

**Report to the Canadian Philosophical Association
from the
Committee to Study Hiring Policies Affecting Women
May 1991**

Committee Members

Brenda Baker, University of Calgary
Josiane Boulad-Ayoub, Université du Québec à Montréal
Lorraine Code, York University
Michael McDonald, University of British Columbia
Kathleen Okruhlik, University of Western Ontario (Chair)
Susan Sherwin, Dalhousie University
Wayne Sumner, University of Toronto

Research Assistant

Andrea Purvis

STATISTICAL SURVEY

The President of the Canadian Philosophical Association, Louise Marcil-Lacoste, was authorized at the November 1990 meeting of the Executive to form a committee to study the hiring policies of Canadian departments of philosophy with respect to the recruitment of women. The membership of the committee was established in December 1990. A questionnaire was formulated by the committee in January 1991 to gather information not only on hiring policies but also on current faculty complement, percentage of female philosophy students at all levels of study, and job placements for female graduate students. The questionnaire was mailed out to the heads of 152 philosophy departments across Canada at the end of February 1991. (The mailing list was compiled from the *Directory of American Philosophers 1990-1991*.)

Ninety-five responses were received by the end of April 1991. The statistical survey that follows is based on a sample size of seventy responses. Of the twenty-five responses received that are not included in the survey, nine were affiliates of larger institutions and thus were included in the response of the parent institution; sixteen were returned unanswered because the respondent felt that the questionnaire was not applicable (for example, because the institution did not have a philosophy program, or because philosophy courses were taught as part of a “humanities” or “literature” or “social sciences” program). Most of these respondents were the only (male) philosopher in a small college. Other respondents were from theological colleges and, again, felt that the questionnaire was not applicable.

Fifty-seven institutions did not respond to the questionnaire. The majority of these are small colleges (1-5 faculty). There are approximately 270 full-time faculty in these institutions.

The response rate from the twenty-six “major” universities (i.e. those with at least nine full-time faculty and a graduate program) was 100 percent. We are confident, therefore, that our data base provides a fairly reliable representation of the current pool of female faculty and graduate students.

The responses were broken down into five categories; four of the categories were determined by the number of full-time, permanent/probationary tenure-track faculty in each department (question 3a). The categories are: small (1-5), medium (6-10), large (11- 15), very large (16+). A fifth category was added for CEGEPs in Quebec.

1. *Has your department adopted a policy of its own on hiring women into faculty positions?*

Number of responses to question 1: 70

Totals: (Yes) 14 (No) 56

Table 1

Departments with policies on hiring women into faculty positions

Size of Institution	<u>N</u>	Have Policy	%
Small	28	2	7
Medium	19	4	21
Large	10	4	40
Very Large	9	3	33
CEGEP	4	1	25
Total	70	14	20 (average)

Note: Large and very large departments are most likely to have policies.

2. *If your department does not have its own policy, does your larger institution have a special policy on hiring women into faculty positions?*

Number of responses to question 2: 70

Totals: (Yes) 34 (No) 36

Table 2

Institutions with policies on hiring women into faculty positions

Size of Institution	<u>N</u>	Have Policy	%
Small	28	7	25
Medium	19	11	58
Large	10	8	80
Very Large	9	7	78
CEGEP	4	1	25
Total	70	34	49 (average)

Note: Again, large and very large departments are most likely to belong to institutions that have policies.

3. (a) How many full-time permanent (or probationary tenure-track) members does your department have?
- (b) How many of these are women (including any woman who is full-time at the university and at least half-time in your department)?
- (c) Please list ranks and normal retirement dates for these women. Indicate which positions are probationary.

Number of responses to question 3a, 3b: 70

Totals: (a) 605 (b) 77

Table 3
Full-time permanent / tenure-track faculty positions

Size of Institution	Men & Women	Women	% Women
Small	74	6	8
Medium	150	24	16
Large	136	21	15
Very Large	198	20	10
CEGEP	47	6	13
Total	605	77	13 (average)

Note: The worst representation for women is at small institutions. Collectively, small units represent rather a large number of employment possibilities across Canada. They are the least likely to currently employ women and the least likely to have special hiring policies to remedy the situation.

