

# Unprecedented Urgency: Gender Discrimination In Faculty Hiring at The University of California

MARTHA S. WEST

*This article outlines the negative impact of California's anti-affirmative action initiative, Proposition 209, on the hiring of women faculty members throughout the University of California (UC) system. Martha West viewed with alarm the widening discrepancy between the increasing percentage of women Ph.D.s in the United States and the declining percentage of women faculty hires in the UC system after Prop 209 passed in 1996. The UC data indicated that serious discrimination against women was occurring in the faculty hiring process. Perceiving the urgency of the situation, she and other faculty advocates approached a state legislator for assistance in putting pressure on the UC administration. The legislator initiated a state audit of UC's faculty hiring process and held three hearings in 2001, 2002, and 2003, inviting testimony from faculty and administrators at all nine campuses and the UC's central administration. The proceedings of the hearings, the obstacles faced by faculty women, and recommendations for change are highlighted in this article.*

**Keywords:** women faculty / junior faculty recruitment / university administration / sex discrimination / affirmative action / Proposition 209 / legislature / state audit

"The world will not evolve past its current state of crisis by using the same thinking that created the situation."

—Albert Einstein

This is a story about a controversial approach to seeking change within higher education—tapping into political power off campus.<sup>1</sup> Professor Gyöngy Laky and I, both faculty members at the University of California Davis (UC Davis), had reluctantly come to the realization after many years of struggle, that significant, meaningful change at the University of California (UC) would not take place by continuing to work within the UC system. Our cause: gender equity in faculty hiring. In one year, the percentage of women among new faculty hires at UC Davis had dropped 22 points: from 35 percent in 1997–98 to only 13 percent in 1998–99. Although UC Davis was only one campus in the nine-campus system, the hiring of women faculty—both tenured and tenure track—had been declining at all the campuses. As an employment law professor at the UC Davis Law School, I had been monitoring the progress of women among faculty hires at UC since the mid-1980s. Rather than just complain or take

it up with the university one more time, Professor Laky and I decided to go outside the system. We managed to get the attention of a state senator, the state auditor, and the state legislature. Only by creating outside pressure on the UC system were we finally successful in catching the ear of UC President Richard Atkinson, which, in turn, caused him to take steps to effect change.

Professor Laky and I focused our efforts on calling attention to issues of sex discrimination—current and continuing discrimination against women in the UC faculty hiring process. In our view, outside pressure was needed to encourage faculty to hire women at rates reflecting women's availability among the primary category of qualified candidates—recent U.S. Ph.D. recipients. Both federal law, Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and state law prohibit employers from discriminating on the basis of gender in hiring. In 1998, 48 percent of recent U.S. Ph.D. recipients were women, but only 13 percent of UC Davis faculty hires were women. This was strong evidence of sex discrimination, particularly in the absence of alternative explanations for this disturbing phenomenon.

We were not interested in the use of "affirmative action" policies to hire faculty. "Affirmative action" as a viable public policy or political strategy had already ended in California. In 1995, the UC Regents adopted Resolutions SP-1 and SP-2, abolishing affirmative action as university policy. In 1996, California voters passed Proposition 209, amending the California Constitution to forbid any state entity from giving "preferences" based on race, ethnicity, or sex in making employment decisions, issuing contracts, or providing any other state benefits. It was ironic, however, that this political abolition of affirmative action, in fact, led to increased discrimination against women at UC. With hopes that California's experience is not duplicated elsewhere, the story of what happened in the UC system following passage of Proposition 209 is particularly instructive for those in other states where attacks on affirmative action policies continue to take place.

The issue of discrimination in faculty hiring is particularly difficult because the decision makers are faculty members themselves. The decision of whom to hire as a faculty member is made by faculty at the department level, a highly decentralized process within the UC system. A campus administration can veto a proposed hire but cannot make an actual decision to hire someone. Thus, it is a daunting challenge to sensitize faculty to issues of sex, race, or ethnic discrimination in order to bring about change among such a wide group of decision makers.

