similar response rates; thus, when clinical faculty are removed from the sample, the response rate of tenure-track faculty remains the same at 60.3%. Women responded at higher rates than men, with 68.4% of women returning their questionnaires compared to 57.3% of men in the full sample (Table 2).

Table 2: Response Rates for Men and Women

Gender	No. of Respondents	Total Sample	Percent
Men	939	1,638	57.3%
Women	399	583	68.4%
Total	1,338*	2,221	60.3%

*Two respondents removed their case IDs and did not report gender.

Although the survey was approved by the UW-Madison Institutional Review Board, several respondents expressed concerns about confidentiality and/or anonymity. Twenty-nine respondents removed their case ID numbers from their surveys before returning them. Consequently, we could not link these cases to the original sample frame and they are not always assigned in the sample analysis that follows. Where information was provided in the questionnaire (for example, the respondent provided his or her gender, race, department, etc.), the case is included in the tables; otherwise, it is left as missing data. Because it is considered a completed case even with the item non-response, it is included in the 1,340 returned surveys. Further, because the WFMP is only available to women tenure-track faculty at UW-Madison, we removed clinical faculty from the School of Veterinary Medicine and men from our full sample of responses; thus, in the analyses that follow, we report only on responses of *women tenure-track faculty*.

SURVEY RESPONSE RATES: WOMEN TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Women faculty’s response rate is comparable across the four academic divisions at UW-Madison, ranging from a low of 65.7% in Biological Sciences to 69.3% in Social Studies when academic division is defined by *department* rather than at the individual level (Table 3).⁴ Respondents provided departmental information in the *Study of Faculty Worklife* questionnaire, but not individual divisional affiliation (this was not asked on the questionnaire). Therefore, a divisional assignment was made on the basis of departmental membership. A list of departments

⁴ Because no results will be reported at the departmental level, and because divisional affiliation is a convenient way to group departments, this departmental definition of “Division” will be used throughout this report.

assigned to each division is found in Appendix III, as well as a list of which departments are considered “science” departments in these analyses.

Table 3: Response Rates by Division (Departmental)

Division	No. of Women Respondents	Total No. of Women Faculty Members	Percent
Biological Sciences	119	181	65.7%
Physical Sciences	32	47	68.1%
Social Studies	142	205	69.3%
Humanities	101	150	67.3%
Total	394	583	67.6%

Response rates are also quite consistent for women faculty across the different schools and colleges at UW-Madison (Table 4). Women faculty in the School of Human Ecology (SOHE) have the highest response rate at 79.2%, and women in the College of Agricultural & Life Sciences (CALs), School of Veterinary Medicine (VETMED), and the School of Nursing also responded at rates higher than 70%. Women faculty in the Medical School have the lowest response rate at 64.9%.

Table 4: Response Rates by School/College

School/College	No. of Women Respondents	Total No. of Women Faculty Members	Percent
Business, Law, Misc.	26	40	65.0%
CALs	39	55	70.9%
Education	34	52	65.4%
Engineering, Pharmacy, VETMED	39	55	70.9%
Letters & Science	170	257	66.1%
Medical School	50	77	64.9%
Nursing	17	23	73.9%
SOHE	19	24	79.2%
Total	394	583	67.6%

The survey was originally intended to target the six schools and colleges containing the majority of biological and physical scientists on campus: Letters & Sciences (L&S, Natural Sciences), Agricultural & Life Sciences (CALs), Engineering, Veterinary Medicine, the Medical School, and Pharmacy. Prior to fielding the survey, the WISELI directors visited the department chairs of all six schools except Pharmacy (which does not have departments) to promote the survey, and asked the department chairs of the Biological and Physical Science departments to encourage their faculty to return the survey. The difference in response between these “science” departments and “non-science” departments⁵ was small (Table 5).

Table 5: Response Rates by Type of Department

Type of Department	No. of Women Respondents	Total No. of Women Faculty Members	Percent
Science	145	220	65.9%
Non-Science	249	363	68.6%
Total	394	583	67.6%

⁵ With apologies, Kinesiology, Environmental Studies, and the social sciences are not included as “science” departments.

Women assistant and associate professors were more likely to respond than their professor counterparts, although the difference is slight (Table 6). There is also little difference overall in response between untenured and tenured faculty (Table 7).

Table 6: Response Rates by Rank (Title)

Rank	No. of Women Respondents	Total No. of Women Faculty Members	Percent
Assistant Professor	143	210	68.1%
Associate Professor	73	104	70.2%
Professor	177	269	65.8%
Total	393	583	67.4%

Table 7: Response Rates by Rank (Tenure Status)

Rank	No. of Women Respondents	Total No. of Women Faculty Members	Percent
Not Tenured	143	210	68.1%
Tenured	256	373	68.6%
Total	399	583	68.4%

Overall, under-represented minority (URM) women faculty tend to have a slightly higher response rate than majority faculty (Table 8). Although the numbers are too small to report in detail, we find that Blacks, Native Americans, and Hispanic women tend to have higher response rates than majority women faculty, while Asian women faculty have a lower response rate, although the differences are quite small. Finally, women faculty who are U.S. citizens are much more likely to have returned the survey, compared to those who are not U.S. citizens (Table 9).

Table 8: Response Rates by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	No. of Women Respondents	Total No. of Women Faculty Members	Percent
Under-represented Minority	63	90	70.0%
Majority	326	476	68.5%
Total	389	566	68.7%

Table 9: Response Rates by Citizenship

U.S. Citizenship	No. of Women Respondents	Total No. of Women Faculty Members	Percent
Non-citizen	25	540	68.9%
Citizen	372	43	58.1%
Total	397	583	68.0%

With an overall response rate of almost 70%, the data for women faculty is probably quite representative of all women faculty at UW-Madison. Furthermore, faculty of color do not appear to be under-represented in the female-only sample, as they are in the sample combining women and men faculty (not shown). Among science departments, women from the Medical School are slightly under-represented in our sample.

WOMEN FACULTY MENTORING PROGRAM BACKGROUND

A study commissioned by the Chancellor in 1987 led to the establishment of the Women Faculty Mentoring Program (WFMP) in 1989. This study found that untenured women faculty were voluntarily resigning from the University of Wisconsin-Madison at a rate greater than that of their male counterparts, and many women cited feelings of isolation as a major reason for their departure. To try to address such problems, all women faculty were invited to participate in the WFMP. In 1990 the Office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs formally adopted the program. In 1997, the program expanded its mission to include providing additional resources and services for tenured women.

The WFMP operates very simply. In the fall of each year, the program's director and coordinator invite all newly hired and newly tenured women to participate in the WFMP. Interested women fill out a brief questionnaire indicating their field of study and personal interests. Each untenured woman is then matched with a tenured woman outside of her own department but, insofar as it is possible, in her field. The WFMP does not replace the need for the department to assign a guidance committee or mentor for each assistant professor; rather, it offers additional information and resources that build upon the work of departmental mentoring relationships.

In addition to celebrating the successes of newly promoted and tenured women faculty at an annual reception, the WFMP provides an orientation workshop for mentors and mentees and offers several "brown bag" sessions on topics of special interest to women faculty each year.⁶

WOMEN FACULTY MENTORING PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

PARTICIPATION RATES

The WISELI questionnaire asked respondents to rate the value of a number of campus programs for faculty at UW-Madison as "Very Valuable," "Quite Valuable," "Somewhat Valuable," "Not at all Valuable," or "Never Heard of Program." A follow-up question asked the respondent to indicate whether he or she had ever used the program—"Yes" or "No." The WFMP was one of 16 programs evaluated in this way. Overall, 51.3% of women faculty respondents reported they participated in the WFMP (Table 10).

Table 10: Participation in WFMP

WFMP Use	No. of Respondents	Percent
Use WFMP	184	51.3%
Do not use WFMP	175	48.7%
Total	359	100%

Participation in the program appears to be evenly distributed across rank (i.e., tenured women professors are as likely to say they participated as untenured women professors), minority status, U.S. citizenship, sexual orientation, and parenting status (Table 11).

⁶ Cameron, Lindsey Stoddard (2002) <http://www.wisc.edu/provost/women/what.html>.

