



*"The APSA Council recently formed a council subcommittee to prepare an agenda for actions in response to concerns about family and career in political science. The following report for Council attention and eventual dissemination is the result of this subcommittee's assessment of the issue. Members of the subcommittee included **Frances Hagopian**, who prepared the report, **Jack Snyder**, **Marsha Pripstein Posusney**, **Judith Baer**, **Gary Segura**, **Shirley Geiger**, and **Jeff Spinner-Halev**.*

This report and action agenda will be acted upon by the Council at its April 2005 meeting. Comments from members are welcome. Please send them to Michael Brintnall (brintnall@apsanet.org) at APSA."

Report of Workplace and Family Issues Subcommittee **American Political Science Association Council**

August 27, 2004

PREAMBLE

It should be possible to have a family and a career. But the results are in from numerous studies: it is not always easy to do so. Pressures are mounting in these days in which community and extended family support have broken down on parents of young children and on those with aging parents and seriously ill family members. While these challenges will affect all faculty members at some point in their careers -- men and women, young and old -- studies show that the burdens fall more squarely on some than on others, and women still pay the price to a greater extent than do men.

There are numerous obstacles to making the academic workplace more family friendly. Overcoming some will require massive resources that are in scarce supply; resolving others will require super coordination across many institutions and their component parts. In other cases, there needs to be a major shift in academic culture. Admission to the top tier of the academic profession is still governed by the model of the "ideal worker," that scholar who "enters a profession immediately upon receiving the relevant credential, works his or her way up the career ladder by putting in long hours without interruptions beyond short vacations, and continues in this fashion until retirement age ... but cannot make substantial time commitments to children or other family members without endangering his or her career" (from the Penn State Study, as cited in the CSWP 2004 report). Although this characterization may sound like an accurate representation of a certain reality but one that is quite remote from the daily experiences of the majority of our colleagues who work at teaching-intensive institutions, in a less extreme version, it is played out across the academy in our policies and our practices. We assume that it is better for undergraduates to have a teacher teach a steady diet of courses per semester rather than allowing that professor to compensate for a reduced teaching load one semester with an overload during another. We assume that older faculty should have first choice in selecting teaching times. We assume that faculty should be able to write in the mornings, teach in the afternoons, and be available for meetings in the late afternoon. In sum, we prioritize everything but the family.



Facing these daunting challenges, it is easy to become discouraged. This report begins from the premise that even small changes would be welcome, and that if much is required, it is time to start. We propose a “best practices” list. Because precisely the departments that need to make changes will be the ones that do not believe they have a problem, the weight of the Association is important to establish a list of best practices. This list should be made available to departments through departmental services, and be posted on the APSA website.

It is time to elevate families among our priorities in our workplace practices. We should do so because it is the right thing to do. But it is also in our personal and institutional interest to do so. One day, the flexibility we seek for young parents will be useful if our own parents or partners are in need. Small changes can enable us and our colleagues to remain productive -- without incurring unreasonable financial burdens -- in times that our families need us. Adopting family-friendly policies and practices will also facilitate faculty retention. If we fail to act to make our workplaces more family friendly, and if as a consequence we continue to lose faculty early in their careers because they wish to have families, and if a disproportionate number of women drop out of the academy, then we will all be impoverished. We will deprive ourselves of the most talented departments in the long run, we will deprive our undergraduate and graduate students of role models and mentors, and we will deprive ourselves of the opportunity to have more diverse faculties.

THE SOBERING FINDINGS

The results are in: women who do not have children are gaining tenure and promotion at roughly the same levels as men, but women who bear children within five years of earning their Ph.D. are far more likely to drop out than men who also have small children during their tenure probationary period. According to the study, “Marriage and Baby Blues: Re-defining Gender Equity” (hereafter referred to as the “Berkeley study”), women are entering graduate school in record numbers but the percentage of women in the upper tenured ranks is still disproportionately small because the academic pipeline for women has “leaks,” and the predominant reason for those leaks is child-bearing. Those few late mothers (those who begin motherhood more than five years post-Ph.D.) do achieve as much as women without children; the most critical effects are experienced by women who have babies in graduate school or within the first five years after receiving their Ph.D, which the study classifies as “early babies.” The report reached the dramatic conclusions that women with babies are 29 percent less likely than women without babies to enter a tenure-track position, and women with “early babies” are 23 percent less likely than men to be promoted to Associate Professor. What happens to them? A high percentage of mothers are sliding into the second tier, the part-time, adjunct, and lecturer corps, or what the report calls the “gypsy scholars” of the university world. On the other hand, “married with children” for men is a successful formula, suggesting that family burdens fall disproportionately on women. In one of the report’s most sobering findings, University of California ladder rank faculty of both genders who were surveyed regretted not having had more children, but women faculty were more than twice as likely to indicate this regret (38 percent versus 18 percent).