## The Problem and the Players

Throughout the 1980s, on a national level, women were obtaining Ph.D.s at unprecedented rates; in 1981–82, women accounted for 35 percent of Ph.D. recipients among U.S. citizens.<sup>2</sup> By 1991–92, women's percentage had increased to 44 percent. Reflecting the movement of more women into Ph.D. programs, more women faculty were being hired throughout the UC system. In 1984–85, women obtained 25 percent of these UC faculty positions (77 women among 314 hires system-wide). By 1990–91, women accounted for 29 percent of faculty hires (153 women among 530 hires). Women reached a peak in 1993–94, obtaining 37 percent of new positions (108 women among 292 hires). Although the percentage of women among faculty hires was always below the percentage of women in the "qualified labor pool" of recent Ph.D. recipients, the upward trend in women's percentage of hires paralleled the upward trend in women's participation in graduate education.

This positive picture began to change in 1995–96, immediately after UC Regent Ward Connerly convinced the other UC Regents to abolish affirmative action as university policy. The Regents' primary targets were campus student admissions policies. Regent Connerly and his friends then placed Proposition 209 on the statewide ballot and it passed in November 1996. Even though the Regents' resolutions and Proposition 209 purported to eliminate "preferences" based on race, sex, and ethnicity, they both contained clauses permitting UC and other state entities to continue to follow federal affirmative action employment requirements in order to preserve the receipt of federal funds. Under Federal Executive Order 11246, any entity employing at least 50 employees and receiving \$50,000 or more in federal funds must follow federal affirmative action policies in hiring employees. Because each UC campus receives considerably more than \$50,000 in federal funds, neither the Regents' 1995 resolutions nor the adoption of Proposition 209 in 1996 should have affected university employment practices, including faculty hiring. Unfortunately, however, the political message sent to faculty by the statewide abolition of affirmative action was much more powerful than the continuing federal employment requirements, about which the university was silent.

In 1995–96, 36 percent of new UC faculty hires were women (140 out of 391). By 1996–97, however, women's percentage fell 10 points, to 26 percent (99 out of 376 hires). The lowest point was reached in 1999–2000, when women represented only 25 percent of new faculty hires (92 of 369 hires). This was the lowest percentage of women among faculty hires in the UC system since 1987–88. Meanwhile, women's percentage among U.S. citizen Ph.D. recipients continued to climb, reaching 48 percent in 1999. No longer were UC hires of women paralleling women's increasing percentage of the national Ph.D. pool.

The situation at the UC Davis campus was even worse. Davis had been hiring women at a higher rate than at the system-wide level. In 1994–95, a whopping 52 percent of faculty hires were women (22 out of 42 hires). By 1998–99, however, only 13 percent of the new hires were women (7 of 46 hires). As an employment law expert, I concluded that these numbers indicated a serious problem of discrimination. Under employment discrimination theory, if the “qualified labor pool” is 48 percent women, but the hires from that pool are only 13 percent women, a *prima facie* case of discrimination is indicated. Plus, as a recipient of federal funds, UC was still required under its affirmative action plans to make “good faith efforts” to eliminate gender, racial, and ethnic underrepresentation on its faculty. The data both at the system-wide level and at UC Davis demonstrated that not only had affirmative action efforts on behalf of women ceased, but the faculty decision makers at the department level had switched back to traditional discriminatory hiring practices.

### **Predicted Rates of Hire for Faculty Women Before and After 1995**

I discussed the situation with Professor Gyöngy Laky. At that time, Laky was a professor of Environmental Design in the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences. We had worked closely together on faculty issues since 1984, when we first met while serving on the UC Davis Academic Senate Affirmative Action Committee. We had both later chaired that committee; Laky had gone on to chair the Senate’s system-wide Affirmative Action Committee. I had been on numerous campus task forces in the 1980s and 1990s dealing with the need to diversify the UC Davis faculty.