Number of responses to question 3c: 29

Table 3.1
Ranks of women in full-time permanent / tenure-track faculty positions

Size of Instit.	Inst	Inst (probat.)	Ass't	Ass't (probat.)	Assoc	Prof	Total
Small (10%)	2	1	2	0	1	0	6
Medium (20%)	0	2	3	1	3	3	12
Large (34%)	0	0	11	0	6	3	20
Very Large (29%)	0	0	3	2	8	4	17
CEGEP	0	0	0	0	0	4	4 (7%)

Total	2 (6%)	3 (5%)	19 (31%)	3 (5%)	18 (30%)	14 (23%)	59 (100%)
-------	-----------	-----------	-------------	-----------	-------------	-------------	--------------

Note: We received data on ranks for 59 full-time permanent or probationary tenure-track female faculty; the percentages in parentheses at the bottom of each column and at the end of each row are percentages of 59. We did not receive enough data on normal retirement dates to compile useful statistics.

4. (a) *How many full-time sessional or limited-term members does your department have?*
- (b) *How many of these are women?*
- (c) *Please provide information about the length of contracts and whether they are renewable.*

Number of responses to question 4a, 4b: 70 (35 institutions hire full-time sessional / limited term members)

Totals: (a) 65 (b) 24

Table 4
Full-time sessional / limited term faculty positions

Size of Institution	Men & Women	Women	% Women
Small	8	2	25
Medium	19	8	42
Large	14	3	21
Very Large	19	8	42
CEGEP	5	3	60
Total	65	24	37 (average)

Note: Thirty-seven percent of full-time sessional / limited term positions are currently filled by women, compared to only thirteen percent of full-time permanent positions.

Number of responses to question 4c: 25

Table 4.1
Contracts for sessional / limited term positions (men and women)

Length	<u>N</u>	Renewable	Non-Renewable
8 mo	10	9	1
10 mo	1	1	0

1 yr	10	6	4
2 yr	3	3	0
3 yr	1	0	1
Total	25	19 (76%)	6 (24%)

Note: Contracts are not all automatically renewed. The information in Table 4.1 is probably too limited and too ambiguous to be very useful.

5. (a) *How many part-time permanent members does your department have?*
- (b) *How many of these are women? (Exclude any who were counted in 3(b) above.)*
- (c) *Please list ranks and normal retirement dates for these women.*

Number of responses to question 5a, b: 70 (15 institutions hire part-time permanent members)

Totals: (a) 44 (b) 5

Table 5
Part-time permanent faculty positions

Size of Institution	Men & Women	Women	% Women
Small	2	1	50
Medium	10	2	20
Large	3	1	33
Very Large	5	1	20
CEGEP	24	0	0
Total	44	5	11 (average)

Note: Only two institutions, out of six with part-time female faculty, responded to question 5c (ranks and retirement dates). No statistics were compiled for this question.

6. (a) *How many part-time sessional or limited-term members does your department have? Even those teaching a single course should be included*
- (b) *How many of these are women?*

Number of responses to question 6: 70 (31 institutions hire part-time sessional / limited term members)

Totals: (a) 132 (b) 41

Table 6
Part-time sessional / limited term faculty positions

Size of Institution	Men & Women	Women	% Women
Small	5	2	40
Medium	33	5	45
Large	49	15	31
Very Large	42	9	21
CEGEP	3	0	0
Total	132	41	31 (average)

Note: The questionnaire did not include the qualifier “part-time” in question 6a, but the omission seems not to have created any confusion.

7. *Please provide any information you may have on the gender breakdown of undergraduate students in your department.*

Number of responses to question 7: 35

Note: The information for question 7 was given in a number of ways: total numbers for undergraduate course enrolment, number of male and female honours students, number of males and females majoring in philosophy, number of males and females in upper year courses, percentage of female students, with no indication of how the percentage was calculated. Statistics were not compiled. It appears, however, that, on average, forty-five percent of students enrolled in undergraduate courses are female. The information from StatsCanada (Appendix A) shows female undergraduate enrolment to be thirty-six percent. This is based on female philosophy majors only. It was clear from the data we received that the percentage of female philosophy majors is low and that there is a significant difference between the number of female students enrolled in general philosophy courses and those who are majoring in philosophy. The numbers continue to decline in M.A. and Ph.D. programs.