Other reports reveal a number of burdens for young parents that cover a wide gamut of bad practices, large and small: pregnant women cannot park close to their place of work; mothers of infants have no place to breastfeed at work; parents of small children cannot make late afternoon talks or meetings and still retrieve their children from day care; when children are sick or otherwise cannot attend school because of snow days or half-days or vacations that do not coincide with university calendars, these parents are at a loss about what to do with their children. Burdens will also mount for middle-aged academics that will face caring for very ill parents who may not live close by, or that may have very ill partners.



The American family has changed, but many university practices assume a model of a male faculty member with a wife at home who can care for his children and his parents. It is time to align university practices with contemporary realities.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

To address these challenges, political science departments could implement some realistic changes on their own, or with the approval of deans. But because many other important changes would require coordination, and would have to take place at the University and supra-University level, APSA officers and staff should also work with other associations and organizations to bring forth proposals for family-friendly practices to such bodies as the American Association of University Professors and associations of university provosts.

Some of the proposals directed toward departments involve changes in institutions, but most institutional changes that would matter -- such as revisiting the tenure clock and developing part-time job tracks -- could only be introduced at the level of universities and might require the involvement of the American Association of University Professors. Most of the changes that are within the purview of departments are cultural. We know as political scientists that institutions can be sticky and that culture changes only very slowly. But we are hopeful that our department cultures are already changing and more change should be possible. Moreover, even a new equilibrium for a new set of institutions may emerge from the dramatic changes to family structure of the past quarter century.

PART I: TOP TEN DEPARTMENTAL WORST PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BEST PRACTICES

10. Meeting times

Academic life was constructed for the gentleman professor who rose early to write at home, came in to work to teach in the early afternoon, and then attended late afternoon seminars, job talks, and department meetings. This model does not work for parents with young children, who often must retrieve their children from childcare settings (or face stiff financial penalties), and must be home with them outside these hours.

Worst Practice: Scheduling department meetings, job talks, and lectures and seminars that all faculty are expected to attend in the late afternoon or evening.

Best Practice: Set aside one teaching block during the day when no one in the department teaches. That bloc should be used for department meetings and recruitment talks. Very large departments with multiple searches will not be able to accommodate all talks within one weekly time slot. But such a solution would go a long way in most instances.

9. A family friendly workplace

There will be occasions when faculty and graduate students who are parents of young children will want to bring them to work. These occasions may be predictable, such as during a school vacation, but most often they are not. A child may become too sick to attend school and despite their best efforts, parents may not be able to find emergency baby-sitting. Even when these

occasions can be predicted, there may be compelling reasons why a parent may want a child close by: a nursing mother, for example, may want to bring her baby to work in order to breastfeed.

It is hard to imagine an issue over which there will be more genuine differences of interests. If parents of young children will want occasionally to bring their kids into work for all the reasons stated, their neighbors and colleagues will not want the distraction of a crying, sick child next door or in a meeting.

There is probably a sensible balance; perhaps very small children shouldn't be in offices and meetings and class all the time, but parents should be able to bring a child into work on occasion and in an emergency without worrying that they will be seen as not a serious member of the faculty.

The APSA cannot presume to know how thick the walls of offices are, what the ratio of young parents are to older faculty members in each department. But we do think that common sense can reign. At minimum, children should not be seen as something to be hidden from view. To the extent that they cannot be accommodated at work, it should be because they genuinely disrupt a classroom or other setting, not because they signal that their parent is not serious.

Worst Practice: Parents of young children and nursing mothers are reprimanded for bringing an infant or a child to work.

Best Practice: Departments should be flexible, to the extent possible, in making accommodations for parents in a bind. Pictures of children could be posted on departmental bulletin boards and websites to signal that children are welcome, not something to be hidden from view.