We learned that internal Davis statistics showed that faculty hires for the next year, 1999–2000, would include only 18 percent women hires. With two years of data, we knew this downturn was not just a fluke. At the same time that fewer women were being hired, the UC system was projecting a significant increase in faculty hiring—approximately 7,500 new faculty would be hired statewide over the next ten years, more than the total 6,400 UC faculty employed in 1999. Because faculty in academia tend to remain at their institutions for long careers, this tremendous hiring surge would shape the make-up of the UC faculty for the next half century. Massive faculty turnover, combined with the alarming decline in women’s hires, made the need for change urgent.

Professor Laky and I considered the possibility of getting someone in the state legislature to champion our cause and be our voice. We knew we would have much stronger support for gender equity issues among members of the state legislature than we had among UC administrators

or Regents. We also knew time was of the essence and the slow pace of bureaucratic change within the UC system made internal action hopeless. Laky mentioned our concern to an old friend, Phyllis Friedman, a prominent UC Berkeley alumna and financial supporter. Without hesitation, Friedman said she knew just the right person: State Senator Jackie Speier. The next day Friedman contacted Speier, who was clearly interested.<sup>3</sup>

In December 1999, Professor Laky and I, along with Phyllis Friedman and Professor Jessica Utts from UC Davis's Statistics Department, met with Speier. After discussing the dramatic decline in women faculty hires and the many obstacles Laky, Utts, and I had faced on campus, Speier suggested a state audit of the UC's hiring practices. This would provide a baseline from which to work. Before she requested an audit, however, Speier wanted to meet with faculty from other UC campuses to understand the problem more broadly. In July 2000, Senator Speier met with a group of 13 senior UC faculty women representing five campuses. The women were unanimous in detailing the need for an investigation of the UC's hiring practices. One woman after another described the difficulties they had encountered in bringing the serious underrepresentation of women among the ladder rank faculty to the attention of campus officials. After Proposition 209, neither the UC Office of the President (UCOP) nor campus administrations seemed concerned that the hiring data indicated increasing gender discrimination. At the meeting, Speier agreed to seek approval from the legislature for an audit of the UC's hiring practices.

On August 22, 2000, the Joint Legislative Audit Committee approved Speier's request, and \$250,000 was appropriated to fund the audit. UCOP representatives were present at the committee's meeting and were supportive, publicly acknowledging that there appeared to be a "problem." During fall 2000, word spread among UC faculty and staff that an audit of gender issues in faculty hiring was occurring. Once the audit was underway, Senator Speier's office began preparations for the Select Committee on Government Oversight to hold a hearing in January 2001.

### **The Three Hearings— January 2001, March 2002, February 2003**

#### ***Hearing I***

The first of what was to become three one-day hearings was held on January 31, 2001; seventeen faculty from throughout the UC testified.<sup>4</sup> Two outside experts, Professor Nancy Hopkins, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Professor Elaine Shoben, University of Illinois College of Law, offered a national perspective on the difficulties women faculty faced. Professor Laky pointed out that in the UC system, Proposition 209 had

become an “affirmative action” program for men: Men were being given “preference” by being hired at rates 30 percent above their availability in the Ph.D. pool. Furthermore, national data showed that women were, in fact, more interested than men in academic employment: in 2000, 56 percent of women receiving Ph.D.s chose to apply for academic jobs, as opposed to only 44 percent of men earning Ph.D.s. I testified that after Proposition 209 passed, it appeared the faculty (80% male) “relaxed,” thinking affirmative action was gone and that everything was back to “normal,” meaning hiring people most like themselves. In the absence of pressure from UC administrators to hire diverse candidates, faculty reverted to their traditional hiring practices of finding the “best” graduate students, primarily men, recommended by their mostly male colleagues at other schools. I offered a second explanation for the relatively low percentage of women among UC faculty hires: UC hires more than 40 percent of its new faculty at the tenured ranks of associate or full professor. When hiring at the tenured level, the UC is hiring from a pool of faculty already teaching at research universities, a pool that includes only 20 percent women. When hiring at the entry-level assistant professor rank, the “qualified labor pool” expands to include 48 percent women—recent Ph.D. recipients. I recommended that if the UC truly wants to increase the hires of women, it should severely limit the number of hires at the tenured ranks. Ten years of data at UC Davis from 1988–1998 showed that among faculty hired with tenure, only 25 percent were women, whereas among faculty hired without tenure, 37 percent were women. Based on this data, in 2000, we had been able to convince the UC Davis campus to adopt a policy that hires at the higher tenured levels be limited to 20 percent of faculty hires in any given year.