Table 11: Participation in WFMP by Selected Characteristics of Women Faculty

Selected Characteristics	No. of Women Respondents	Total No. of Women Faculty Members	Percent
Rank			
Assistant Professor	70	124	56.5%
Associate Professor	33	64	51.6%
Professor	79	166	47.6%
Total	182	354	51.4%
Tenure Status			
Non-tenured	70	124	56.5%
Tenured	114	235	48.5%
Total	184	359	51.3%
Minority Status			
Under-represented Minority	22	41	53.7%
Majority	160	314	51.0%
Total	182	355	51.3%
U.S. Citizenship			
U.S. Citizen	165	321	51.4%
Not U.S. Citizen	19	35	54.3%
Total	184	356	51.7%
Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual?			
Yes	172	328	52.4%
No	11	25	44.0%
Total	183	353	51.8%
Parenting Status: Mother (Children any age)			
Yes	104	193	53.9%
No	79	164	48.2%
Total	183	357	51.3%
Parenting Status: Mother, Youngest Child Under 18			
Yes	73	135	54.1%
No	110	219	50.2%
Total	183	354	51.7%
Parenting Status: Mother, Youngest Child Under 6			
Yes	22	40	55.0%
No	161	314	51.3%
Total	183	354	51.7%

Large differences in participation occurred between women faculty in “science” departments, and others (Table 12). The highest participation in the WFMP came from women in social science departments (62.0%), while biological science departments showed the lowest levels of participation in the WFMP (43.0%). This seems to stem largely from the very low participation of women in the Medical School (33.3%) and biological scientists in Letters & Sciences (37.5%). In contrast, biological scientists in CALS and the Veterinary School had participation rates above 50% (analysis not shown). Women who have never heard of the WFMP similarly tend to come from biological science departments, and they tend to be assistant professors, although the size of this group is very small (13 individuals, not shown).

Table 12: Participation in WFMP by Division and Department Type

Division/Department Type	No. of Women Respondents	Total No. of Women Faculty Members	Percent
Division (Departmental)			
Physical Sciences	17	32	53.1%
Biological Sciences	43	100	43.0%
Social Studies	80	129	62.0%
Humanities	43	94	45.7%
Total	183	355	51.5%
School/College			
Business, Law, Misc.	8	22	36.4%
CALS	23	37	62.2%
Education	24	33	72.7%
Engineering, Pharmacy, VETMED	14	24	58.3%
Letters & Science	76	161	47.2%
Medical School	16	48	33.3%
Nursing, SOHE	21	29	72.4%
Total	182	354	51.4%
Department Type			
Science	60	132	45.5%
Non-Science	123	223	55.2%
Total	183	355	51.5%

REASONS FOR PARTICIPATION

The following quotes reflect some of the interviewees' reasons for participating in the WFMP. . . They discussed their own degree of participation in the WFMP, and why they were or were not involved in it. A few women faculty who did not participate in the WFMP at all said they were too busy to make the commitment. "I found that, and perhaps this is kind of self-defeating, I never felt like I could make time to go to the [WFMP events]," said Renee,⁷ an assistant professor, "They were big two-hour things and I . . . couldn't go." One interviewee, Helen, an assistant professor, also addressed the issue of time constraints, although she felt grateful for the program's existence:

When I was hired there was talk that you could get together with other women on campus, and they would provide some kind of support to help you find a [mentor] and have you get together. I was just too busy. So I was thinking that would take up so much time and I just didn't have the time to do that. But yeah, I appreciate it very much.

Another assistant professor, Barbara, did not participate in the program immediately after she began her faculty position because she did not think she qualified for or needed it. Once she began to participate however, she realized its usefulness, specifically the importance of having a mentor from outside her department. Having an unbiased mentor was mentioned by many of the women who spoke about their participation in the WFMP in their interviews. Barbara said:

I didn't apply for it right away because I thought, 'I don't have kids, maybe I don't have some of the same issues that other women have,' and I guess I thought I didn't need that

⁷ Pseudonyms are used to protect the identity of the interview participants.

sort of thing. But then after a while I thought, 'Well, it's probably good to have somebody, especially a female, because maybe I can relate better in some ways. And also somebody outside of my department that I could go to for advice.'

Elaine, an associate professor, who also felt the importance of having an extra-departmental mentor, said, "I knew the department wasn't giving me as much information as I needed. [It was a way to get advice outside the department.]" Another associate professor, Jodi, had a mentoring relationship set up for her by one of her colleagues. Although she did not participate in the WFMP, she, like others, thought it was a good idea to have a faculty member from a different department to go to for personal and/or career advice and support. Jodi explained her situation:

R⁸: I used a resource. I found a woman who was willing to chat with me about tenure. [A colleague] looked for her for me. [The colleague] suggested it, and [the colleague] hooked me up with her and she was great. She'd invite me to their family parties, and when I got tenure—flowers. But she was there to talk to. I didn't talk with her a lot, but I did have someone to talk to.

I⁹: Was that very helpful?

R: Yes, because I felt that I could be entirely honest with her. And that she was being entirely honest with me. So it was good.

I: Was she able to give you good advice?

R: Yes, very good advice—resources, the sorts of things that would be looked for at tenure. She'd been on [a tenure] committee. She was just really helpful.

Jodi went on to explain that because she had a woman mentor outside her department, she did not feel the need to participate in the WFMP, saying, "Early on I knew about [the Women Faculty Mentoring Program], and then I probably threw [the information] away. I don't know if I still get anything about them. No, I don't think about them." She, like others, chose to not participate in the WFMP. Gloria, a full professor, had been a participant at one time, but was dissatisfied with her experience in the program:

I contacted [my WFMP advisor] and then we had lunch. It was a perfectly nice lunch, [but] I found it totally useless. . . I had all these problems and I was just bitching. And here's this poor person. . . It wasn't like there was anything to say about it, you know what I mean?

Many interviewees did participate in the WFMP, and the benefits they received from the program are included in the subsequent sections of this report.

⁸ R = Respondent

⁹ I = Interviewer

“VALUE” OF THE WOMEN FACULTY MENTORING PROGRAM

OVERALL VALUE

To identify how valuable women faculty think the WFMP is, we dichotomized question 30 (see Appendix I). We combined responses of “Very Valuable” and “Quite Valuable” into one category (“Very or Quite Valuable”), and “Somewhat Valuable,” “Not at all Valuable,” and “Never Heard of Program” into another (“Somewhat or Not Valuable”). Overall, a strong majority of women faculty (69.9%) thought the WFMP is a valuable program (Table 13).

Table 13: Value of WFMP

Value	No. of Women	
	Faculty Respondents	Percent
Very or Quite Valuable	255	69.9%
Somewhat or Not Valuable	110	30.1%
Total	365	100%

Just as there are differences in participation rates for women by departmental division, differences in how much women faculty value the WFMP also appear by departmental division (Table 14). Women in the Social Sciences and Humanities divisions value the WFMP the most, and women in the Biological Sciences division value it the least. This makes some sense, given the lower participation of women in the Biological Sciences. What is less clear is why women in the Physical Sciences value the WFMP less than their counterparts in other divisions (57.6% of women in Physical Science departments say the program is “Very Valuable” or “Quite Valuable,” while 74.2% of women in Humanities and Social Science departments rate the WFMP highly), even though they participate in the program at similar rates to the Social Science and Humanities women.

Table 14: High Value of WFMP by Division

Division	No. of Women		Total No. of Women Faculty Members	Percent
	Faculty Respondents			
Physical Sciences	19	33	57.6%	
Biological Sciences	61	99	61.6%	
Social Studies	105	137	76.6%	
Humanities	69	93	74.2%	
Total	254	362	70.2%	

Two other striking differences emerge among women faculty in their assessment of the value of the WFMP. First, women faculty who are not U.S. citizens think the program is more valuable than do U.S. citizens (Table 15). Second, a difference emerges between women who are parents of young children (under age 6) and other women. Women who are parents of children of any age tend to value the WFMP more than non-parents, although this difference is not statistically significant. The margin shifts when mothers of children under age 18 are compared to other women—these women with children in the home tend to value the program less than other women, although again this difference is not significant. When women with children under age 6 are compared to other women faculty, however, we see that they are significantly less likely to rate the program as “Very Valuable” or “Quite Valuable” (Table 16). The assessed value of the

WFMP does not differ significantly among women based on rank, race/ethnicity or sexual orientation (not shown).