Table 7
Institutions with graduate programs

Size of Institution	Graduate Program (Yes)
Small	0
Medium	7
Large	10
Very Large	9
CEGEP	NA
Total	26

Note: Number of universities with M.A. and Ph.D. programs: 16

8. *Do you have a special policy for attracting female graduate students?*

Number of responses to question 8: 11

Table 8

Departments with policies for attracting female graduate students

Size of Institution	Have Policy
Small	NA
Medium	0
Large	1
Very Large	3
CEGEP	NA
Total	4

Note: Twenty-six universities have graduate programs; there were eleven responses to the above question (four positive, seven negative). We can probably assume that the fifteen universities that did not respond do not have a special policy for attracting female graduate students. Of the four departments that do have policies, two were described as “informal”. Obviously this is an area where improvement is possible. There were no descriptions provided of special policies to attract female graduate students.

9. (a) *How many M.A. students are currently enrolled in your program?*

(b) *How many of these are women?*

Number of responses to question 9: 26

Totals: (a) 522 (b) 161

Table 9

M.A. students

Size of Institution	Men & Women	Women	% Women
Small	0	0	0
Medium	53	17	32
Large	190	46	24
Very Large	279	98	35

CEGEP	NA	NA	NA
Total	522	161	31 (average)

10. (a) *How many Ph.D. students are currently enrolled in your program?*

(b) *How many of these are women?*

Number of responses to question 10: 16

Totals: (a) 470 (b) 120

Table 10
Ph.D. students

Size of Institution	Men & Women	Women	% Women
Small	0	0	0
Medium	2	1	50
Large	153	38	25
Very Large	315	81	26
CEGEP	NA	NA	NA
Total	470	120	26 (average)

11. Please consider the period from 1981 through 1990 and provide the following information as far as you are able:

(a) How many students successfully completed Ph.D.s in the decade in question?

(b) How many of these were women?

Number of responses to question 11a, 11b: 16

Totals: (a) 359 (b) 82

Table 11
Ph.D.s successfully completed between 1981 and 1990

Size of Institution	Men & Women	Women	% Women
Small	0	0	0
Medium	0	0	0
Large	82	19	23
Very Large	277	63	23
CEGEP	NA	NA	NA
Total	359	82	23 (average)

(c) For each of these women (and for any who may have gotten jobs before actually completing the Ph.D.), please provide the following information:

(i) Date of Ph.D. completion.

(ii) Area of specialization (e.g., Ethics, Philosophy of Science)

(iii) Type of job she got (e.g., tenure-track in a large Canadian department, a series of limited-term positions in the U.S., employment outside philosophy).

(d) For the sake of comparison, please provide similar information for male Ph.D.s between 1981 and 1990.

Note: See Appendix B.

APPENDIX A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STATSCANADA

Table 12
Percentage of female philosophy students

Year	Undergrad	M.A.	Ph.D.	Graduate
1989-1990	36	29	27	29
1988-1989	–	31	29	30
1987-1988	–	31	25	–

APPENDIX B: PH.D.s COMPLETED BETWEEN 1981 AND 1990

Note: The responses to questions 11a and 11b showed that a total of 359 Ph.D.s were granted in the decade from 1981 to 1990 and that 82 of these were granted to women. In comparison, in response to question 11c, we received data on only 243 persons (50 females and 193 males); and even within this smaller group, the information was incomplete. We caution that the data are limited and that females are overrepresented relative to their representation in the pool of recent Ph.D.s.

Table 13
Successful Ph.D. completions 1981-1990

Gender	<u>N</u>
Females	50
Males	193
Total	243

Table 13.1

Category	Female (all)	Male (all)
Non-Academics	3	30
Academics	42	121
Unknown	5	39
Unemployed	0	2
Deceased	0	1
Total	50	193

Table 13.2

Year of Completion	Female (all)	Male (all)	Female (academic)	Male (academic)
1981	3	15	3	6
1982	2	10	2	2
1983	7	21	5	12
1984	5	9	4	7
1985	4	9	3	6
1986	5	14	5	11
1987	7	11	6	9
1988	7	9	6	6
1989	7	16	6	11
1990	3	13	2	10
Total	50	127	42	80

Note: We did not receive data for 66 of the 193 males with respect to year of graduation.