UC Berkeley, Boalt Hall Law Professor Marge Schultz testified that the picture was particularly bleak at the UC Berkeley Law School: Between 1997 and 2000, the Law School had made ten offers to men and ZERO offers to women, during a time when women had reached 46 percent of law school graduates. At Boalt Hall, 64 percent of the entering class were women. UCLA Law Professor Carole Goldberg pointed out that according to UCLA’s own analysis, women should have represented 35 percent of UCLA’s faculty in 2000, instead of 2001’s 23 percent. She testified that a narrow focus on specialization, plus continuing favoritism and cronyism among senior faculty at feeder schools, encouraged faculty to hire people most like themselves. In her view, no one in the UC system was holding departments accountable for their failure to hire women.

The UCOP was represented at the first hearing by Chancellor M.R.C. Greenwood, head of the UC Santa Cruz campus. She pointed out that the UC system was doing better in its overall percentage of women faculty (23.5%) than other elite institutions, such as MIT (14.5%), Harvard (12.9%), or Stanford (17%). She testified that having a Ph.D. was no longer

sufficient for most faculty positions. Some teaching experience, publication in an outstanding journal, or independent research funding was often required, making the pool of recent Ph.D. recipients an inadequate measure of qualified candidates. In response to previous testimony, however, Chancellor Greenwood announced eight new “action” items that UCOP would pursue during the coming year to increase the hires of women, such as setting new campus goals, analyzing candidate pools, providing new resources, and holding chancellors accountable for making progress on their campuses.

In response to Senator Speier’s request for suggestions on how to improve the situation, Professor Andrew Dickson, from UC San Diego’s Scripps Institute of Oceanography, testified that progress was made in hiring women when faculty were hired at the entry level as assistant professors, instead of hiring at the tenured level of associate or full professor. By focusing on assistant professor hires, Scripps had gone from 10 percent women hires to 50 percent, hiring four women out of eight new hires during the past year. This January 2001 hearing received significant press coverage and Senator Speier was strong and articulate in setting forth the difficulties women faced in obtaining UC faculty positions.

The state audit of the UC’s hiring practices was completed in May 2001. The audit found that the “UC’s hiring data for the past 5 years show that a significant disparity appears to exist” between the proportion of women faculty hired by the UC and the proportion of women receiving doctorates nationwide (West et al. 2005). To address this underrepresentation of women, the audit made several recommendations: avoid all-male search committees; direct deans and department chairs to consider more fully the rank at which hires are made; require written search plans and incorporate the data on the underrepresentation of women into the plans; collect hiring data on a system-wide basis and set benchmarks for departments to meet. Many of these suggestions had, in fact, been required by federal affirmative action guidelines since 1978.

## *Hearing II*

State Auditor Elaine Howle opened Senator Speier’s second hearing on March 11, 2002. She was pleased to report that, in response to the audit, UCOP had issued its new “Affirmative Action Guidelines on Recruitment and Retention of Faculty” in January 2002, but she was unsure how the UC system was actually going to implement these guidelines. She requested that the UCOP ask each campus to respond to the problems identified by the audit and detail how they would comply with the UCOP guidelines. Following Auditor Howle, Provost Virginia Hinshaw from UC Davis, representing the UC President, reported that the hires of women faculty at UC had increased from 25 percent of the hires in 1999–2000 to 30 percent

in 2000–01. The improvement was even greater among faculty hires at the assistant professor level, increasing from 27 percent in 1999–2000 to 37 percent in 2000–01. Provost Hinshaw also reported that President Atkinson had allocated \$6 million to support hiring faculty engaged in research that advances the understanding of issues of race, gender, and ethnicity as they intersect with traditional academic fields. At the close of Provost Hinshaw's testimony, Senator Speier engaged her in a lively exchange. Speier announced that she had spoken with President Atkinson before the hearing and obtained his promise that he would personally appear at a third hearing the following year.