Table 15: High Value of WFMP by Citizenship

Citizenship	No. of Women Respondents	Total No. of Women Faculty Members	Percent
U.S. Citizen	223	326	68.4%
Not U.S. Citizen	30	36	83.3%
Total	253	352	71.9%

Table 16: High Value of WFMP by Child Status

Child Status	No. of Women Respondents	Total No. of Women Faculty Members	Percent
No children	112	163	68.7%
Mother, Children any age	143	201	71.1%
Total	255	364	70.1%
Mother, Youngest Child Under 18	95	139	68.3%
Mother, Youngest Child Under 6	22	39	56.4%

BENEFITS

Some interviewees described a number of benefits they received from the program. Brenda, a full professor, said the program helped to decrease her feelings of isolation on campus, boost her knowledge about acceptable practices in the department, and create confidence to remedy negative situations that were potentially harmful to her career:

I think that the women’s mentoring group . . . is very good. Sometimes you don’t have something tangible that results from it, but women like to be brought together and to get to know each other and to just listen to other women. A lot of times all they do is complain . . . but there’s something sort of, you know, you don’t feel so alone: ‘Well, so that’s happening in that other department also,’ and then you have a connection. Then you know you could be isolated, and you may not know that you need to go to your department chair and say, ‘Hey, why am I teaching twice as much as this other person?’ You may not know that. But you’re sort of empowered, if you’re in this group, listening to other women. So I think these are good things.

Other women who used the WFMP reiterated the importance of having a mentor outside their home department. Natalie, an associate professor said:

I think that I learned from some colleagues how to write grants and how to operate politically in the funding environment. But then I learned from the other outside—this was not the department. I would say the Women’s Faculty Mentoring Program had an excellent mentor. That was a huge resource for me personally. . . I really was pulled in by their advertising and their programming and I did get one of the strongest leaders in [X School] as my mentor. It was extremely helpful. I didn’t know what I didn’t know, but I did learn a lot about . . . how to negotiate a lot of different situations. . . Having a mentor not in the department can be really helpful.

Barbara, an assistant professor, initially thought she did not have as compelling a reason as other women to join the WFMP (e.g., children, an immediate need for support). Later, she joined because she felt the need for an extra-departmental mentor, and the WFMP has been valuable to her in this way:

I think I've had a little bit of concern periodically about whether my [departmental] mentor is somebody who was initially a good person to collaborate with. We have a lot in common—complimentary research areas. And I guess I wondered whether my interests were really in their best interest. . . I am using other people on my mentoring committee more now, just because I've wondered whether the person really had my interests at heart or their interests. And also, it's someone that I could collaborate with a lot. I don't know, maybe there's a conflict there. I've had other people tell me that it's not good to have a collaborator as a mentor.

SOME LIMITATIONS

Some women thought that the WFMP had value to women at the University in very specific situations. For example, some thought that the mentoring relationships should be approached cautiously and deliberately for the program to be of any benefit. Helen, an assistant professor who does not participate in the WFMP, but appreciates its existence, said:

I think it depends on who the people are. If, for example, [the mentor] comes from a very different discipline or something, then I am not sure. I guess you understand each other better if you are in a close [discipline].

Nicole, a full professor, also explained her opinion of the value of the WFMP for women in specific situations:

I think [the WFMP] is working to some extent. It hugely depends on the personality of both the person who's the mentor and the mentee. . . I've seen it work really well, and I've seen it not work well.

Not all interviewees felt the WFMP was valuable, and much of their dissatisfaction was a result of snags in the way the program was run. There were two comments about the length of time it took mentees to be paired up with mentors. Barbara, an assistant professor who joined the WFMP specifically to find a mentor for herself outside her department, described one such situation, although it did not affect her decision to participate in the WFMP:

I applied for the [WFMP], and it took over a year to get somebody assigned to me, and she's on sabbatical until the end of July. So I'll meet with her next month. . . I don't know, maybe it was just a bad time or something, but it took several emails just to, 'You remember me? Have you got anybody?'

Gloria, a full professor who decided not to participate in the WFMP based on some negative experiences, also had a few comments about the process of being assigned a mentor:

R: Well, one of the problems was that . . . there was this thing, I filled it out, and then it was like, I don't know, four months later—

I: A long time.

R: A long time, [and] I get this thing, 'Here's your faculty person.'

Elaine, an associate professor, felt that her experience in the WFMP as a mentee was not valuable because of an unsupportive mentor. However, she participates in the program currently as a mentor, and makes sure her mentee has a positive experience in the program. She also suggested some ways to improve the quality of the mentoring the program provides. She said:

R: I did not have a good experience with my mentor. . . She was pretty harsh. . . I was going through a death and divorce at the same time, and I'd see her and she'd say, 'Well, how many pages have you written?'

I: And what motivated you to become a mentor?

R: I would say wanting to change my experience [as a mentee].

I: Okay, so you wanted to give back and make sure someone else had a positive experience?

R: Yeah.

I: How could that have been improved, your experience with that faculty mentor?

R: I think they need to coach the mentors more directly and say, 'this is the plan and we need you to volunteer,' in a very direct way. [Present] a mentor workshop . . . send them a letter, outline the obligations and say, 'If you can't fill this [responsibility], then don't take this on, because we really need you to spend time with them.' Call them, check in on them. If I had just one or two phone calls when I was with my mother [who had cancer], it would've been super. I was new, I had no friends in the area; I was really, really alone. We're all adults, we can take care of ourselves, but still, it's a huge university and nobody really cares.

EFFECTS OF WOMEN FACULTY MENTORING PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

We explored whether participation in the WFMP affects other areas of faculty worklife (e.g., satisfaction with the tenure process, ability to balance work and family life, satisfaction with job and career, feelings of isolation, etc.) First, we looked to see whether participation in the WFMP influences the ratings of the value of the program. Again, we dichotomized question 30 (see Appendix I) by combining responses of “Very Valuable” and “Quite Valuable” into one category (“Valuable”), and “Somewhat Valuable,” “Not at all Valuable,” and “Never Heard of Program” into another (“Not Valuable”). As expected, women faculty who have used the WFMP are

significantly more likely to say that the program was valuable (Table 17). Controlling for some of the other variables that influence the value rating (division, citizenship, and having children under age 6) did not appreciably change the relationship of use of the WFMP to its value (results not shown).

Table 17: High Value of WFMP by Use

Use of WFMP	No. of Women Respondents	Total No. of Women Faculty Members	Percent
Used the WFMP	136	182	74.7%
Did not use the WFMP	99	160	61.9%
Total	235	342	68.7%

Next, we looked at the items from the survey that could be affected by participation in the WFMP. Specifically, we looked at question 9 in the *Tenure Process* section; questions 14 and 21 in the *Professional Activities* section; questions 23, 24, 27, and 28 in the *Satisfaction with UW-Madison* section, question 35 in the *Balancing Personal and Professional Life* section, and questions 50 and 51 in the *Health* section (see Appendix I). We found *no statistical differences* between women who participated in the WFMP, and women who did not participate, in any responses to these questions (at the $p < 0.05$ level; results not shown). Some of the findings of marginal significance include:

⇒ WFMP participants are somewhat less likely to agree that their senior advisor/mentor committee is/was very helpful in working towards tenure (question 9g¹⁰; Table 18).

Table 18: Helpfulness of Senior Advisor/Mentor*

My senior advisor/mentor committee is/was very helpful to me in working toward tenure/promotion	No. of Women Respondents (% Agree)
Use WFMP	55.6%
Do not use WFMP	68.0%

*T-Value = 1.93; PR > |t| = 0.055

⇒ WFMP participants are somewhat more likely to agree that they have enough internal funding to conduct their research (question 14g; Table 19).

