From the President’s Desk
by Joan Luby, M.D.

The Changing Face of the AWN

As this academic year comes to a close, I am heartened by the progress we have made as an organization championing the role of women in the medical school and as follows from this, the further advancement of our institution as an innovator in the medical sciences. Over the past year, the AWN has made significant progress in highlighting the gender inequities by department at the higher ranks of academic medicine and putting them into the context of national trends (see AWN website). We have also highlighted those chairs that have shown a particular concern for these issues and who have developed leadership methods designed to foster the advancement of women. We have had the opportunity to work with Vice Provost Adrienne Davis who has had a remarkable impact thus far on diversity initiatives at the university overall through programs designed to raise awareness of the university community and through direct work with our administrative leaders. Based on all of these factors, I am very optimistic that real and significant change is within reach at the School of Medicine. There can be little doubt that if these goals are achieved WUSM will become an even more stellar environment in which to work, attracting the brightest women in science. We have also called for the inclusion of men in the AWN. The rationale behind this modification in policy is based on the notion that the goal of increasing gender equity in the School of Medicine will benefit the entire community. While not all members agree, there has been
overwhelming support from the membership and broad consensus that the gender equity problem is not just a problem for women. A number of men have already been active in the gender equity effort through the Gender Equity Committee and other organizations.

In addition to these changes, this year has been marked by numerous other important AWN initiatives. The AWN has also made advances in social networking through the efforts of two new board members, Kelly Ross, M.D. and Kathleen Berchelmann, M.D (both from the Department of Pediatrics). Due to their efforts, the AWN is now on LinkedIn as well as other social networks and in this way our communication with our own community as well as other groups that represent women in science has been greatly facilitated. In addition, plans are almost complete for a permanent “Dress for Success” drop box on the medical school campus, an effort championed by board member Katherine Rivera. Next year, I look forward to the Presidency of Linda Peterson, M.D. Linda has done an excellent job on the fall and spring dinners this year, making welcome innovations in our cuisine and programming. She has also arranged some very well attended Brown Bags focusing on the pragmatic challenges for women in science juggling numerous other responsibilities.

In the upcoming year we hope to continue our peer to peer mentorship program, led by Drs. Tamara Hershey and Lisa Moscoso. We also plan to continue to increase awareness and develop productive strategies that department chairs can take to facilitate maintaining and advancing women along the academic track. The associate dean for faculty affairs Dr. Diana Gray is also continuing her efforts to increase the services provided on campus to help busy working academics manage the demands of their home and work life (e.g. “Concierge Services”). We are hopeful that these efforts together will continue to gain momentum. Such pragmatic steps can greatly facilitate the capacity of a busy scientist to manage the demands of work and home life.

In closing, I wish to thank the AWN community for your participation and energies in these important efforts. My year as president was a truly exciting and invigorating experience that I will never forget. I look forward to ongoing participation in this productive, pro-active, stimulating and engaging organization.

**************************************************************************************************

Did you know...

That you are welcome to attend AWN Board meetings and participate on AWN committees regardless of whether you are a board member?

If you are interested in participating, email Anne Glowinski, M.D., AWN Secretary (glowinskia@psychiatry.wustl.edu)

"When nothing is sure, everything is possible"

-Margaret Drabble

English novelist, biographer, critic
In March, the Executive Faculty passed a revised proposal to create an Ombuds office with a supermajority of votes. The proposed mission of the Ombuds office is to provide School of Medicine (SOM) faculty with a mechanism for voluntary, informal, neutral, confidential, third-party assistance in resolving work-related issues, concerns, or conflicts. The Ombuds will serve as a designated impartial and informal dispute resolution practitioner whose major function is to provide confidential and informal assistance to SOM faculty. The office supplements, but does not replace, the SOM’s existing resources for conflict resolution.

The revised version of the proposal calls for 25% time of an internal, senior faculty person who will have protected time for the ombuds' activities. The proposal includes a 5% position for a second faculty member to handle issues arising from the senior ombuds' own department. Both people will receive formal training for the role that includes conflict resolution, negotiation and mediation if they do not already have experience in these areas. At this time it is a temporary position whose goal is to acquire sufficient data during the 3 year trial period to determine the need and merits of such a position going forward.

A search committee has been formed which will meet shortly to undertake the task of sending out a job announcement and establishing criteria other than those described above for the search process.