As at the first hearing, a panel of nine faculty from the majority of UC campuses testified at the second hearing. In my testimony, I noted that the state audit found that only 20 percent of the applicants for faculty jobs were women. This was surprising in light of the fact that by 2001, women were earning 50 percent of Ph.D.s among U.S. citizens, and 44 percent of all Ph.D.s in the United States. I urged UC to examine why women were not applying for faculty jobs at the rates one would expect. I also urged the UC to formalize how departments were keeping track of who the actual "applicants" were. Professor Goldberg from UCLA noted that the state audit had generated significant activity at UCLA; the College of Letters and Science was putting a new electronic method in place to monitor searches, identify the gender and ethnicity of applicants, and track how they fare in the search process. Also, UCLA had created the new position of Associate Vice Chancellor of Faculty Diversity.

Professors Angelica Stacy and Deborah Nolan from UC Berkeley testified that although Berkeley hired 27 percent women in 2000–01, nine years earlier in 1993, 35 percent of the UC Berkeley hires had been women. If the 1993 hire rate had continued, 90 more women faculty would have been hired at Berkeley. Professor Stacy, recently appointed as UC Berkeley's Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Equity, testified that all seventeen of the deans and senior administrators who approve faculty hires were men. Among the 63 department chairs, only fifteen were women. In her words, "the vast majority of [UC Berkeley] faculty are reviewed by an entirely male administration" (West et al. 2005). At the end of the second hearing, the faculty who testified were unanimous in their recommendation to Senator Speier that she continue the hearings for another year. In their opinion, whatever progress was occurring on their campuses was a result of the interest and political pressure generated by the hearings and the state audit.

In November 2002, between the second and third hearings, UC President Atkinson convened a Summit on Faculty Gender Equity. He invited approximately 40 senior faculty women from all the campuses to meet for one and a half days in Oakland to develop recommendations for the system. Senator Speier gave the keynote address and several of the

women who had testified at the hearings participated. Among the summit's numerous recommendations, one that the participants stressed was the need for each campus chancellor to provide visible leadership on the faculty hiring issue. Although President Atkinson promised to convene a second summit the following year to monitor progress, he had resigned by fall 2003 and none was held.

### *Hearing III*

Senator Speier's third hearing was held on February 19, 2003. The data on the previous year's hires, 2001–02, had just been released by the UC. It showed a disappointing increase of only 1 percent over the prior year: 31 percent of faculty hires were women (154 of 493 hires). More disturbing, at the assistant professor level, women's percentage had actually declined, from 37 percent in 2000–01 to 34.5 percent in 2001–02. President Atkinson testified, acknowledging that the UC still had a ways to go to reach the 37 percent women hires made in 1993–94, before Proposition 209 passed. Senator Speier responded that "disappointment is an understatement. . . . Gentle persuasion has had limited results. We need less talk, less lip service, and more action" (West et al. 2005).

Testimony by the fourteen UC faculty members continued the same themes from the previous hearings. I testified that the gap between the percentage of women in the Ph.D. pool and the percentage hired had doubled. In 1994, women were 46 percent of the Ph.D. pool and 37 percent of the hires, a nine-point gap; eight years later, in 2002, women were more than 49 percent of the Ph.D. pool but only 31 percent of the hires, an eighteen-point gap. UC Berkeley had made more progress than the rest of the system, increasing its percentage of women hires to 34 percent, according to Professor Angelica Stacy. Nevertheless, in the Berkeley Mathematics Department, one of the largest producers of female mathematics Ph.D.s in the nation, not a single woman was hired in the last ten years out of 28 mathematics hires. The Dean of UC Berkeley's Graduate Division, Mary Ann Mason, presented data showing that women with babies are 33 percent less likely than others to land a tenure-track position; she focused her presentation on the need for UC to develop more "family friendly" personnel policies.