Table 19: Sufficient Internal Funding*

I receive enough internal funding to conduct my research	No. of Women Respondents (% Agree)
Use WFMP	52.1%
Do not use WFMP	42.9%

*T-Value = -1.66; PR > |t| = 0.098

¹⁰ The analysis sample for question 9 was restricted to women who achieved tenure or expected to achieve tenure after 1989, the year the WFMP first began.

⇒ Women using the WFMP are slightly more likely to say that they are in “Fair” or “Poor” health, rather than “Excellent,” “Very Good,” or “Good” health (question 50; Table 20).

Table 20: Health*

How would you rate your overall health at the present time?	No. of Women Respondents (% “Fair” or “Poor”)
Use WFMP	12.1%
Do not use WFMP	6.1%

*T-Value = -1.94; PR > |t| = 0.053

Again, these differences are only of marginal statistical significance as no correction for multiple comparisons was made.

Although no statistical effects of WFMP participation were uncovered, at least one interviewee described such an effect. Natalie, an associate professor, gave some very specific ways in which her WFMP mentor exhibited effective strategies for improving her career and personal life and passed these strategies on to Natalie:

I: So how do you manage to balance your home life and your work life? Are there resources on campus that help deal with those issues?

R: I would say the biggest help in this issue has been my women’s faculty mentor.

I: Can you tell me how that was helpful?

R: By observing some groundbreaking changes that she’s making to balance those things; seeing someone that’s quite successful making those changes in an environment in which it’s not always easy to pave the way.

I: What kinds of changes?

R: Reducing commitments for administrative responsibilities, for courses. Changing—actually reducing university commitment when private industry components can be added in as you go through your career and get patents.

Natalie credited her participation in the WFMP directly with helping her to achieve better work/life balance.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the WFMP seems to be meeting its goals. Women who participate in the program see it as a “Very” or “Quite” valuable program, and the majority of women faculty on campus see it as a valuable program, whether or not they have participated in it. The program is serving women faculty of color in the same proportions as their non-minority counterparts, and women faculty of color value the program at the same levels as their majority counterparts. This seems to indicate

that the WFMP is effective at reaching out to women faculty of color and is addressing their needs.

It is somewhat disappointing to find that participation in the program does not seem to increase women faculty's satisfaction with the tenure process, access to resources or support, satisfaction with interactions with departmental colleagues, satisfaction with UW-Madison overall or their careers overall, satisfaction with work/life balance, or physical and mental well-being. At the same time, some indications are that the WFMP is helping women who are “on the edge”—women with the least access to resources, the least satisfaction with their departmental mentoring committees, and/or the most health problems—at least keep up with their peers who are not in the program. For example, women who use the WFMP tend to say that their mentoring committee is not very helpful to them as they work towards tenure, and at the same time they report the same amount of satisfaction with the tenure process overall as their peers who are not in the WFMP. Perhaps this indicates that the WFMP mentoring program is “picking up the slack” from a bad mentoring committee, increasing the chances of a successful outcome. Another indication of this is the finding that women in the WFMP report that their health is much worse than that of their peers who do not participate in the program. Perhaps women who carry an additional burden such as a health problem are finding that the program provides the extra bit of support they need due to their extraordinary situation. The finding that women who are not U.S. citizens tend to value the program more highly than citizens also underscores this point.

One of the reasons the WFMP was created was to address the feelings of isolation that led many junior faculty to leave the UW-Madison. Therefore, we were especially interested in discovering whether women who had ever participated in the program are less likely to agree that they feel isolated in their departments or on the UW-Madison campus overall. We also wondered whether women who have participated in the WFMP are less likely to consider leaving UW-Madison than non-participants. Our data showed the following results:

- ⇒ Although women who have used the WFMP do report feeling less isolated on the UW campus overall than those who have not participated in the program, the difference is not statistically significant. Women who participated in the program report feeling *more* isolated in their departments than non-participants; perhaps this is why they sought out the program.
- ⇒ A higher percentage of women who have used the WFMP report that they have considered leaving UW-Madison compared to women who have not used the WFMP. Again, the difference is not great enough to reach statistical significance; still, it is interesting to note.

The results from the survey and interviews uncover five areas that the steering committee of the WFMP may want to examine more closely in the next year:

- ⇒ Women faculty in the Biological and Physical Sciences seem to be underserved by this program. In particular, women in the Medical School and women biological scientists in L&S participate in the program at very low rates. Women in physical science

departments, while they do participate at high rates, do not rate the program as “Very” or “Quite” valuable, indicating that the program may not be meeting their needs. The steering committee of the WFMP might want to look at the special needs of women in Physical and Biological Sciences, and see whether the program might be changed to address some of these needs.

- ⇒ Women faculty with children under age 6 find the program less valuable than other women, even though women with very young children in the home participate in the WFMP at the same rates as other women. Perhaps it is the inability to find time to fully utilize the program that makes these women less happy with it. It might also be possible that the WFMP is not addressing the unique needs of women faculty with young children, suggesting a closer look at how the issues of importance to this group are addressed by the program (work/family balance issues, for example).
- ⇒ Some of the interviewees suggested that the program could be improved with better communication between the administrators of the program and the participants. In particular, at least two respondents were frustrated by the long time lag between signing up for the program and being assigned a mentor, with little communication between the two events.
- ⇒ Several interview respondents did not participate in the WFMP because they perceived it as being too time consuming. The WFMP steering committee might consider holding events that take less time, in order to include more time-strapped women faculty. Another way to make attendance at WFMP events less time-consuming would be to vary the location around campus.
- ⇒ Several respondents commented that the program is heavily dependent on matching two different personalities. To the extent that the personalities match well, the program is helpful. This suggests that providing more training to the mentors about their role in this program and the expectations of them, as mentors might be helpful as a way to remove some of the “personality factors” from mentoring matches.

*Study of Faculty Worklife at the
University of Wisconsin-Madison*



This questionnaire was developed to better understand issues related to quality of work life for faculty at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. This is part of a larger project, funded by the National Science Foundation, to develop new initiatives for faculty on campus.

Please return this completed questionnaire in the envelope provided to the:



University of Wisconsin Survey Center
630 W. Mifflin, Room 174
Madison, WI 53703-2636

Hiring Process

We are interested in identifying what makes UW-Madison attractive to job applicants, and the aspects of the hiring process that may be experienced positively or negatively. Please think back to when you first were hired at UW-Madison (whether into a faculty position or another position) to answer the following questions.

1a. What was your first position at UW-Madison? *Please check one.*

- a. Assistant Professor
- b. Associate Professor
- c. Professor
- d. Other

1b. In what year were you hired? _____ *Go to question 3*

2a. What position were you first hired into? _____

2b. What year were you hired? _____

2c. What year did you become faculty? _____

3. Were you recruited to apply for a position at UW-Madison? a. Yes b. No

4. Please Rate your level of agreement with these statements about the hiring process. If you were hired into more than one department or unit, please answer for the department or unit that you consider to be your primary department or unit.

<i>Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4. Circle NA if the statement does not apply to you.</i>	Agree Strongly 1	Agree Somewhat 2	Disagree Somewhat 3	Disagree Strongly 4	NA
a. I was satisfied with the hiring process overall.	1	2	3	4	NA
b. The department did its best to obtain resources for me.	1	2	3	4	NA
c. Faculty in the department made an effort to meet me.	1	2	3	4	NA
d. My interactions with the search committee were positive.	1	2	3	4	NA
e. I received advice from a colleague/mentor on the hiring process.	1	2	3	4	NA
f. I negotiated successfully for what I needed.	1	2	3	4	NA
g. I was naïve about the negotiation process.	1	2	3	4	NA
h. I was please with my start up package.	1	2	3	4	NA

5. What were the three **most important factors** that *positively* influenced your decision to accept a position at UW-Madison? *Check three.*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. Prestige of university | <input type="checkbox"/> i. Support for research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. Prestige of department/unit/lab | <input type="checkbox"/> j. Salary and benefits |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. Geographic location | <input type="checkbox"/> k. Colleagues in department/unit/lab |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. Opportunities available for spouse/partner | <input type="checkbox"/> l. Climate of department/unit/lab |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e. Research opportunities | <input type="checkbox"/> m. Climate for women |
| <input type="checkbox"/> f. Community resources and organizations | <input type="checkbox"/> n. Climate for faculty of color |
| <input type="checkbox"/> g. Quality of public schools | <input type="checkbox"/> o. Quality of students |
| <input type="checkbox"/> h. Teaching opportunities | <input type="checkbox"/> p. Other, please explain: _____ |

6. What factors, if any, made you hesitate about accepting a position at UW-Madison? _____

The Tenure Process at UW

7. Did you, or will you, experience the tenure or promotional process to associate professor at the UW-Madison?

- a. Yes b. No —————> Go to question 13



8a. Do you currently have tenure or an indefinite appointment?