8. *Scheduling Classes*

Chairs and Directors of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies in political science departments have a great deal of latitude in scheduling courses. Often, assistant professors are assigned either very early morning or late afternoon classes, course times that make it difficult for them to meet family obligations. They are often afraid to complain to chairs. The Women's Status Committee also called attention to the "department custom of having the most junior faculty members be the last to choose course time slots may harm those with heavy parenting obligations," and called for flexibility in the scheduling of classes. Anyone can have extraordinary obligations at any stage in their career, and the problem is not necessarily restricted to young faculty. But young faculty may be more vulnerable because they have less negotiating power with department chairs.

Worst Practice: Give one's friends on the senior faculty their choice of times, and stick the assistant professor with the least desirable time.

Best Practice: To the extent possible, try to accommodate all faculty with special obligations. Be particularly cognizant of the needs of people struggling to establish their families and careers. Don't give them the last choice in selecting course times.

7. *Taking advantage of existing policies*

Studies have shown that many faculty members do not take advantage of existing family-friendly policies. The Penn State study found that this underutilization of existing leaves was dramatic, and focus groups revealed that women were afraid to take advantage of these opportunities because they feared a heavy burden on their colleagues and possible adverse consequences at the time of their tenure decisions.

In addition to the fear of discrimination, the Berkeley study suggests that existing leave and clock-stopping options are underutilized because faculty do not know about them. Another consideration that emerged from the Penn State study is that faculty fear that if they teach less, they will simply be given other responsibilities, so they might as well not take leave.

Tenure clock-stopping policies were among the most significant adopted in recent years to level the playing field and enable young professors, especially women, to bear or adopt children and still earn tenure. It would be especially perverse, and pernicious, if departmental cultures or ignorance preventing women from availing themselves of this opportunity.

The Women's Status Committee recommended that "Departments (especially chairs) should be aware of what their institutions offer in the way of family-related policies, and should take the initiative in making that information available to current colleagues, as well as to prospective faculty members." We support this recommendation. But we are further concerned that knowledge alone will not assuage fears of future discrimination and negative evaluations.

Worst Practice: Leave options are not made known to faculty, and are not utilized for fear that they will not be taken seriously, or promoted.

Best Practice: Each department should write up a manual of university policies with respect to family policies that should be handed to every faculty member and potential faculty member, and posted on a department website. **There should also be a strong statement at the outset of such a document stating that no faculty member will be penalized in evaluations for making use of existing policies.**

We do not naively believe that by making such a statement, we will turn the head of every member of the senior faculty of every political science department that casts a vote on a tenure candidate. But if departments adopt this as a best practice, it will make it harder for such opinions to be voiced aloud in deliberations. And if every department in the country does this, we will start to make it part of the culture.

6. *The "resume gap" in recruitment and promotion decisions*

It would be hard to imagine anyone in the country who has been a member of a recruitment committee who has not heard a candidate dismissed because of the number of years it took to complete a graduate degree, or a "gap" in productivity at some point. Of course there will be candidates who simply did not work hard enough. But in many instances, these gaps were generated for family reasons; a graduate student had a baby, a young mother took a year of family leave, a middle-aged man took a year off to care for a dying spouse. Yet, a gap in productivity, or a failure to attend major conferences is often the kiss of death for a job candidate, a sure signal that the candidate is not serious or will not be productive. The same conclusion can and is often drawn by many external reviewers who are asked to evaluate a candidate for tenure and promotion. Recognizing this problem, the Berkeley study includes among its elements of a new

family friendly package for UC ladder-rank faculty a recommendation for “discounting of familial-related resume gaps in the hiring of faculty.”

Worst practice: Allow statements in recruitment and tenure deliberations about gaps in productivity to go unchallenged and be allowed to stand.

Best practice: Do not penalize a “resume gap” in recruitment decisions. If there is a serious question about a candidate, make every effort to determine whether there are extenuating circumstances, including making inquiries to dissertation advisers, provided these inquiries do not violate the privacy of job applicants. A statement should also be included in letters soliciting external evaluations of scholarship for promotion decisions that notes that a stay of the clock was granted, and the candidate should not be penalized for that year or year(s). In some cases, there may be a family reason for a productivity gap -- the birth or adoption of a child or the serious illness of a partner or parent -- in which no stay of the clock was granted. Again, in such cases, department chairs should weigh the career and privacy interests of the candidate in communicating as much information as possible to ensure a fair appraisal of the case.