Table 13.3

Working in	Female (academic)	Male (academic)
Canada	20	42
U.S.	12	9
Other	3	17
Unknown	7	12
Total	42	80

Note: We received information for only slightly more than one third of the 193 male academics with respect to the country in which they are working. It is interesting to note that twenty-nine percent of the female academics represented in these figures are working in the United States compared to eleven percent of the male academics. These job losses may be the result of more aggressive recruiting by American universities that have well-established affirmative action programs.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Only about thirteen percent of tenured and tenure-track positions in Canadian philosophy departments are currently held by women. There is widespread consensus that this situation must be rectified but less agreement as to how change should be brought about. Approximately twenty percent of Canadian departments have adopted special policies concerning the hiring of faculty women, and forty-nine percent belong to institutions that have adopted such policies. In some cases, the special departmental policies are stronger than what is recommended below. The committee applauds those stronger policies but recognizes that they might not be workable in all institutional settings.

In formulating the recommendations given below, the committee was guided chiefly by information about the pool of qualified female job candidates and about the likely availability of new positions in the foreseeable future. It was also, of course, guided by a certain understanding of the problem, its origins, and likely remedies. These latter elements were gleaned from a variety of sources, but most notably from responses to the recent survey of department chairs. Our recommendations are based on the understanding that affirmative action programs are best understood not primarily as backward-looking programs designed to compensate past victims of injustice or to punish past offenders but as forward-looking programs designed to bring about desirable states of affairs in the future. Our recommendations are also based on the understanding that considerations of equity and considerations of academic excellence are not inherently and unavoidably in conflict. On the contrary, there is compelling evidence that philosophy's gender imbalance is the source of bias and partiality in many of its theoretical products and that a better representation of women would help to rectify these shortcomings. In addition, of course, it seems plausible that enlarging the pool from which future philosophers can emerge is likely to enhance rather than detract from academic excellence.

Finally, we are convinced that the problem of gender imbalance must be addressed simultaneously on a variety of fronts. In particular, it is not sufficient to resolve to "stop discriminating" where that means "start hiring women in proportion to their representation in the pool of qualified applicants". This strategy rests upon the naive and ultimately indefensible presupposition that only one kind of causal process is at work in creating and sustaining gender imbalance. It assumes that the entire process is driven "from behind", so to speak: that the number of female students in philosophy causally contributes to the low representation of women in the professoriate but that the low number of women in the professoriate has no causal influence upon the number of female students who choose to pursue philosophy as a career. Once it is recognized that the causal connections are not simple or unidirectional, it becomes obvious that any remedy that proposes to address only one component of the causal nexus is bound to be woefully inadequate.

Another way to understand the problem is in terms of the "inertia" that is built into the present system. Many forces have been applied to that system to divert it from a gender neutral path. Even if it were possible to suddenly cease applying any new gender-biased forces, the philosophic body would continue to move as before. New forces must be applied if we are to change our direction, and these new forces must be commensurate with those that created the present deviation from gender-neutrality. Just as a proper account of inertia was a necessary

prerequisite for the development of an adequate dynamics in the seventeenth century, it does not seem too far-fetched to suggest that a recognition of the “inertial forces” built into the current gender system is similarly crucial to the task at hand.

RECOMMENDED GOALS FOR HIRING FEMALE FACULTY

The next twenty years are crucial to the success of any program designed to bring about gender equity. The high rate of retirements during that period presents a window of opportunity that must be used to full advantage. If something very close to female/male parity is not achieved during this term, it will be still more difficult to achieve in later decades as the discipline enters a new period of low turnover. The following goals seem both reasonable and necessary, although different departments may have to pursue and implement them in diverse ways. Departmental size and geographic location are among the factors that will have to be taken into account; there is no suggestion here that a single blueprint will fit all units.