- a. Yes b. No —————> 8b. What year do you expect to become an associate professor? _____



8c. What year did you become an associate professor? _____

9. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding your experience with the tenure or promotional process in your primary unit or department.

<i>Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4. Circle NA if the statement does not apply to you.</i>	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	NA
	1	2	3	4	
a. I am/was satisfied with the tenure/promotional process overall.	1	2	3	4	NA
b. I understand/understood the criteria for achieving tenure/promotion.	1	2	3	4	NA
c. I receive/d feedback on my progress toward tenure/promotion.	1	2	3	4	NA
d. I feel/felt supported in my advancement to tenure/promotion.	1	2	3	4	NA
e. I receive/d reduced responsibilities so that I could build my research program.	1	2	3	4	NA
f. I was told about assistance available to pre-tenure/promotion faculty (e.g., workshops, mentoring).	1	2	3	4	NA
g. My senior advisor/mentor committee is/was very helpful to me in working toward tenure/promotion.	1	2	3	4	NA
h. I feel there is/was a strong fit between the way I do/did research, teaching and service, and the way it is/was evaluated for tenure.	1	2	3	4	NA

10. Have you ever extended or reset your tenure clock at UW-Madison?

- a. Yes b. No —————> Go to question 12 c. Not applicable —————> Go to question 13



11. For each time you have extended or reset your tenure clock, please list the reason you extended/reset the clock, the extent to which you feel your primary department/unit was supportive, and the reduced responsibilities you received.

	11a. What was the main reason for extending/resetting your tenure clock?	11b. How supportive was your department/unit? <i>Please circle on number on a scale of 1 to 4.</i>	11c. What reduced responsibilities were you granted, if any?
First Time		Extremely Supportive 1	Generally Supportive 2
		Generally Unsupportive 3	Extremely Unsupportive 4
Second Time		Extremely Supportive 1	Generally Supportive 2
		Generally Unsupportive 3	Extremely Unsupportive 4

12a. Did you choose NOT to extend/reset the tenure clock even though you may have wanted to?

a. Yes b. No —————> Go to question 13



12b. Please explain: _____

Professional Activities

We are interested in a number of dimensions of the work environment for faculty at UW-Madison including your feelings about your work allocation, resources you have for research, service responsibilities, and your interaction with colleagues.

13. What proportion of your work time do you **currently spend** on the following activities, and what proportion of your work time would you **prefer to spend** on these activities? The total should equal 100% even if your appointment is not 100% time.

	% of time currently spend	% of time would prefer to spend
a. Research	_____ %	_____ %
b. Teaching	_____ %	_____ %
c. Advising students	_____ %	_____ %
d. Service	_____ %	_____ %
e. Administrative	_____ %	_____ %
f. Clinical	_____ %	_____ %
g. Mentoring	_____ %	_____ %
h. Extension	_____ %	_____ %
i. Outreach	_____ %	_____ %
j. Other _____	_____ %	_____ %
TOTAL	100 %	100 %

14. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the resources available to you?

<i>Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4. Circle NA if the statement does not apply to you.</i>	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	NA
	Strongly	Somewhat	Somewhat	Strongly	
	1	2	3	4	
a. I have the equipment and supplies I need to adequately conduct my research.	1	2	3	4	NA
b. I receive regular maintenance/upgrades of my equipment.	1	2	3	4	NA
c. I would like to receive more department travel funds than I do.	1	2	3	4	NA
d. I have sufficient office space.	1	2	3	4	NA
e. I have sufficient laboratory space.	1	2	3	4	NA
f. I have sufficient space for housing research animals.	1	2	3	4	NA
g. I receive enough internal funding to conduct my research.	1	2	3	4	NA
h. I receive the amount of technical/computer support I need.	1	2	3	4	NA
i. I have enough office support.	1	2	3	4	NA
j. I have colleagues on campus who do similar research.	1	2	3	4	NA
k. I have colleagues or peers who give me career advice or guidance when I need it.	1	2	3	4	NA
l. I have sufficient teaching support (including T.A.s).	1	2	3	4	NA
m. I have sufficient clinical support.	1	2	3	4	NA

15. Do you currently collaborate, or have you collaborated in the past, on research with colleagues...

	Currently collaborate?		Collaborated in the past?	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
a. In your primary department?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Outside your department, but on the UW-Madison campus?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Off the UW-Madison campus?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

16. Please indicate whether you have ever served on, or chaired, any of the following committees in your department.

Check NA if there is no such committee in your department.	Have you ever served on this committee?		Have you ever chaired this committee?		NA
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
a. Space	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Salaries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Promotion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Faculty search	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Curriculum (graduate and/or undergraduate)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Graduate admissions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Diversity committees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17. Please indicate whether you currently hold, or have held, any of the following positions on the UW-Madison campus:

	Currently hold		Held in the past	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
a. Assistant or Associate Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Department Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Assistant or Associate Dean	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Dean	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Director of center/institute	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Section/area head	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Principal Investigator on a research grant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Principal Investigator on an educational grant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Other, please explain: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

18. Have you held any of the following leadership positions outside UW-Madison?

	Yes	No
a. President or high-level leadership position in a professional association or organization?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. President or high-level leadership position in a service organization (including community service)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Chair of a major committee in a professional organization or association?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Editor of a journal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Member of a national commission or panel?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19. Do you have an interest in taking on any formal leadership positions at the UW-Madison (e.g. dean, chair, director of center/institute, section/area head)?

a. Yes b. No —————> Go to question 21



20a. Are there barriers preventing you from taking on such a position?

b. No —————> Go to question 21 a. Yes



<p>20b. What are the barriers?</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
--

If you have an appointment in more than one department or unit, please answer question 21 and 22 using the department or unit that you consider to be your primary department or unit.

21. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your interactions with colleagues and others in your primary department/unit?

<i>Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4 for each statement.</i>	Agree Strongly 1	Agree Somewhat 2	Disagree Somewhat 3	Disagree Strongly 4
a. I am treated with respect by colleagues.	1	2	3	4
b. I am treated with respect by students.	1	2	3	4
c. I am treated with respect by staff.	1	2	3	4
d. I am treated with respect by my department chair.	1	2	3	4
e. I feel excluded from an informal network in my department.	1	2	3	4
f. I encounter unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with colleagues.	1	2	3	4
g. Colleagues in my department solicit my opinion about work-related matters (such as teaching, research, and service).	1	2	3	4
h. In my department, I feel that my research is considered mainstream.	1	2	3	4
i. I feel that my colleagues value my research.	1	2	3	4
j. I do a great deal of work that is not formally recognized by my department.	1	2	3	4
k. I feel like I “fit” in my department.	1	2	3	4
l. I feel isolated in my department.	1	2	3	4
m. I feel isolated on the UW campus overall.	1	2	3	4

22. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your participation in the decision-making process in your department/unit?

<i>Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4 for each statement.</i>	Agree Strongly 1	Agree Somewhat 2	Disagree Somewhat 3	Disagree Strongly 4
a. I feel like a full and equal participant in the problem-solving and decision-making.	1	2	3	4
b. I have a voice in how resources are allocated.	1	2	3	4
c. Meetings allow for all participants to share their views.	1	2	3	4
d. Committee assignments are rotated fairly to allow for participation of all faculty.	1	2	3	4
e. My department chair involves me in decision-making.	1	2	3	4

Satisfaction with UW-Madison

We would like to know how you feel about the University of Wisconsin-Madison in general.