This office represents almost three years of hard work on the part of many members of AWN, an exploratory subcommittee composed of Drs. Kim Carmichael, John Cooper, Bettina Mittendorfer, and Karen O’Malley as well as all of the members of the ECFC to research such positions, to gather best practices and to formulate a SOM-specific prototype. We can all be proud of the vision, persistence and dedication to our faculty that it took to get this trial office in place. Although modified from the original proposal, it seems likely that the office will prove its worth.
The 2012 AWN Spring Dinner was bucolic, lively and interesting, thanks to the highly civilizing influences of Board members Linda Peterson (our President-Elect who selected the delicious menu) and Katherine Riviera-Spoljaric (one of our clinical councilors with an evident talent for transcending the usual slightly somber academic medicine party) as well as outstanding award winners including: AWN student award winners Kate Chiapinelli (DBBS) and Natalie Villafranco (WUSM); AWN Mentor Awards Laura Beirut (Psychiatry) and Katherine Weilbaecher (Medicine/Oncology) and last but not least, the winner of the AWN Pioneering Woman Award, the outstanding pediatrician Mary Anne Tuggle Tillman. The Spring Dinner keynote speaker was Diana Gray, WUSM Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, who spoke about “Gender Equity at WUSM”.

Without any doubt, a major highlight of the Spring Dinner was the story telling by Pioneering Woman Award winner Mary Tillman, after a fantastic introduction by one her many fans, AWN Board Member Kathleen Berchelmann, who described eloquently the many virtues embodied by Mary Tillman (a career long role model for Kathleen), including intelligence, love, and justice; virtues exemplified by Dr. Tillman in her care of countless patients, among them many under-served patients. In a gentle but powerful way, Dr. Tillman, who just retired from being a practicing pediatrician last year from 50 continuous years of medical practice, but is still an active community leader, illuminated our lives with glimpses of hers: her experience as one of six women medical students at Howard, intersections with bigotry, small-mindedness and grueling demands as a pioneer (in every possible way). Afterwards, we all knew that she was indeed a pioneer: exceedingly brave and forward looking, odds-defying and never outwardly bitter, this extraordinary woman made a path for herself and an easier path for all those behind her.

Hoping to see as many of you as possible at our 2012 AWN Fall Dinner!
An Interview of Susan Frelich Appleton

The Leamma Barkeloo and Phoebe Couzins Professor of Law
and primary (and inaugural) Ombuds for the Danforth Campus

By Anne Glowinski, M.D., M.P.E.

Professor Susan Frelich Appleton is a widely recognized expert in family law. Her research, scholarship, and writings address legal aspects of issues such as adoption, assisted reproduction, gender and parentage, surrogacy, and abortion rights. Professor Appleton is currently serving a two-year term as Washington University's inaugural Ombuds. Since the WUSM ECFC recently approved the creation of a .25 FTE pilot Ombuds position at our medical school, I interviewed Professor Appleton about her Ombuds role to inform AWN members, and others, not familiar with this type of position.

For this interview, Professor Appleton graciously welcomed me in her Ombuds office in Eliot Hall. This is the special office, completely separate from her usual Law Professor office, where she meets the faculty who bring their concerns to the Washington University's Ombuds Office.

Professor Appleton has been a WU faculty since 1975, and has significant institutional knowledge and memory. She explains to me that before being the first WU Ombuds since 2010, she was already fairly familiar with some of the concerns that WU faculty experience, in particular tenure-related concerns. This familiarity came from a 10 year position on the board of WU's AAUP chapter (the American Association of University Professors: http://www.aaup.org/aaup, which defines its purpose as “to advance academic freedom and shared governance, to define fundamental professional values and standards for higher education, and to ensure higher education's contribution to the common good”).

Anne Glowinski (AG): How did you decide to take on the Ombuds position?
Susan Appleton (SA): Ed Macias asked me to meet with him. (Edward S. Macias is the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs since 2009). I did not know what he wanted to talk to me about. He explained that he had been working with a task force to improve Washington University’s culture and approach to gender issues and that this task force had recommended the creation of an Ombuds position. He asked if I would take on this role. I called each of the women faculty who had worked on this task force: Marion Crain from the Law School, Mary Ann Dzuback from the Department of Education in Arts and Sciences and Diana Gray from the Medical School. I talked with them about this Ombuds position. I told each of them as well as Ed Macias that I was not interested in a role that would give the appearance of concern about gender issues: I would consider a role that could genuinely improve the environment for WU faculty, however. After that, I did some research. I became familiar with the information available on the website of the International Ombudsman Association http://www.ombudsassociation.org/ and started raising some questions.

