



Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

Report from Consortium of Women in Research

December 6, 2011

The Vice Chancellor for Research requested a report from the Consortium of Women in Research to address several issues (see report for details). The Davis Division of the Academic Senate is asked to review and comment on the report provided. Please note: the referenced report was lost in transit when forwarded for Davis Division comment on June 30, 2011.

Administrative Partners (DANN TRASK)

December 9, 2011 5:28 PM

Dear Professor Bisson,

The L&S Executive Committee has reviewed the report from the Consortium for Women in Research (CWR). We were grateful to receive the April 19, 2011 letter from Vice-Chancellor Lewin which was the impetus for the report on the CWR, as it clarified the intent of the report. The committee had several comments about the CWR:

- The Bylaws are notably out of date.
- We don't understand this organization well, or its mission, and the report didn't help very much. It seems as though the campus is giving a grant to a very amorphous organization.
- We suggest that all of the groups interested in the status of women at UC Davis be coordinated and organized so their efforts can be more effective. Perhaps a high-quality group, or Center, that was well-organized, would be able to attract major grant funding; this does not seem to be the case with the present structures.
- In the absence of a larger organizational structure, it doesn't seem to be productive to fund a group that is just doing "bits and pieces" of activities, as it appears to us the CWR is. :

Sincerely,

Abigail Thompson, Chair
Executive Committee
College of Letters and Science

Affirmative Action & Diversity

November 28, 2011 9:29 AM

[Report from Consortium of Women in Research :](#)

The Affirmative Action and Diversity committee recognizes the CWR for its considerable efforts in reducing gender disparities on campus. Its accomplishments are to be commended; especially given the limited resources it has been allocated. The fact that support for the CWR has diminished over time is most unfortunate, and the committee urges the administration to consider increasing (or at least restoring to its former amount) the level of funding to CWR. It is clear that even a modest increase would go a long way for this committee, and this relatively small investment would speak volumes to the UC Davis' commitment to end the gross gender inequities that exist across the campus.

CAP Oversight Committee

December 1, 2011 4:51 PM

Report from the Consortium for Women and Research

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) finds that the report from Consortium for Women and Research Director Laura Grindstaff addresses the questions raised by Vice Chancellor for Research Harris Lewin directly and effectively. CAP acknowledges the significance of the Consortium's accomplishments in the ongoing efforts of UC Davis to ensure a research environment and a personnel process free of discrimination based on gender. CAP commends Professor Grindstaff for outlining her vision of the possibilities for future development of the Consortium in a clear and open-minded fashion.

Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction

November 28, 2011 4:14 PM

No response at this time.

Faculty Welfare

December 6, 2011 8:24 PM

Submitted on behalf of the 2011-12 Academic Senate Faculty Welfare Committee Chair Stuart Hill

The Faculty Welfare Committee supports University aid to female faculty to pursue their research agendas and professional development at UC, Davis. The Committee, however, is divided in its assessment of whether the CWR is the best means to achieve those goals. The CWR was seen by some as providing effective outreach to many women researchers on this campus, particularly in light of the limited alternatives. They believed that the University should continue to back this organization at current, if not higher levels of support. The opposing view was that CWR had not been very helpful to large numbers of women. Women in STEM fields (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics), in particular, found little help at CWR despite the mandate of this organization to increase the role of women in all disciplines in the University, including STEM. The majority of Faculty Welfare Members did not fall in either of these camps. The primary reason was that they knew little of CWR's accomplishments other than what they read in the report. One could assess the pros and cons of the activities CWR has pursued, especially when it has been constrained by diminishing resources. But in looking forward this discussion would be not very helpful unless we simultaneously examined other efforts at Davis to support the research efforts of female faculty. The Faculty Welfare Committee believed that this type of global evaluation would be the most fruitful approach in a time of scarce means.

Graduate Council

December 6, 2011 9:43 AM

Many of the activities of the Consortium for Women and Research (CWR) have an impact on the education of graduate students; we note only those activities on which the impact is most direct. The Outstanding Mentor Award, for example, encourages with recognition the important role of advisers (to both graduate and undergraduate students) in higher education. The awards to Research Interest Groups brings together faculty (and, presumably graduate students) with common concerns in gender-related studies. Even more immediately, the small but vital graduate student awards provide money for graduate student research, often in areas where faculty financial sponsorship is unavailable. The recipients' participation in the Graduate Research Brown-Bag Series gives them the opportunity to present their research to an interested audience. The CWR also provides Graduate Travel Awards to allow graduate students to go to conferences in areas of interest to them.

We note that budget cuts have resulted in a loss of \$10,000 a year to CWR, with the result that CWR will necessarily be unable to fund many commendable graduate student projects.

Planning & Budget

November 28, 2011 4:14 PM

No response at this time.

Research

November 28, 2011 4:14 PM

Response continued on next page.

The Committee on Research discussed the Report from the Consortium of Women in Research (CWR). Overall, COR agrees that the group does valuable work and that the university should continue to fund this program. In addition, COR agrees that there are important research policy issues to be addressed regarding gender equity and therefore funding should not be cut or reduced at this time. The Vice-Chancellor is clearly dissatisfied with the report's content, and COR would like to be sure that the dissatisfaction is situated in the following context:

1. Did the report address the specific issues required (i.e. past contributions, current value, and future promise)?

Yes. While the opening Introduction on the History and Mission, the Justification, and the CWR on Campus were not requested, this section was extremely useful in contextualizing the mission statement and its achievability. COR finds the CWR's contributions laudable in terms of graduate support, acknowledging mentors, the Research Interest Groups, etc. In terms of current value, Professor Grindstaff has established forums for research and dissemination well beyond the expectations of her position. For example, the international nature of the Davis Feminist Film Festival is extremely impressive.

2. Is there a future promise for the CWR?

The CWR manages to do a lot with very little money. COR argues that even the small amounts that the CWR is able to grant to researchers (students and faculty alike) are necessary for promoting interdisciplinary research on campus and making it possible for graduate students and faculty to find and win larger grants.

3. Is the CWR sustainable as it is?

The director is loud and clear on this point: No, it isn't.. The Office of Research should provide money for a full-time member of staff and an overhaul of the website.

Finally, the committee would encourage the director to apply for one of the new COR initiative/collaborative interdisciplinary large grants, which are historically used to promote additional external funding.