23. How satisfied are you, in general, with your job at UW-Madison? *Please circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4.*

Very Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Somewhat Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied
1 2 3 4

24. How satisfied are you, in general, with the way your career has progressed at the UW-Madison?

Very Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Somewhat Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied
1 2 3 4

25. What factors contribute most to your satisfaction at UW-Madison? _____

26. What factors detract most from your satisfaction at UW-Madison? _____

Sexual Harrassment

The UW-Madison defines sexual harassment as including unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when such conduct influences employment or academic decisions, interferes with an employee's work, or creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive work or learning environment. Please use this definition as you answer the next two questions.

33. Using this definition, within the last five years, how often, if at all, have you experienced sexual harassment on the UW-Madison campus? *Check one response.*

- Never 1 to 2 times 3 to 5 times More than 5 times

34. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about sexual harassment at UW-Madison.

<i>Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4.</i>	Agree Strongly 1	Agree Somewhat 2	Disagree Somewhat 3	Disagree Strongly 4	Don't Know
a. Sexual harassment is taken seriously on campus.	1	2	3	4	DK
b. Sexual harassment is a big problem on campus.	1	2	3	4	DK
c. I know the steps to take if a person comes to me with a problem with sexual harassment.	1	2	3	4	DK
d. The process for resolving complaints about sexual harassment at UW-Madison is effective.	1	2	3	4	DK

Balancing Personal and Professional Life

We would like to know to what extent faculty at UW-Madison are able to balance their professional and personal lives.

35. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about balancing your personal and professional lives.

<i>Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4. Circle NA if the statement does not apply to you.</i>	Agree Strongly 1	Agree Somewhat 2	Disagree Somewhat 3	Disagree Strongly 4	NA
a. I am usually satisfied with the way in which I balance my professional and personal life.	1	2	3	4	NA
b. I have seriously considered leaving UW-Madison in order to achieve better balance between work and personal life.	1	2	3	4	NA
c. I often have to forgo professional activities (e.g., sabbaticals, conferences) because of personal responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	NA
d. Personal responsibilities and commitments have slowed down my career progression.	1	2	3	4	NA

36. Have you cared for, or do you currently care for, dependent children?

- a. Yes b. No \longrightarrow *Go to question 42*



37. We are interested in how the timing of raising children affects career trajectories. For each child that has been dependent on you in the past or at the present time, please list the year that child was born, the year that child entered your home (if different), the child's gender, and year the child first moved out of your home (e.g., to attend college).

	Year of Birth	Year Child Entered Home	Child's Gender	Year child moved away
Child 1			<input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	
Child 2			<input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	
Child 3			<input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	
Child 4			<input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	
Child 5			<input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	

38. Do you currently use, or need, any day care services or programs to care for a dependent child?

- a. Yes
 b. No —————> *Go to question 42*

39. Which of the following childcare arrangements do you have? *Check all that apply*

- a. University of Wisconsin childcare center
 b. Non-university childcare center
 c. Childcare in the provider's home
 d. In-home provider (nanny/babysitter in your home)
 e. Family members (spouse/partner, grandparent, yourself, etc.)
 f. After-school care
 g. Child takes care of self
 h. Other (please specify): _____

40. How satisfied are you with your current childcare arrangements? *Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4.*

Very satisfied Somewhat satisfied Somewhat dissatisfied Very dissatisfied
 1 2 3 4

41. To what extent are the following childcare issues a priority for you?

<i>Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4.</i>	High Priority 1	Quite a Priority 2	Somewhat a Priority 3	Not at all a Priority 4
a. Availability of campus childcare	1	2	3	4
b. Availability of infant/toddler care	1	2	3	4
c. Care for school aged children after school or during the summer	1	2	3	4
d. Childcare when your child is sick	1	2	3	4
e. Back-up or drop-in care when your usual childcare arrangements do not work	1	2	3	4
f. Childcare specifically designed for children with developmental delays or disabilities	1	2	3	4
g. Childcare when you are away at conferences and special events held elsewhere	1	2	3	4
h. Extended hour childcare when you must work evenings, nights, or weekends	1	2	3	4
i. Assistance in covering childcare costs	1	2	3	4
j. Assistance with referrals to non-university childcare situations	1	2	3	4
k. Other, please specify: _____	1	2	3	4

42. Have you provided care for an aging parent or relative in the past 3 years?

- a. Yes
 b. No —————> *Go to question 44*

43. How much time on average do you, or did you, spend caring for an aging parent or relative **per week**? *Check one.*

- a. 5 hours or less a week b. 6-10 hours a week c. 11-20 hours a week d. 21-30 hours a week e. More than 30 hours a week

44. With regard to **past or current care** of dependent children, aging parents/relatives, or a disabled spouse/partner, what would you recommend the University do to support faculty and staff?

Spouse/Partner's Career

45. What is your current marital or cohabitation status?

- a. I am married and live with my spouse —————▶ Go to question 46
- b. I am not married, but live with a domestic partner (opposite or same sex) —————▶ Go to question 46
- c. I am married or partnered, but we reside in different locations —————▶ Go to question 46
- d. I am single (am not married and am not partnered) —————▶ Go to question 49

46. What is your spouse or partner's **current** employment status? What is your partner's **preferred** employment status?

<i>Check one for each.</i>	Full-time	Part-time	Not employed	Retired
a. Spouse/partner's current employment status	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Spouse/partner's preferred employment status	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

47. Does your partner or spouse work at UW-Madison? a. Yes b. No

48. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your spouse or partner's career.

<i>Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4. Circle NA if the statement does not apply to you.</i>	Agree Strongly 1	Agree Somewhat 2	Disagree Somewhat 3	Disagree Strongly 4	NA
a. My spouse/partner is satisfied with his/her current employment opportunities.	1	2	3	4	NA
b. I have seriously considered leaving UW-Madison in order to enhance my spouse/partner's career opportunities.	1	2	3	4	NA
c. My partner/spouse and I are staying in Madison because of my job.	1	2	3	4	NA
d. My spouse/partner and I have seriously considered leaving Madison to enhance both our career opportunities.	1	2	3	4	NA

49. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your department/unit's support of family obligations. If you have an appointment in more than one department or unit, please answer the following questions using the department or unit that you consider to be your primary department or unit.

<i>Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4. Circle NA if the statement does not apply to you.</i>	Agree Strongly 1	Agree Somewhat 2	Disagree Somewhat 3	Disagree Strongly 4	Don't Know	NA
a. Most faculty in my department are supportive of colleagues who want to balance their family and career lives.	1	2	3	4	DK	NA
b. It is difficult for faculty in my department to adjust their work schedules to care for children or other family members.	1	2	3	4	DK	NA
c. Department meetings frequently occur early in the morning or late in the day.	1	2	3	4	DK	NA
d. The department knows the options available for faculty who have a new baby.	1	2	3	4	DK	NA
e. The department is supportive of family leave.	1	2	3	4	DK	NA
f. Faculty who have children are considered to be less committed to their careers.	1	2	3	4	DK	NA

A person's health has been shown to be related to their work environment. Please answer the following questions about your health.

50. How would you rate your overall health at the present time? *Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 5.*

Excellent Very good Good Fair Poor
 1 2 3 4 5

51. How often do you feel:

<i>Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 5 for each item.</i>	Very often 1	Quite often 2	Sometimes 3	Once in a while 4	Rarely 5
a. Happy	1	2	3	4	5
b. Fatigued	1	2	3	4	5
c. Stressed	1	2	3	4	5
d. Nervous	1	2	3	4	5
e. Depressed	1	2	3	4	5
f. Short-tempered	1	2	3	4	5
g. Well-rested	1	2	3	4	5
h. Physically fit	1	2	3	4	5

52. Do you have a significant health issue or disability?

a. Yes b. No **————> Go to question 54**

↓

53. In dealing with this health issue or disability, how accommodating is ...

<i>(Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4 for each statement).</i>	Very 1	Quite 2	Somewhat 3	Not at all 4
a. Your primary department?	1	2	3	4
b. UW-Madison?	1	2	3	4

Diversity Issues at UW-Madison

54. With respect to the recruitment of, climate for, and leadership of women faculty, how much would you agree or disagree with the following statements about your primary department/unit?