AG: Can you give me an example of a question you had?
SA: For instance, I read about the confidentiality principle and wondered about the limits of this principle in situations in which something would be divulged to me that ordinarily should be reported (for instance,
sexual harassment). I wondered whether the institution could be liable if someone told me of such an instance and I kept the information confidential. So, I enrolled for a 3 day training course in California sponsored by the International Ombudsman Association. This training answered many of my questions and also helped me know what I needed to ask for and negotiate for so that the position could be successful at this University. First, regarding confidentiality, I negotiated that I would not be considered “an office of record” (so there would be no accountability for keeping records of what is told to me), in turn allowing my office to not communicate to the University information about sexual harassment issues brought to me in confidence. Second, during the training course, it was strongly suggested that the Ombuds should report to the highest person in the University without any intermediaries. For Washington University, that would be the Chair of the Board of Trustees. I decided that it would make more sense to report to Ed Macias, but at the same time to have the Chancellor unambiguously communicate his support for the Ombuds position. Third, I wanted to be able to track patterns of concerns and complaints brought by faculty to my office and to present these data to both the Faculty Senate Council and the Provost’s Office on a yearly basis. Fourth, in the case of a difficult legal problem, I wanted to be able to consult an outside attorney because the General Counsel represents the institution.

AG: Professor Appleton shows me a book called The Organizational Ombudsman by Charles Howard, which also helped her think through what needed to be optimized for her Ombuds Office.

SA: I also negotiated that, to the extent necessary, and only to that extent, I could have access to privileged information like salary data. I have not had to use an outside lawyer or review salary data, but I can if I need to.

AG: How was the creation of this new position disseminated to faculty to inform them of this new resource?

SA: It was announced by email to the entire faculty and it was featured in the Record. I have been invited to introduce myself and this service at some faculty meetings across this campus. I think that it could be advertised further. In fact, I have told Ed Macias, that when the new Ombuds succeeds me, it will be a new opportunity for publicity.

AG: Can you tell me, in general terms, about the cases you have seen as an Ombuds? How do people contact you?

SA: For this position, because we are not associated with any other University office, I got a non-WU email, a separate Ombuds email through which faculty with complaints and concerns contact me. I check this email account every day. Since October 2010, I have been involved in over 30 different cases and some of these have required multiple meetings with many different parties. Sometimes, my role is simply to coach faculty, for instance faculty who have not yet communicated to their supervisors and should start there. If communication has been tried and has failed, I might get involved in directly helping with the communication. I only do that with permission from the individual with the complaint. Sometimes cases are more complicated.

AG: Can you give me a sense of what such cases might be like?

SA: Yes, I can. Actually the parties involved have authorized public discussion of this particular issue. I have seen faculty who came to me because they received letters notifying them of salary reductions. Sometimes, the same faculty felt they were being encouraged to retire.

AG: I ask for clarification and SA explains that the encouragement would be to retire while it is a better financial deal, i.e., at a higher salary level, before the reduction, as the retirement compensation would be higher for a higher salary. More generally, reductions send a message that a faculty member’s value has decreased.

SA: This is a complicated and important issue. My focus has been on process. I understand that the University is trying to hire bright new talent and has every right to incentivize certain productivity standards among all faculty members. If salaries incentivize performance, however, then due process should include a clear communication that one’s salary is at high risk of reduction and the reasons, so
that the individual has the opportunity to correct the problems that have led to consideration of a salary reduction and to correct any mistakes about the record. If the salary reduction incentivizes retirement of senior faculty members because the salary and the retirement conditions are linked, then this “push” could be construed as age discrimination.

AG: So, this is an important institutional issue identified by your office. Can you give me other examples of why people have sought Ombuds services?
SA: People come to me about tenure matters, leave situations, and curricular changes. I have also encountered some troublesome cases involving long-serving faculty who do not have tenure, but are lecturers and instructors.