Chemical Engineering Professor Martha Mecartney at UC Irvine was distressed that the percentage of women faculty hired at Irvine had declined from 31 percent in 1999 to 28 percent in 2002, even though UC Irvine had received an ADVANCE Grant from the National Science Foundation in 2000–01, during its first round of awards, to increase the number of women faculty in science and engineering. Professor Michael Bernstein, chair of History at UC San Diego, testified that the "majority of male faculty members [do] want to see the hiring of women improve" (West et al.

2005). In his view, however, the goals of the search process itself privilege white men. Departments are asked by the UC to increase their academic excellence and gain academic visibility. They do this primarily by hiring prestigious faculty at the tenured ranks from other institutions, most of whom are white men. When this happens, departments are rewarded by additional resources from central campus funds. In his view, only if departments are forced to recruit at the assistant professor level will the percentage of women among new hires increase.

In contrast to UC Berkeley, UCLA's hires of women fell significantly from 33 percent in 2000–01 to 20 percent in 2001–02. Professor Susan Prager, former Dean of the UCLA Law School, was particularly concerned about the steep decline in women hires at the assistant professor level: Women's percentage fell from 45 percent to only 20 percent women. She believed this data indicated serious discrimination against women when one compares these entry-level hires to the Ph.D. candidate pools. In her words, faculty and administrators "may well be overlooking the overarching legal framework, . . . namely, the anti-discrimination principle itself" (West et al. 2005). Finally, Professor Christine Gailey, chair of Women's Studies at UC Riverside, testified that research demonstrates that women as a whole must be at least one-third more productive than men to get equal treatment. Furthermore, women of color must be twice as productive, twice as well-qualified as men to get equal treatment in hiring.

## Summary

Senator Speier's three hearings produced a variety of recommendations for the UC, including: (1) disseminating widely the past year's hiring data and relevant Ph.D. pool information by gender, race, and ethnicity; (2) issuing a UC directive to expand the percentage of faculty hired at the entry level of assistant professor to 80 percent of new hires, instead of the current 60 percent; (3) setting up uniform procedures to monitor faculty searches; (4) rewarding departments and department chairs who are making effective progress in diverse hiring; (5) appointing more women to administrative leadership positions; (6) reviewing the performance of deans on hiring issues on an annual basis; (7) providing stronger leadership to include more women in the university.

As a result of this legislative activity, and the hard work of many faculty members on each campus, the percentage of women among new faculty hires did gradually increase at the UC. During the 2000–01 academic year, while the state audit was occurring and the first hearing was held, women's percentage among new hires rose from 25 to 30 percent. At the end of the 2001–02 academic year, based on the data the UC released just

before the third hearing in 2003, women's percentage of hires stood at a disappointing 31 percent. By the end of the 2002–03 academic year, however, and after the third hearing, women's percentage rose to 36 percent, where it has remained through the 2005–06 academic year.

On another important measure—the hiring of non-tenured assistant professors—the hearings generated some improvement. According to the 2003–04 hiring data, women's percentage among assistant professor hires increased from 38 percent women in 2002–03 to 41 percent women in 2003–04. This was, however, only a temporary improvement, falling back to 39 percent women in 2004–05 and 2005–06. Even at 41 percent, the hires of women among assistant professors were still significantly below the percentage of women obtaining Ph.D.s throughout the 1990s.

The slow rate of progress after the three hearings has occurred because senior faculty in the University of California system simply do not take this issue seriously. The faculty retain control over the hiring process. Furthermore, there continues to be little leadership on this issue among UC administrators. To my knowledge, the new UC President, Robert Dynes, has made no public statements on this issue since he took office in fall 2003.