- (1) By the year 2000 at least twenty-seven percent of permanent or probationary faculty in any unit should be female, and by the year 2010 at least forty percent should be female.
- (2) In any decade in any department, at least fifty percent of new permanent or probationary positions should be filled by women.
- (3) The first goal takes precedence over the second. (So, for example, if achieving twenty-seven percent female faculty by 2000 requires a hiring rate for women that is higher than fifty percent, the higher rate should be implemented.)

Are These Goals Realistic? Are They Justified?

Currently approximately twenty-eight percent of new Ph.D.s in philosophy are granted to women. During the last decade (1981-1990), 359 philosophy Ph.D.s were granted by Canadian universities. Assume that the total number of Ph.D.s granted during the next decade (1991-2000) rises between three and four percent each year, partly in response to improved job opportunities. Assume further that on average during the next decade thirty-two percent of new Ph.D.s will be awarded to women. Then there will be approximately 140 new female Ph.D.s in addition to a small backlog of underemployed female Ph.D.s from the previous decade. These numbers are sufficient (given flexibility in job descriptions) to fill half of all new positions in the next decade. Our information indicates that approximately 250 new positions requiring a Ph.D. in philosophy are likely to become available during the decade in question. This figure is an extrapolation from the limited data available from responding departments and should not be invested with any magical significance, but it provides a reasonable ballpark estimate suitable for the purpose at hand.

What we conclude from these figures is that it is feasible to begin now to fill fifty percent of new permanent or probationary faculty positions with women. If this policy is adopted now, approximately twenty-seven percent of permanent and probationary faculty will be female by 2000. If the policy is continued (and if our assumptions about continued high rates of hiring in the decade 2001-2010, continued growth in the female Ph.D. pool, retirement rates for female faculty, etc. are approximately correct), then it should be possible to hit the forty percent mark for women faculty by 2010. After that, it is reasonable to expect the number of new positions to decrease, reflecting the lower number of retirements expected between 2011 and 2020. As a result of this consideration and an increasing rate of female retirements, additional increments of progress will be somewhat harder to achieve (assuming that the female/male hiring ratio remains at 50/50). And so numerical parity between female and male faculty would likely be

achieved about forty years from now if the guidelines suggested above were embraced immediately and universally.

It is recognized by the committee that different departments face different opportunities and different constraints in their new appointments. It is recognized that not every department will achieve the twenty-seven percent mark by the year 2000. But if all departments continue to embrace the policy that at least fifty percent of new hirings should be female (even if this means overshooting the twenty-seven percent by 2000 mark in some departments), we should collectively stay more or less on target.

It should be noted that even during the next decade (1991-2000) when there will be the greatest disparity between rates of Ph.D. completion by gender and rates of hiring by gender, fully forty percent of all qualified males can expect to get permanent or probationary jobs in Canada. This makes it unlikely that we shall lose any exceptionally talented males as a direct result of the proposed hiring policy.

Isn't This Too Much Too Fast?

If the proposed guidelines are adopted tomorrow by every Canadian department and abided by faithfully, then fifty percent of permanent or probationary faculty should be female in about forty years. By then most members of this committee and most of the people for whom this report was written will be dead. By then, the young women who are now finishing their doctorates will have retired. They will have spent their entire working lives in a profession that is still predominantly male.

HOW TO ACHIEVE THE GOALS: SOME SUGGESTIONS

1. Enlarging the Pool of Potential Candidates

Undergraduates: Although it seems that approximately forty-five percent of all students enrolled in philosophy courses may be female, only about thirty-six percent of philosophy majors are female. (And it is likely that an even smaller percentage complete honours degrees affording preparation for graduate work in philosophy.) Some departments are able to document a steady fall-off in percentage of females in higher level courses. It would appear that young women are getting almost as much initial exposure to philosophy as young men but that they are not sufficiently attracted to pursue it at more advanced levels. Before deciding that this is due to an inherent difference between the sexes, it would be wise to investigate other hypotheses. In particular, do we continue to convey to students the impression that philosophy is primarily a male activity? Do we denigrate courses that attract female students as "soft" or "touchy-feely"? Is our syllabus completely dominated by male authors? Are our visiting speakers overwhelmingly male? Do we mistake traditional male social roles (particularly those associated with aggressiveness) for philosophical skill? Many women are simply not comfortable with the social behaviours associated with adversarial philosophy. Other models of philosophic discourse should be legitimated and explored. Departments with a low percentage of female faculty might consider inviting the Canadian Society for Women in Philosophy (C-SWIP) to meet on their campus some year to provide their students with some exposure to female philosophers

and feminist philosophy. Hiring policies at the faculty level cannot possibly succeed in achieving their goals unless female undergraduates can be convinced that philosophy provides a hospitable environment for women.