AG: SA notes that she has seen as many senior faculty members as junior ones. She also tells me that her office, unlike some at other institutions like the University of Colorado, where the Ombuds' office hears complaints from faculty and students and staff, has to turn away complaints from students. She notes however that some students are smart and when they find out that faculty involvement is needed, they request that the faculty with whom they have a problem to contact the Ombud’s Office.

AG: What have you enjoyed the most? The least?
SA: It’s actually the same! I really felt my time was well spent working on the salary reduction issues and process. I did a lot of work with institutional leaders. I thought that I had made an important contribution by securing an agreement that future salary reductions would be preceded by a clear communication of what the faculty member could do to address the situation and also would not be tied to retirement. Then I was contacted again by faculty because salary reduction letters have gone out once more. I still have more work to do!

AG: Thinking about what kind of background will be helpful for the Ombuds at the medical school, are your ability to communicate or your legal background important foundational skills for this position? SA notes that she has never practiced law and does not necessarily feel like a negotiations’ expert. She notes that she has met many ombudsmen and ombudswomen who came from other backgrounds: in medicine, in education and many others mostly without a legal background. She gives me in particular, the example of Susan Johnson, a physician, from the office of the Ombudsperson at the University of Iowa:
http://www.uiowa.edu/~ombud/about.shtml

AG: Has the International Association of Ombuds served as an SOS line for you?
SA: The organization offers many resources. I found the training enormously helpful. You can get a mentor, and there are conventions and meetings one can attend. I have not needed help since the training session, but it is available if I need it.

AG: Related to that SA explains to me that it was important for her to ask the Provost to name a 2nd person to the ombuds office, someone whom people in the School of Law could see. It’s also helpful to have a man and a woman. Finally, a second person allows for the possibility of getting a second opinion without compromising the confidentiality of the office. She also initially thought that she would get a chance to team up with an Ombuds from the medical school but as we know, the inauguration of the WUSM Ombuds position is lagging, so that did not happen.

AG: How does 25% FTE for the medical school pilot Ombuds position feel? Does it seem like the right amount?
SA: Well, it has been more work than working on some law school or university committees but less work than, for instance, my past work on the law school’s faculty appointments committee. The demands also depend on the definition of faculty: will post docs be covered by the medical school Ombuds’ office?

AG: Why did you just want to do it for 2 years?
SA: Well, that is what Ed Macias asked me to do! When I attended the training session, I was told that I would fall in love with Ombudsing and that I would want to do it full time. That is not true: I love my
other job. I took this position because I am very committed to institutional service, especially a service that can advance WU’s treatment of gender issues, but I still love my other job even more. Besides, a successor could bring fresh insights and ideas, helping the office evolve.

AG: At this point we are nearing end of interview and SA recaps the principles of ombudsing: confidentiality and neutrality (sometimes difficult because she might have an opinion but this is about seeing both sides). I comment on this being very civilized, to systematically consider that there are multiple aspects to one issue. Other principles she upholds include: independence and informality (she notes that she steps out if problems proceed to formal appeals or lawsuits). I ask if there are any last words.
SA: It took a lot of advance work to get the office launched. We drafted and negotiated approval of lots of material.

AG: I ask if she just gives out the brochure or also has a verbal preamble that she communicates to those seeking Ombuds services? SA notes that she is familiar enough with the medical literature on informed consent to definitely communicate verbally, in particular, to definitely clarify at the outset what the office is and is not. Finally, I ask if the other Ombuds she met tended to be nice?
SA: Yes, very nice. It takes a certain personality.

Many thanks to Professor Appleton, for agreeing to this interview which will hopefully give AWN members and other WUSM faculty as sense of what an Ombuds does and does not do.

(Excerpted from The Record)

******************************************************************************************

Academy of Science – St. Louis 2012 Awardees included several WUSM women faculty:

The George Engelmann Interdisciplinary/Collaborative Science Award: Jointly given to Elaine R. Mardis, PhD, professor of genetics and of molecular microbiology, co-director and director of technology development of The Genome Institute; Timothy J. Ley, MD, the Lewis T. and Rosalind B. Apple Chair in Oncology, professor of medicine and of genetics, and associate director of The Genome Institute; and Richard K. Wilson, PhD, professor of genetics and director of The Genome Institute, will share, a new award that recognizes outstanding achievement in science, engineering or technology that results from collaboration among two or more individuals across disciplinary and/or institutional boundaries. Ley, Mardis and Wilson are recognized for collaborative work that has helped to lay the foundation of cancer genomic research, diagnostics and therapeutics. The academy recognizes them for their unique look at cancer, which has helped to bring in a new era of personalized medicine. The academy also commended them for their participation in a $65 million partnership with St. Jude Children’s Hospital to define the gene mutation spectrum in pediatric cancer. That work is creating a public database that will be shared with the international scientific community to speed progress toward fighting childhood cancers.