5. *Stopping the leaks in the pipeline: graduate students and the time-to-degree clock*

It should be possible for graduate students to begin families, if that is their choice. But if the results of the Berkeley study can be generalized, those that do are at serious risk of dropping out. At present, although most universities have clock-stopping policies for faculty members, they do not for graduate students. Graduate students have limits on the number of semesters in which they can receive funding. They also are required to pass qualifying exams, defend a dissertation proposal, and complete a dissertation, within very strict time limits. At present, the only option they have in many departments if they either bear a child or must care for an ill parent is to withdraw temporarily from their program. This means being disconnected from the program, losing funding, and losing the designation of seriously by advisors and placement directors.

Worst practice: Maintain strict guidelines about deadlines to pass qualifying exams, dissertation proposal stage, and dissertation defense without consideration of interruptions in a graduate career due to family obligations. Leave graduate students temporary withdrawal from program as only option.

Best practice: If departments cannot stretch funding dollars (this may be up to university graduate schools), at minimum they can institute their own “clock-stopping” for completion of requirements for graduate students that fall into the same categories as university policies (pregnancy, sick parents, etc.).

4. *The spousal “problem”*

If the two-career family is a national trend, it is even more pronounced in academic life, especially for women. Whereas many male faculty members have wives who can work as staff in a university, women in particular may be married not only to other professionals, but also to other academics. The University of California-Berkeley study concluded, “The dual-career dilemma is more of a problem for women than men, since, as other studies have established, most women academics are married to men with advanced degrees, and most academic men are not married to women with advanced degrees ... therefore, accommodating two-career couples becomes an important “family friendly” policy.”

Yet, hiring a husband of a female faculty member is often difficult. Some universities still have rules against nepotism; however well intentioned these once were, they are clearly dysfunctional today. But we suspect that more often the obstacles to hiring spouses are related to the scarcity of faculty lines, and to a lesser degree, to the uneasiness of colleagues to hire spouses because they do not fit a particular mold for a particular niche, or even for fear of introducing voting blocks into their departments. But in these days of two-career families, retention of especially female faculty members will be an issue if stability of employment for spouses cannot be assured. When a couple has young children, it will most assuredly be impossible to retain the working spouse.

Worst Practice: When they have the authorization to do so, departments decline to hire spouses on any basis because they “are not exactly what we are looking for.”

Best Practice: Where deans find money to hire spouses and there are not rules against spousal hires, departments allocate existing lines to qualified spouses. In the case of faculty in their tenure probationary period and limited resources, a stable, long-term contract may be a reasonable alternative.

3. *Flexibility and creative accounting*

There will be times, both before tenure and after, when a faculty member will face the pressure of caring for a sick child, partner, or parent. Sometimes this will be an all-encompassing responsibility, but often times, it will involve accompanying the sick family member to a doctor’s office or to medical treatments at a hospital. At the moment, few options exist short of taking unpaid leave. Our primary responsibilities are to teach, but of course there are many others, as we are all too painfully aware.

Other reports have noted this problem, and have similarly urged that departments make accommodations. The Women’s Status Committee suggested that departments “try innovative approaches such as modified duties that shift workload to less teaching and more project work, rather than allowing only leave as an option,” suggesting that “modified duty often allows a faculty member to maintain full pay while having the flexibility, for example, to help an elder make a series of medical appointments.” The American Association of University Professors policy statement similarly recommends the possibility of “active service with modified duties.”

Departments should be flexible wherever possible, and use creative accounting to track the contributions of individual faculty. Flexibility might involve allowing one to take a course reduction in one semester and teach an overload the next. While we recognize that it can be disruptive to scheduling to allow for stacking teaching responsibilities, it may well be the lesser of two evils. Experienced teachers should be able to teach an overload in a subsequent semester.

Creative accounting might involve allowing someone who needs temporary flexibility to team-teach a course and count extra committee work (performed at a different point in the semester) to count toward their departmental responsibilities, or to allow someone who advises a very high number of undergraduate theses or doctoral dissertations (which can be scheduled more flexibly than class) a course reduction in a semester in which it may be needed.

A third suggestion would be to allow the option of reduced course load for reduced pay (say, three-quarters’ time).

Worst Practice: Departments afford no flexibility in course scheduling and in workload, offering faculty the Hobson's choice of failing to meet their family obligations or taking an unpaid leave of absence for some term.