With regard to other options, there is no prospect of overturning Proposition 209. Ward Connerly recently succeeded in convincing Michigan voters to ban affirmative action or “preferences” in that state, and, apparently, he is working to put the issue on the ballot in several more states. Consequently, women need to take the initiative themselves to make sure equitable hiring occurs on their campuses.

As Senator Speier said during the three years of hearings, “We need less talk, less lip service, and more aggressive action attracting women. UC is underutilizing a valuable resource by not hiring more women. When women are shut out, it not only affects the type of research conducted, it also limits the questions pursued” (West et al. 2005). It is clear that further action needs to be taken to bring the hires of women faculty more in line with their current availability in the Ph.D. pool, reaching a new high of 51 percent among U.S. citizen Ph.D.s in 2003.

**Martha S. West** is Professor of Law at the UC Davis Law School, where she has taught Labor Law and Employment Discrimination since 1982. She served as Associate Dean of the Law School from 1988–92. She is co-author with Herma Hill Kay of UC Berkeley Law School of Sex-Based Discrimination (2006), a law school textbook she uses in her course, Sex-based Discrimination. West has been a member or consultant with the American Association of University Professors' Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession since 1996. Send correspondence to UCD Law School, Davis, CA 95616.

## Acknowledgments

Martha West is deeply indebted to her colleagues at UC Davis: Gyöngy Laky, Professor of Design in Textiles and Clothing Division, Kari Lokke, Professor of Literature in Comparative Literature Program, and Kyaw Tha Paw U, Professor of Atmospheric Science in Land, Air, and Water Resources Department. She also acknowledges with great appreciation the work of Sarah Ham, research assistant, UC Davis School of Law, J.D. 2004.

## Notes

1. This article is derived from a 74-page report, *Unprecedented Urgency: Gender Discrimination in Faculty Hiring at the University of California*, authored by Martha S. West, Gyöngy Laky, Kari Lokke, Kyaw Tha Paw U, and Sarah Ham. The report was published on the UC Davis Law School website 2005 and was funded by the Ford Foundation, through the Institute for Women's Leadership at Rutgers University.
2. The national Ph.D. data in this article are from the annual reports, *Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report, Survey of Earned Doctorates*, prepared each year under the auspices of the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the U.S. Department of Education, and several additional federal agencies. Copies of these reports are available from the National Opinion Research Center at <http://www.norc.uchicago.edu/issues/docdata.htm>.
3. Senator Jackie Speier was and is a courageous woman. About thirty years ago, as a young person on Congressman Leo Ryan's staff, Speier almost lost her life in the attempt to uncover the facts about the Reverend Jim Jones and his People's Temple. More than 900 people died on November 18, 1978, in the incident that has come to be known as the Jonestown massacre, including Congressman Ryan. Jackie Speier was shot five times on the airport tarmac in Guyana and left for dead. Thankfully, Speier survived and went on to serve in the California legislature for twenty years from 1986 through 2006. She has strong ties to UC as an alumna of both UC Davis and UC Hastings College of Law. Speier was chair of the Senate's Select Committee on Government Oversight and had a strong record on women's issues.
4. Transcripts of all three hearings are available at [http://www.mail2web.com/cgi-bin/redirect.asp?lid=0&newsite=http://www.senate.ca.gov/htbin/testbin/seninfo\\_dated?sen.committee.select.goover.transcript](http://www.mail2web.com/cgi-bin/redirect.asp?lid=0&newsite=http://www.senate.ca.gov/htbin/testbin/seninfo_dated?sen.committee.select.goover.transcript).

## Reference

West, Martha S., Gyöngy Laky, Kari Lokke, Kyaw Tha Paw U, and Sarah Ham. 2005. *Gender Discrimination in Faculty Hiring at the University of California*. Retrieved from [http://www.mail2web.com/cgi-bin/redir.asp?lid=0&newsite=http://www.law.ucdavis.edu/faculty/west\\_pub.shtml](http://www.mail2web.com/cgi-bin/redir.asp?lid=0&newsite=http://www.law.ucdavis.edu/faculty/west_pub.shtml).