The Innovation Award: Audrey R. Odom, MD, PhD, assistant professor of pediatrics and of molecular microbiology. Odom is dissecting a key metabolic pathway in malaria that is not found in humans and provides a novel target for drug development. Worldwide, there is an urgent need for new drugs to treat malaria, which causes more than a million deaths per year, mostly in young children. Odom’s lab focuses
on improving the fundamental understanding of the basic molecular and cellular biology of the malaria parasite to identify new antimalarial drug targets.

The Trustee Award: Mabel L. Purkerson, MD, professor emerita of medicine. For more than 40 years, Purkerson served as a clinician, teacher, investigator and administrator at the School of Medicine. The academy recognizes her as a physician/scientist, leading by example, focusing on excellence and being open to new opportunities and techniques. She used an interdisciplinary approach to find new strategies and tools to further her research, allowing her to make substantial contributions in the field of kidney physiology. These achievements led to her becoming the first female full professor in the Department of Medicine.

******************************************************************************************

Szeman (Ruby) Chan, PhD, research instructor of pathology and immunology, has received a one-year, $75,045 research grant from Bristol-Myers Squibb for research titled “To Determine Whether the Selective JAK2 Inhibitor BMS-911543 is Effective in Controlling the Progression of ERa+/PR+ Mammary Tumors that are Insensitive to Endocrine Treatment.” ...

Laura Palanker Musselman, PhD, research instructor in medicine, has received a two-year, $80,000 Diabetes Research Training Center Pilot & Feasibility award from the Diabetes Research Training Center at Washington University School of Medicine for research titled “The Roles of Nuclear Hormone Receptor Signaling in a Drosophila Model of Diet-Induced Type 2 Diabetes.” ...

Susan E. Mackinnon, MD, is one of three U.S. physicians to be honored with a Clinical Excellence Award by Castle Connolly Medical Ltd., which publishes America’s Top Doctors and other guides to choosing physicians.

The Graduate Professional Council’s 2012 Bridging GAPS (Graduate and Professional Students) Awards were announced during a ceremony on April 9 at Washington University, where the Saint Louis Chapter of the Association for Women in Science (AWIS-STL) was selected as the winner of the group Professional Development Award.

The Bridging GAPS Awards was created by the Graduate Professional Council (GPC) at Washington University in 2001 to recognize exceptional work in bringing people together across Washington University and throughout the larger St. Louis community. The GPC recognizes individuals and groups whose programming, events, and missions exemplify the spirit of Community Service, Diversity, Professional Development, and Sustainability to improve the graduate and professional student experience.

AWIS-STL has been a part of both the Washington University and the greater St. Louis community since 2003, promoting a positive environment for women through education, advocacy, and outreach. Anyone of any gender, employment, or stage of their career is welcome to participate in our events. Our chapter
events fall broadly into two categories: those for the benefit of professionals and students already in science, and outreach events for younger students (K-12).

Professional development training and networking events that AWIS-STL organized in the past year include: Work-Life Satisfaction workshops series, co-sponsor of the annual New Year's Reception for Women in Science & Medicine, and a networking reception in conjunction with the National AWIS board meeting. Our website and newsgroup also serve as focal points for networking, job search and mentoring opportunities.

AWIS-STL also participates in a variety of outreach opportunities, such as the annual “Women in Science day” (since 2006), which brings together students and professionals to implement a science day for over 150 local St Louis high school girls. This spring, we also extended our reach to participate in Annual Science Day at St Clair high school in Missouri. Ben Martin, the organizer of the event as well as one of the science teachers in the high school wrote to us stating: “We had over 450 people total in attendance. The AWIS table went over very well. Several people told me how impressed they were with the sophistication that was on display. My own mother said she learned the most at your table and thoroughly enjoyed hearing about the research going on with the senses. I want to sincerely thank AWIS for your participation and I hope that it motivates some of our female students here to go into the sciences.”