Graduate Students: Much of what was said about undergraduates applies here; but there are special considerations as well. The percentage of females continues to decline at this level: about thirty-one percent of M.A. students in Canada are female as are about twenty-eight percent of Ph.D. students. It is striking that only four universities reported having a special policy to attract female graduate students. This is an area where immediate improvement is called for.

It must be made clear to potential female graduate students that their interests and needs will be taken into account in our graduate programs. Perhaps we should investigate whether the general lack of funding for part-time graduate students has particularly adverse effects on women.

The association of graduate students with their departments is typically much more intimate than for undergraduates. Therefore, the measures suggested above with respect to undergraduates may be even more urgent with respect to female graduate students. It must be possible for female students to interact with (predominantly male) faculty just as comfortably as do their male counterparts. This requires special attention to the social settings within which departmental interactions occur. Those much-loved departmental athletic teams may be inadvertently making women feel left out. That raunchy bar where most of the good departmental gossip gets swapped may not be a setting in which female students typically feel as comfortable as males. And if female students don't get invited to lunch as often as male students because everybody fears sexual innuendo, that will make a difference in the long run.

Others: Women in sessional and part-time jobs should be considered for full-time and permanent employment. Departments would be wise to do everything possible to help them upgrade their credentials. This may mean allowing time off to finish a dissertation that has been on the back burner for months or years. It may mean providing opportunities for research to women who have been so overburdened by the demands of teaching on a course-by-course basis that they have become trapped in dead-end jobs. Measures such as these will help to enlarge the pool of job candidates, especially in the next few crucial years.

2. Attracting and Retaining Female Faculty

Advertising and Recruiting: Keep job specifications as flexible as possible so as to generate a larger pool of female applicants. Ideally, simply advertise the job as open. If you have definite preferences about teaching/research areas, list these as preferences within an open position so that those with other fields of expertise will be encouraged to apply. In this way, you will maximize the applicant pool, thus increasing the chance that you will find a suitably qualified woman in it. You will also preserve the opportunity to hire outside your preferred area, should you find a first-rate female candidate with other interests. Above all, try to avoid advertising positions in areas known to be overwhelmingly dominated by men.

Make it clear in your ad that the department is particularly interested in attracting qualified female applicants (for example: "Dalhousie University has a policy of affirmative action in hiring qualified women academic staff" or "Brock University is committed to a positive action policy aimed at reducing gender imbalances in faculty.")

Place ads in publications read by women philosophers, for example: the *Women's Review of Books*, the C-SWIP and SWIP Newsletters, and the *Journal of Feminist Ethics*. Send a copy of the ad to the chairs of other departments with a request to circulate it.

Maintain files on women who have recently graduated or who will be completing dissertation work soon. Write to departments with doctoral programs and ask them to provide names of female candidates. Involve members of the department by asking them to look out for promising prospects. Write personal letters to likely looking candidates inviting them to apply for your department's job.

Composition of the Search Committee: Ensure that women are represented on the committee but that responsibility for affirmative action is not made to rest entirely on them. Do not include on the committee men known to be hostile to women.

Shortlisting, Interviewing and Assessing Female Candidates: Do not accept a short list without female candidates. Try to include at least the two best women who have applied, unless they clearly are not suitably qualified.

When candidates are entertained as part of the interviewing process, make sure other women are included in all invitations. Do not ask inappropriate questions over dinner (for example, questions aimed at discovering whether she plans to have children).

Ensure that candidates are assessed in a setting that does not privilege the paradigmatically masculine skills of argumentative battle.