Best Practice: Departments are flexible to the extent possible in rescheduling courses of faculty with family obligations, and use creative accounting to track the teaching and service contributions of individual faculty. Where there are no institutional obstacles, they allow an option of a reduced workload for reduced pay.

2. Using an Ombudsperson

Typically, departments have affirmative action committees or an affirmative action officer, whose charge is typically understood to monitor a department's recruitment procedures and results, to ensure that the department is complying with the university's responsibilities as an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer. Yet, the department's affirmative action committee, if there is one, might not seem the appropriate venue for a second-year assistant professor to voice a complaint about her course time or the actions of a chair that she perceives to be unsympathetic. In these cases, the university ombudsperson might be an effective advocate for formulating, monitoring, and implementing family friendly policies.

Most universities have trained ombudspersons. Their duties are varied, but they are often best known for being the point person to handle charges of sexual harassment or any form of discrimination. It is less well known that, in practice, many do handle workplace and family issues. They respond to individual requests for assistance or reconsideration of departmental or university decisions, and they help identify and seek remediation for systemic problems.

Worst practice: University ombudspersons are remote figures that are not known to members of the faculty.

Best practice: Every department should ensure that all faculty and graduate students are aware of the full range of duties of the university ombudsperson. Department chairs should understand that these duties will include ensuring that family-friendly policies are known to all members of the department, and to advocate that they be applied in individual cases and as general practice.

1. Making family issues a priority - pushing against constraints

We cannot possibly anticipate all the constraints that faculty and graduate students will encounter, nor can we imagine all the most creative and workable solutions. We also recognize that many problems may require some modest university support that is within reach, but will not be automatically forthcoming unless someone pushes. The most important thing is to make establishing a family-friendly work environment a priority, one that is just as important as offering undergraduate courses in particular fields, recruiting top graduate students, and raising departmental rankings.

Paradoxically, university administrators worried about the retention of female faculty may be more willing to listen to creative suggestions about creating the conditions in the workplace in which all faculty can succeed than department level administrators with conflicting priorities.

Worst practice: Department chairs throw up hands and say they don't have the money or "it can't be done."

Best practice: Department Chairs should lobby deans and provosts for the resources and policies to make possible those changes that departments cannot make on their own. Chairs routinely lobby for all sorts of resources -- summer stipends for graduate students, replacement positions for faculty who retire or leave the university, money to hire adjunct faculty when regular faculty go on leave. Chairs should make family-friendly practices a priority.

PART II: THE SUPRA-UNIVERSITY LEVEL

Proposed Actions for the Association:

I. Domestic Partner Benefits

A family-friendly workplace should be provided for everyone, and families come in different forms. All of the membership of the American Political Science Association, regardless of orientation or legal marital status, should have the opportunity to purchase health-care and other benefits for their immediate family (partners and children of partners) through the University benefits system. But many members of our association who work at public institutions that are particularly sensitive to political pressure do not currently have that opportunity. This also applies to those who work at some private religious institutions.

Action I. The Association work in concert with other associations to establish the provision of domestic partner benefits as a standard and best practice.

II. Accommodate Spouses and Domestic Partners

We noted in the first part of this report that some universities may still have nepotism rules. Whatever the merits of these rules, they clearly undermine a family-friendly work environment. In the case of two-academic career families where one partner works at a university that is geographically isolated from other colleges and universities, the other will not be able to work.

Some universities will consider spousal employment on an ad hoc basis, and in some limited cases, may help to seek employment for spouses or partners of faculty they are particularly trying to recruit. This practice needs to be more systematic.

Action II. The Association work in concert with other associations to establish a norm whereby universities should consider employing spouses for positions for which they are best qualified, and to establish an office to assist new faculty with spousal/partner employment and other familial-related relocation issues.

III. A Commitment to Child Care

Pre-school aged children require full-time care that full-time working parents cannot provide. Quality childcare is expensive, often distant from campus, and to state the case with humor, parents must often join waiting lists for slots before conceiving a child.

The 2004 Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession recommends both on-site child care and the availability of child care during class and seminar times. The Berkeley report proposes that the University of California system guarantee making high quality child care and infant care slots available to ladder-rank faculty, establishing school-break childcare and summer camps, and providing emergency back-up child care programs.

We recognize that there are huge financial obstacles for universities to provide quality, on-site childcare for all faculty and staff who need it, and for departments to find the space, the personnel, and the money to pay them to provide emergency childcare. But there are still steps that are realistic that we anticipate could make the workplace more family friendly. For example, many universities have some on-site day care facilities, but they are often limited to pre-school aged children, placing an extra burden on parents of very young children to make other arrangements. Universities should be encouraged to expand existing facilities to accommodate infants and toddlers.