We would not have achieved so much without the work of past AWIS-STL officers as well as all members of our chapter. Our chapter is actively seeking to further expand membership and the types of programs we offer. In the coming year, we anticipate collaborating with the St Louis Science Center’s efforts to develop programs for the Girl Scouts, inviting more speakers on topics of interest to our members, and organizing additional workshops on career development.

We hope you visit our website (https://sites.google.com/site/awisstl/), and if you are within the Saint Louis area, please get in touch to join our chapter or our mailing list!

2012 AWIS-STL Officers:
Co-President: Parinaz Massoumzadeh, PhD
Co-President: Kelsi Singer, PhD candidate
Co-Secretary and Industry Liaison: Nancy Rawson, PhD
Co-Secretary and Webmaster: Winnie Pong, PhD
Treasurer: Sarah Gutbrod, PhD candidate
*Please email tammy@wustl.edu to share press releases, websites and articles that are relevant to women in science and medicine.

*********************************************************************************************

Salley Rockey, the NIH's Deputy Director for Extramural Research publishes a Blog and regular newsletter, often addressing issues relevant to women scientists. (http://nexus.od.nih.gov/all/nexus-by-date/).

*********************************************************************************************

Another regular publication, titled “NIH Updates on Women in Science” is written by the NIH Working Group on Women in Biomedical Careers. http://womeninscience.nih.gov/. The most recent issue discusses the following topics:

- White House and NSF Issue Joint Press Release on New Family-Friendly Policies
- Interview with Stephanie Schierholz, NASA Social Media Manager and Public Affairs Specialist
- Science Fair Winner Meets with President Obama
- Harvard Student-Run Programs Support Women and Girls in Science
- New Study Identifies “Professional Role Confidence” as a Major Factor Causing Gender Imbalance in STEM
- Highlighting Best Practices- Distance Mentoring Programs

*********************************************************************************************

Article in Nature:

“Women miss out”; Nature Volume:485, p 139-139 (2012);

Informal benefits are more frequently awarded to men, according to study of one university. Female academics across all fields are less likely than their male colleagues to receive bonuses, according to a study of employees at a large, unnamed Canadian university (C. Doucet et al. Ind. Relat. 67, 51–75; 2012). The discrepancy may be because female faculty members have fewer networking connections and less knowledge about bonuses than men, suggests Christine Doucet, a sociologist at the University of Montreal, Canada, and co-author of the article, which used data on some 1,900 faculty members. Those who lack institutional networks should seek out information about informal benefits, she advises. If universities followed more formal compensation practices, rather than relying on informal discretion, equity would improve, she notes.

*********************************************************************************************

Messages and announcements from other women scientists/physician organizations:

Dear Colleagues on the NIH Women in Science Listserv:

The National Institutes of Health invites you to participate in the Women of Color Research Network (WoCRn), supported by the NIH Working Group on Women in Biomedical Careers. The Working Group
addresses challenges faced by all women entering and advancing in scientific careers, including women of color.

**The WoCRn is a new social media site for women of color and anyone who values diversity in the scientific workforce.**

The primary goal of WoCRn is to serve as an instrument of outreach. We use this site to promote community, provide information, and facilitate access to colleagues and mentors who can offer advice on career development and navigating the NIH grants process. Members include biomedical professionals with significant research experience, early-career scientists, and students and fellows just starting out. So the network spans the continuum from experienced mentors eager to share their knowledge to young scientists looking for expert guidance.

There are currently over 270 members of this network, and membership is growing every day!

**We invite you to join the WoCRn today. To register, go to [http://www.wocrn.nih.gov](http://www.wocrn.nih.gov) and click on “JOIN NOW.”**

Note that we are working to release an updated site with enhanced functionality within the next few months. Please check back frequently to see the improvements, and to read new discussions on our community forum.

Thank you for your support in growing the network of women in biomedical research careers. And feel free to forward this message to all friends, colleagues, and students who might be interested in joining the WoCRn.