<i>Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4.</i>	Agree Strongly 1	Agree Somewhat 2	Disagree Somewhat 3	Disagree Strongly 4	Don't Know
a. There are too few women faculty in my department.	1	2	3	4	DK
b. My department has identified ways to recruit women faculty.	1	2	3	4	DK
c. My department has actively recruited women faculty.	1	2	3	4	DK
d. The climate for women in my department is good.	1	2	3	4	DK
e. My department has identified ways to enhance the climate for women.	1	2	3	4	DK
f. My department has taken steps to enhance the climate for women.	1	2	3	4	DK
g. My department has too few women faculty in leadership positions.	1	2	3	4	DK
h. My department has identified ways to move women into leadership positions.	1	2	3	4	DK
i. My department has made an effort to promote women into leadership positions.	1	2	3	4	DK

55. With respect to the recruitment of, climate for, and leadership of faculty of color, how much would you agree or disagree with the following statements about your primary department/unit?

<i>Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4.</i>	Agree Strongly 1	Agree Somewhat 2	Disagree Somewhat 3	Disagree Strongly 4	Don't Know
a. There are too few faculty of color in my department.	1	2	3	4	DK
b. My department has identified ways to recruit faculty of color.	1	2	3	4	DK
c. My department has actively recruited faculty of color.	1	2	3	4	DK
d. The climate for faculty of color in my department is good.	1	2	3	4	DK
e. My department has identified ways to enhance the climate for faculty of color.	1	2	3	4	DK
f. My department has taken steps to enhance the climate for faculty of color.	1	2	3	4	DK
g. My department has too few faculty of color in leadership positions.	1	2	3	4	DK
h. My department has identified ways to move faculty of color into leadership positions.	1	2	3	4	DK
i. My department has made an effort to promote faculty of color into leadership positions.	1	2	3	4	DK

Personal Demographics

As always, responses to the following questions will be kept confidential. Information from this survey will be presented in aggregate form so that individual respondents cannot be identified.

56. What is your sex? a. Male b. Female

57. What is your race/ethnicity? *Check all that apply.*

- a. Southeast Asian e. Native American (American Indian or Alaskan Native)
b. Other Asian/Pacific Islander f. White, not of Hispanic origin
c. Black/African American, not of Hispanic origin g. Other, please explain: _____
d. Hispanic

58. What is your sexual orientation? a. Heterosexual b. Gay/Lesbian c. Bisexual

59. Are you a U.S. citizen? a. Yes b. No

60a. What degrees have you received? *Check all that apply.*

- a. Ph.D. d. J.D. _____
b. M.D. e. M.A./M.S.
c. D.V.M. f. Other, please list: _____

60b. Year earned highest degree: _____
 60c. Institution grant highest degree: _____

61. Which department/unit did you have in mind when completing this survey? _____

62. As a general measure of socioeconomic background, what is/was your parents' highest levels of education?

<i>Check NA if not applicable.</i>	Less than high school	Some high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Advanced degree	NA
Mother	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Father	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

THANK YOU for your time!

APPENDIX II: WOMEN FACULTY INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

WISELI Baseline Interview Protocol for UW-Madison female faculty/staff/ instructors in sciences and in engineering

1. Tell me how you got to where you are today in your current position at UW. Start as early as you like.

FOR FACULTY:

We know: Title (Assistant., Associate, Full professor; Tenure-track or Tenured)

- How long working at UW-Madison in current position?
- Transferred from elsewhere? Went through tenure process elsewhere?
- Current position entails?
(__ % research, ___ % teaching, __ % service, __ % administration)
- Educational background (degrees- Ph.D.? Working toward Ph.D.?)
- If switched from academic staff to faculty –find out when and how.

FOR ACADEMIC STAFF (RESEARCHERS, SCIENTISTS):

We know: Title (Researcher or Scientist --Assistant, Associate, Full)

- How long working at UW-Madison in current position?
- Transferred from elsewhere?
- Current position entails?
(___ % research, ___ % teaching, ___ % service, ___ % administration)
- Educational background (degrees- Ph.D.? Working toward Ph.D.?)
- If switched from faculty to academic staff – find out when, how, and why.

FOR INSTRUCTORS:

We know: Title (Lecturer, Associate Faculty; other)

- How long working at UW-Madison in current position?
- Transferred from elsewhere?
- Current position entails?
(___ % research, ___ % teaching, ___ % service, ___ % administration)
- Educational background (degrees- Ph.D.? Working toward Ph.D.?)

2. Tell me about your experience starting here. Start with when you first applied. Why here? Tell me about process, negotiations, etc.

Get info about:

- What motivated you to apply at UW-Madison?
- The hiring process (i.e., the application, interview, contract negotiation process).
 - FACULTY: Start up space? Start up dollars? What did you negotiate? What did you get? Satisfied with start up package?
- What was good about the hiring process? What could have been improved?
- Did you receive mentoring during the negotiations of start-up package? By whom?

- Was "dual hiring" an issue? Describe.
- How did this position fit (or not fit) with your career aspirations?

3. Let's talk about your [department, unit, or lab].

A) Briefly describe your [department, unit, lab] for me. (How large? Geographical layout (e.g. in one location or several locations)? Diversity in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, age?)

B) What's it like to work/be in your [department, unit or lab]? We are interested "in general" and for you "personally." Interested in resources and social environment.

Examples of prompts:

- What is "tone" of department? (friendly, supportive, competitive, hostile)
- unit/lab/departmental meetings-- how do you feel about your participation in meetings with colleagues? Other collegial interactions?
- how committee assignments are made
- FACULTY/INSTRUCTOR: how teaching assignments are made
- resources available in the department
- support for advancement in your career
- kind of chair/director you have
- your colleagues and your relationships with them

C) Do you or have you had a role in leadership? Describe. Do you want or plan towards a role in leadership?

D) What are the best features of your work environment?

E) How does working in this [department, unit, or lab] compare to other [departments, units, labs] (here and at other jobs) with respect to:

- resources?
- social environment?

F) What are the issues that come up for you in your [department, unit or lab]? How do/did you handle these issues?

EXAMPLES INTERVIEWEES MAY RAISE – Some may be used as probes if interviewee doesn't discuss.

- Amount of work demanded
- Amount of resources – space, assistance
- Course and service assignments
- Sense of isolation or limited social interaction in workplace
- Leadership by chair/director and support in your career
- Colleagues to work/talk with; Respect from colleagues
- Availability of mentors or role models
- Having a voice in unit/department policy

- Balance between work and non-work life (including child care)
- Sexual harassment
 - Discrimination
 - Things that are done to make you feel valued or de-valued

G) Based on issues raised by interviewee, ask:

- Have you used campus resources/initiatives to address these issues? [mention all]

Examples:	Mentoring	Child care
	Stopping the tenure clock	Family leave
	Extended tenure clock	Academic Staff merit
	Committee on Women	Faculty Ombudsperson
	Sexual Harassment Workshops/Brochures	
	Women Faculty Mentoring Program	
	Employee Assistance	
- Are there initiatives that WISELI could undertake to address these concerns?
(e.g., Leadership training for chairs/deans; Professional development workshops for faculty/staff; Studies of key issues)

4. Let's talk about balancing life at work and life outside of work.

A) Tell me about your commitments/interests outside of work.

- Partner/spouse?
- Children? Other dependents?
- Dual career? Both in sciences or engineering? Primary & secondary earners?
- Other commitments?
- How are responsibilities shared?

B) How do these commitments/interests influence your work?

Examples:

- Expectations about balancing career and life outside of work
- Ability to attend late meetings, work nights and weekends, work in lab 24-7
- Time
- Interruptions

C) Does balancing work and home life/interests have an effect on your physical and mental health? If so, in what way? Would you consider this effect to be positive or negative?

5. Can I ask you to reflect on your career at UW-Madison and to think about your future?

A) Tell me about how your career has evolved at UW-Madison?

- Has it evolved as you expected? How happy or satisfied are you in your career? Tell me about success and your definition of success. What motivates you?
- What are your short-term and long-term career goals?
- What has been most influential?