Recognize that feminist scholarship is an important focus for scholarly work. Feminist interests in research and teaching should not be undervalued, and publications in feminist journals must be assigned full credit.

Recognize the validity of career patterns that differ from the (male) norm; the pressures of marriage and childrearing have caused many women to defer graduate work and career advancement. Do not discriminate on the basis of age.

Comparison with Male Candidates: The most effective policy is to require that a male candidate be clearly and unequivocally superior to all female candidates in order to be hired (or in other language, that he be "substantially better suited for the appointment"). This is not equivalent to "all else being equal, select the female candidate". The difficulty with the latter approach is that it is virtually impossible to establish that two candidates are exactly "equal", since there are always differences that may be weighted or valued differently. The approach suggested here shifts the burden of argument in a significant way.

It must be clear to all parties involved that unqualified candidates will not be hired and that quality will not be sacrificed for equity. At the same time, however, it must be recognized that quality and gender cannot be entirely separated. Female philosophers may bring to a predominantly male department perspectives and methods that are underrepresented. Furthermore, in a department with too few women to meet the needs of female students, being female is itself an academic asset in a job candidate. These factors need to be weighed together with more traditional ones in determining who the best candidate is.

If you are unable to find a suitably qualified woman, consider deferring the appointment for a year. (This, of course, depends upon the willingness of your administration to guarantee that the position will not be eliminated. Sometimes, however, it may be easier to convince your

administration to hold a job (or even on occasion to create new positions) if you make it very clear that your aim is to address the problem of gender imbalance.)

GENERAL COMMENTS

It is not particularly healthy to have all female faculty clustered in the lower ranks of the professoriate. Whenever you have the opportunity to fill a senior position, try especially hard to find qualified female candidates.

Recognize that women faculty often have to include a very heavy service component in their work. Because of the large discrepancy between the percentage of female undergraduates and the percentage of female faculty, women professors are often required to spend a great deal more time with students than are similarly positioned males. In addition, the requirement that women occupy visible positions on committees at the departmental, faculty, and university levels means that their administrative load is often very heavy indeed. These contributions to the university must be recognized and credited. Equity must not be achieved on the backs of existing female faculty; it must be seen to be the responsibility of all members of the department equally. Do not overwork your department's current female faculty. That would not be good for them or for your department's reputation in the outside world.

Take steps to ensure that yours is a woman-friendly department. (All your special efforts to hire women may come to nothing if your department has a bad reputation in this regard.) Make it clear to all that sexist comments or jokes will not be tolerated. Be supportive of female faculty or students who have sexual harassment complaints. Be sensitive to the needs of female faculty or students who carry heavy family responsibilities, such as child care or the care of elderly family members. Go out of your way to provide feedback mechanisms to junior faculty women so that they know what is expected of them and what resources are available to them. Remember that women faculty are often excluded from informal lines of communication, and so it may be necessary to institute more systematic measures to compensate. Ensure that your curriculum makes adequate room for feminist concerns and that these are not regarded as weird or marginal. Make sure that such resources as *Hypatia*, the APA's *Feminism and Philosophy Newsletter*, feminist bibliographies and course outlines are available to members of your department who wish to incorporate these concerns into their teaching and research. Do what you can to make your space safe for women to work in, especially at night and on weekends.

Finally, it is important to bear in mind that not all potential philosophers (male or female) are white and able-bodied. Philosophy departments should seek to reflect the diversity of our society when reviewing recruitment policies.

THE ROLE OF THE CPA

We recommend that this report be circulated to all Canadian philosophy departments and that parts of it be published in the *Bulletin*. We further recommend that the CPA establish a standing committee to deal with issues involving women in philosophy. One task for this committee would be to undertake a study following up on this one in a few years. Another task would be to determine what role the CPA might play in providing a central clearing house for information about potential female philosophers.

THANK YOU

The committee would like to acknowledge the hard work and co-operation of many departments in providing the materials for this report. The response was heartening, and the level of genuine interest in seeking new remedies was remarkable. Thank you to everyone who contributed. The committee would especially like to acknowledge the indispensable research assistance of Andrea Purvis, who assembled the data and imposed order on a chaotic assemblage of materials. Without her, this report would not have been possible.