Action III. *The Association work in concert with other associations to lobby universities to seek endowment or other resources to expand on-site childcare wherever and to the full extent possible.*

IV. Stopping the Tenure Clock - Securing a Moderate Gain

In 1988, the University of California was one of the first University systems in the country to institute a policy of tenure-clock stoppage that permitted tenure-track faculty with “substantial responsibility for the care of a newborn child or child under age five placed for adoption or foster care” to request a year stoppage of the tenure clock (which was capped at a total of 2 years). Since that time, many universities followed suit with similar policies. But many did not. Worse still, in some universities, provisions exist for tenure-track faculty to stop the tenure clock for a paid, full-year research leave, but not for family reasons, creating even greater inequities.

Action IV. *The Association work in concert with other associations to extend the two-time, one-year stoppage of the tenure clock for the birth of newborn children and the adoption of small children for primary care givers to all universities and colleges.*

V. The Tenure Clock - A Radical Suggestion

The Penn State study verifies what has long been a hypothesis: postponing childbearing until after tenure is achieved can and does result in infertility or smaller family size. The Berkeley study shows that people regret their decisions not to have fewer children than they would have liked. Other measures suggested in this report can help to make the workplace more family friendly, and to help with faculty retention at the margins, but we do not pretend that these measures, if adopted, will truly level the playing field for everyone who wishes to have a family and a career.

Our evaluation of faculty for appointments without limit of time is premised on the assumption that the quality and quantity of scholarship output during the tenure probationary period, an average period of six years (with the decision being made on the basis of five year’s worth of work), is an accurate signal of what can be expected in the rest of that

scholar's career. We presume that in year one of an appointment (or perhaps even earlier, in graduate school), a scholar plots their trajectory of research productivity, and that six years is sufficient time to judge whether they have stuck to that trajectory, and that the quality of output is as high as we anticipated at the time the faculty member was hired. A book and six articles in the first six years, in other words, should translate into three books and 18 articles within the next twelve. Of course, we know that after tenure, university and professional responsibilities intrude on research productivity, and in the end, we come to know the scholarship of colleagues in the profession not by the eighteenth or twenty-seventh article they have published, but by the ones that are particularly memorable and influential, and that contributed to our body of knowledge. Similarly, we heavily penalize the assistant professor that turns in low course evaluations in one semester of teaching out of ten; that same professor may not be able to overcome low scores in two successive semesters. But fifteen years later, we remember the award-winner undergraduate teacher for his best semesters, for the students under his tutelage who won prestigious prizes, fellowships, and admission to top graduate programs.

The window for having babies and raising them is a small one that happens to coincide with establishing a career. Does the window need to be so small? At this point, there are very few universities that violate AAUP guidelines and have a longer tenure clock. Two that we know of that do have ten-year clocks promote to tenure at the rank of full professor, and so in those cases, the achievement bar is set even higher. It may be time to rethink the length of the tenure clock. Over the course of ten years, a semester of poor teaching evaluations, or without a published article, would matter less than it does over the course of five. Early tenure would remain an option for male and female assistant professors whose research output already exceeds department standards, and such a practice in fact would be important to maintain so that the benefits of lengthening the clock would not be negated eventually by "standard creep." Also, the option of early tenure could be explored for faculty in teaching-intensive institutions that have already demonstrated their success in the classroom.

Action V. *The Association work in concert with other associations to explore the feasibility of instituting as the American university standard a longer tenure clock, with readily available options for early tenure for those who have demonstrated teaching and research excellence.*

VI. An Even More Radical Proposal: A Part-time Option for Ladder-rank Faculty?

The Berkeley report concluded with the recommendation to adopt a part-time option for ladder-rank faculty. The report's authors acknowledged that such a proposal would be controversial. Some will see such an option as a "mommy-track" that no serious scholar would take, while others will see this as the best solution to a problem that has yet to be resolved by any other means.

Action VI. *The Association may not wish to take a position on one side of the other of this emerging debate at this time. But in concert with other associations, it should join this debate. Specifically, the Association's officers and staff should monitor the adoption of such policies in the country, and report back to the Council at an appropriate later date with recommendations on the merits of this proposal.*