Best wishes,

Lawrence A. Tabak, DDS, PhD  
Principal Deputy Director, NIH  
Co-Chair, NIH Working Group  
on Women in Biomedical Careers

Janine Austin Clayton, MD  
Acting Director, Office of Research on  
Women’s Health  
Co-Chair, NIH Working Group  
on Women in Biomedical Careers

******************************************************************************

**From AWIS:**

NEW YORK – Attracting workers into science and technology fields could be hampered by work-life integration issues according to a new international survey. Drawing data from 4,225 publishing scientists and researchers worldwide, the Association for Women in Science (AWIS) finds that lack of flexibility in the workplace, dissatisfaction with career development opportunities and low salaries are driving both men and women to re-consider their profession.

More than half (54%) of all scientists and researchers said that work demands conflict with their personal lives at least 2-3 times per week. Only a third of researchers agreed they work for family friendly institutions. A number said that their employers do not have spousal hire policies or that such policies are not available because of funding cuts. Only half of the women (52%) reported that they are happy with their work-life integration, compared with 61% of men working in research across all fields.
One third of researchers say that ensuring good work-life integration has negatively impacted their careers and women (37%) were more likely than men (30%) to say this was the case. For those researchers with dependent children, 36% reported career problems.

Nearly 40% of women respondents have delayed having children because of their careers, while 27% of males indicated the same situation. A number of women mentioned waiting until they had a permanent position to get pregnant or noted that they could not afford to start a family on their wages.

One in 10 researchers indicated that they expect to leave their current job within the next year. Of those intending to leave, females were twice as likely (12%) as males (6%) to cite a spouse’s job offer or relocation as the reason. Of researchers intending to leave, 9% indicated it was because they were unable to balance work-life integration.

The survey was released during the convening of Global Experts on Work-Life Family Issues held by AWIS in New York this week and coincides with International Women’s Day and the United Nation’s 56th session of the Commission on the Status of Women. Thirty-six percent of respondents were from Western Europe (including 6% United Kingdom, 6% Italy, 5% Germany, 3% Spain, 3% France). Twenty-eight percent were from North America (24% United States, 4% Canada). Twenty-two percent were from Asia Pacific (including 6% China 4% Japan). Six percent were from Latin America. Six percent were from Eastern Europe. The remaining two percent were from Africa and the Middle East.

“These findings confirm that work-life conflict is not gender-specific in the scientific community,” said Janet Bandows Koster, AWIS executive director & CEO. “The real issue is that the academic workplace is still modeled on an ideal that no longer exists nor complements the realities of today’s global workforce.”

“If researchers who want a fulfilling home and work-life are being driven out of the industry through archaic working practices, it’s time to address the system itself. Let’s stop pointing the finger at women by putting a “baby” band aid on the problem and solve the real issues,” said Bandows Koster.

The survey results were collected in December 2011 and January 2012 with 4,225 scientists and authors responding. Of the respondents, 80% were married or partnered, 70% were male, 64% worked at a university and 83% worked 40 or more hours per week. Survey respondents were working scientists and researchers who publish academically across all disciplines.

This AWIS project is underwritten with a grant from the Elsevier Foundation New Scholars Program. Elsevier assisted with the technical administration of the survey which has a margin of error of <1.3% at the 90% confidence level. The Association for Women in Science (AWIS) is the largest multi-discipline organization for women in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) dedicated to achieving equity and full participation of women in all disciplines and across all employment sectors. AWIS reaches more than 15,000 professionals in STEM with members and chapters nationwide. Membership is open to any individual who supports the vision and mission of AWIS.

www.awis.org

Download a pdf version of this Press Release and the Executive Summary in the AWIS Press Room.<http://www.awis.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=1&subarticlenbr=574>

Association for Women in Science (AWIS)
1321 Duke Street, Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
http://www.awis.org
Telephone: (703) 894-4490
From GWIMS:

Dear GWIMS Community,

We are now accepting nominations for the 2012 AAMC Women in Medicine and Science Leadership Development Awards!

Each year, an individual and an organization/program are recognized for their contributions to advancing women leaders in academic medicine.

The GWIMS Steering Committee strongly encourages nominations of established and emerging leaders and organizations/programs. To learn more about the awards and nomination process, visit the GWIMS Awards page.

The deadline to apply is June 1, 2012.

Questions? Email: gwims@aamc.org

Group on Women in Medicine and Science (GWIMS)

Association of American Medical Colleges
2450 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037-1127 gwims@aamc.org
https://www.aamc.org/members/gwims/
www.aamc.org