- Have you ever wanted or tried to leave UW-Madison? If so, what prompted you to want to leave? And, what kept you here? Did you re-negotiate space, salary, etc.?
- Do you plan to stay at UW-Madison?

B) Do you feel that your work has been supported/recognized at UW-Madison?

- If so, how has it been supported? (e.g., financial or other rewards; request for leadership roles; access to key committees; access to resources such as equipment and graduate students; research collaborators)
- Are there ways that you feel your work has NOT been supported/recognized at UW-Madison?

6. *What role has gender played in your career and in your experience?*

A) In your view, did gender effect your early career aspirations, experiences, or planning?

B) Does it effect your current work experience?

C) What's it like to be a woman working at UW in the [science, engineering]?

- Are there challenges or obstacles that women in [science, engineering] in general encounter?
- Are there challenges or obstacles that you encounter?
- Many women leave the [sciences, engineering] and leave academia. What keeps you in the [sciences, engineering]? Are there factors that keep you here?

D) How, if at all, do you think gender might play a role in your future professional career?

E) Have you observed differences between the career choices or paths of women and those of men in [science, engineering] in your [department, unit, or lab]? If so, what are they?

7. *Let's talk about some of the gender issues people raise.*

Discuss chart with interviewee

8. *If these are experienced by you, where do you go (would you go, or did you go) to get assistance with these types of issues? What is available here? Where is more help needed?*

9. *What are your thoughts about the future for women in [sciences or engineering] at UW in particular? Why do you feel this way? How could WISELI fit with this future? Where should efforts be focused?*

10. *Feel free to make any additional comments.*

FOR QUESTION #7.

The literature on women in science and engineering describes possible differences experienced by men and women in academic science and engineering careers. Here is a list of possible differences. Can you let us know:

- Have you have experienced any of these differences? (describe, if you have)
- Have you observed any differences experienced by other women in [science or engineering]?
- In your view, are some of these more serious/critical than others?

Differences in...	Experienced by interviewee	Observed by interviewee	Considered most/more critical
Allocation of teaching/service assignments (e.g., committees)			
Access to resources (lab or office space)			
Salary (although similar rank, title, experience, publications)			
Value/respect by colleagues			
Degree to which taken seriously as scholar/scientist/engineer			
Attitudes or consequences if one needs to meet family responsibilities, uses family leave, stops tenure clock, or attempts to job share			
Processes or standards for promotion			
Inclusion into professional collegial relationships			
Access to senior faculty			
Opportunities to show leadership			
Value given to informal service activities (e.g., community involvement)			
Negotiating salary when about to go elsewhere			
Involvement with colleagues in informal activities			
Interactional/conversational styles			
The experience of having your ideas ignored			
Feelings of professional or social isolation			
Feelings of being undervalued or ignored by colleagues			
Sexual harassment			
General happiness/mental health			
Physical health			

APPENDIX III: DIVISIONAL INFORMATION

Division/Department	School/College*	“Science” Department
Physical Sciences		
Biological Systems Engineering	CALS	Yes
Soil Science	CALS	Yes
Chemical Engineering	ENGR	Yes
Civil & Environmental Engineering	ENGR	Yes
Electrical & Computer Engineering	ENGR	Yes
Biomedical Engineering	ENGR	Yes
Industrial Engineering	ENGR	Yes
Mechanical Engineering	ENGR	Yes
Materials Science & Engineering	ENGR	Yes
Engineering Physics	ENGR	Yes
Engineering Professional Development	ENGR	Yes
Astronomy	L&S	Yes
Chemistry	L&S	Yes
Computer Sciences	L&S	Yes
Geology & Geophysics	L&S	Yes
Mathematics	L&S	Yes
Atmospheric & Oceanic Sciences	L&S	Yes
Physics	L&S	Yes
Statistics	L&S	Yes
Biological Sciences		
Agronomy	CALS	Yes
Animal Science	CALS	Yes
Bacteriology	CALS	Yes
Biochemistry	CALS	Yes
Dairy Science	CALS	Yes
Entomology	CALS	Yes
Food Microbiology & Toxicology	CALS	Yes
Food Science	CALS	Yes
Genetics	CALS	Yes
Horticulture	CALS	Yes
Nutritional Sciences	CALS	Yes
Plant Pathology	CALS	Yes
Forest Ecology & Management	CALS	Yes
Natural Resources – Wildlife Ecology	CALS	Yes
Kinesiology	EDUC	No
Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies	MISC	No
Botany	L&S	Yes
Communicative Disorders	L&S	Yes
Zoology	L&S	Yes
Anatomy	MED	Yes
Anesthesiology	MED	Yes
Biostatistics & Medical Informatics	MED	Yes
Family Medicine	MED	Yes
Genetics	MED	Yes
Obstetrics & Gynecology	MED	Yes
Medical History & Bioethics	MED	Yes
Human Oncology	MED	Yes
Medicine	MED	Yes
Dermatology	MED	Yes

Medical Microbiology	MED	Yes
Medical Physics	MED	Yes
Neurology	MED	Yes
Neurological Surgery	MED	Yes
Oncology	MED	Yes
Ophthalmology & Visual Sciences	MED	Yes
Orthopedics & Rehabilitation	MED	Yes
Pathology & Laboratory Medicine	MED	Yes
Pediatrics	MED	Yes
Biomolecular Chemistry	MED	Yes
Physiology	MED	Yes
Population Health Sciences	MED	Yes
Psychiatry	MED	Yes
Radiology	MED	Yes
Surgery	MED	Yes
School of Pharmacy	PHARM	Yes
Animal Health & Biomedical Sciences	VET	Yes
Medical Sciences	VET	Yes
Pathobiological Sciences	VET	Yes
Comparative Biosciences	VET	Yes
Surgical Sciences	VET	Yes
Social Studies		
Agricultural & Applied Economics	CALS	No
Life Sciences Communication	CALS	No
Rural Sociology	CALS	No
Natural Resources – Landscape Architecture	CALS	No
Urban & Regional Planning	CALS	No
School of Business	BUS	No
Counseling Psychology	EDUC	No
Curriculum & Instruction	EDUC	No
Educational Administration	EDUC	No
Educational Policy Studies	EDUC	No
Educational Psychology	EDUC	No
Rehabilitation Psychology & Special Education	EDUC	No
School of Human Ecology	SOHE	No
Law School	LAW	No
Anthropology	L&S	No
Afro-American Studies	L&S	No
Communication Arts	L&S	No
Economics	L&S	No
Ethnic Studies	L&S	No
Geography	L&S	No
LaFollette School of Public Affairs	L&S	No
School of Journalism & Mass Communication	L&S	No
School of Library & Information Studies	L&S	No
Political Science	L&S	No
Psychology	L&S	No
Social Work	L&S	No
Sociology	L&S	No
Urban & Regional Planning	L&S	No
School of Nursing	NURS	No
Professional Development & Applied Studies	MISC	No
Humanities		

Art	EDUC	No
Dance	EDUC	No
African Languages & Literature	L&S	No
Art History	L&S	No
Classics	L&S	No
Comparative Literature	L&S	No
East Asian Languages & Literature	L&S	No
English	L&S	No
French & Italian	L&S	No
German	L&S	No
Hebrew & Semitic Studies	L&S	No
History	L&S	No
History of Science	L&S	No
Linguistics	L&S	No
School of Music	L&S	No
Philosophy	L&S	No
Scandinavian Studies	L&S	No
Slavic Languages	L&S	No
Languages & Cultures of Asia	L&S	No
Spanish & Portuguese	L&S	No
Theatre & Drama	L&S	No
Women's Studies Program	L&S	No
College Library	MISC	No
Library – Social Sciences	MISC	No
Liberal Studies & the Arts	MISC	No

* BUS = School of Business

CALS = College of Agricultural & Life Sciences

EDUC = School of Education

ENGR = College of Engineering

L&S = College of Letters & Science

LAW = Law School

MED = Medical School

MISC = Gaylord Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies (IES), Division of Continuing Studies, Libraries

NURS = School of Nursing

PHARM = School of Pharmacy

SOHE = School of Human Ecology