

WESTERN SYDNEY
UNIVERSITY



Vice-Chancellor's GENDER EQUALITY FUND Final Report 2019

**Redressing the Promotion Gap:
Practices and processes to minimise
gender disparities in academic
advancement**

Authors: Associate Professor Kate Huppertz,
Cris Townley,
Dr Nida Denson,
Dr Peter Bansel
*Sexualities and Genders Research Group
Social Sciences and Psychology*

Contents

Introduction	2
Literature Review	2
Underrepresentation	2
Benchmark Man	3
Workload allocation and teaching.....	4
The promotions process.....	5
The Current Study.....	6
Methods	6
Findings comparing WSU's promotion policy and procedure compared with other Australian institutions	7
Policy	7
Procedure	7
Findings from interviews with Level D and E female academics.....	8
Obstacles to Achieving 'Excellence'	8
Boys clubs and mentoring	8
Career interruptions and caring obligations.....	9
Pastoral Care and Collegiality	11
Gender Bias in Management, Invisibility and Stigma.....	13
Self-Confidence	16
Discussion	18
Recommendations:.....	19
References	22
Appendices	25
Appendix A. Cross-institution comparisons of policy and process	25
Appendix B: Demographics of the women academics	31

Introduction

Like many universities in Australia and internationally, women at Western Sydney University (WSU) remain under-represented in senior academic positions. In addition, there is a persistent gender pay gap for female academic staff across the institution - the current pay gap is 8.6% (McKay, 2019). This project provides recommendations for increasing women's promotion rates at WSU, which will also assist in reducing the gender pay gap. This project can also be included as evidence to support the university's next SAGE/Athena Swan application.

Despite the robust literature, researchers and higher education institutions have struggled to understand how vertical gender segregation might be alleviated in academia, and to establish effective gender equity programs which target gender differences in promotion. In addition, little research has evaluated the impact of existing programs beyond the individual level and in comparison to other institutional initiatives (Caprile et al, 2012, Science In Australia Gender Equity, no date). The degree to which gender initiatives are effective in making change is one of the most important and challenging questions in striving for gender equity in contemporary universities, yet this has been inadequately addressed by researchers.

There are two key research questions for this project: how does WSU's promotion policy and process compare with other Australian institutions, and; how might WSU alter current policy and practice to reduce the gender promotion gap?

Literature Review

Underrepresentation

Women remain underrepresented in senior positions within universities in Australia and internationally (Kahn, 2012). Previous literature has identified structural and cultural barriers to academic women's career progress, including gender micro-politics, (un)conscious bias, caring obligations (Probert, 2005; Robertson & Moreau, 2017), the long working hours culture, gendered systems of merit and excellence (Bird, 2011), limited social networks, fewer mentors, and specific features of the promotion process (Peetz, Strachan, & Troup, 2014). The typical academic career path is a masculine trajectory (Knights & Richards, 2003). In Australia, there is gender segregation by discipline, earnings and contracted hours (Carrington & Pratt, 2003; Strachan, Whitehouse, Peetz, Bailey, & Broadbent, 2012). While there are no statistics available on the number of Indigenous women academics, the number of Indigenous academics at level E was lower per capita in 2018 than in 2001 (O'Sullivan, 2019), suggesting that Indigenous women are further marginalised at professorial level.

Conceptualised as a 'leaking pipeline' (White, 2004), or 'career funnelling' (Peetz et al., 2014), the proportion of women in academia at the professorial levels of D and E in Australia is much less than at junior levels, and drops to its lowest at level E (Peetz et al., 2014). Even where the proportion of women in aggregate appears similar to men, women are overrepresented in teaching focused jobs, in other words, jobs with lower job security, and this compromises career trajectories in which research outputs are privileged. A key

challenge, captured by the pipeline metaphor, is that although women have for some time now been overrepresented at undergraduate level, and make up almost half of doctorate completions (Carrington & Pratt, 2003), this progress has not flowed through to senior levels of academia (Bell & Bentley, 2005).

Despite these issues, the situation has improved somewhat in Australia since the mid 1980s, with women holding 31% of senior positions in universities in 2014, but challenges remain (Winchester & Browning, 2015). These challenges include that women are overrepresented in some disciplines, such as teaching and student support areas, but are underrepresented in research; in addition, Indigenous women, women from non-English speaking backgrounds and women with disabilities are also underrepresented (Winchester & Browning, 2015). Eggins (2016) argues that, globally, there are more highly qualified and experienced women academics than previously, but two key remaining challenges are the appointment of women to top posts, and equal pay.

Benchmark Man

A range of factors have been identified in the underrepresentation of women in the professoriate. Underpinning many of these is the concept of merit, and the corresponding ideal of what it is to be a professor. This ideal is based on a white male professor, termed 'Benchmark Man', a

normative masculinist standard [which] favours those who are Anglo-Australian, heterosexual, able-bodied, middle class, not elderly, espouse a right-of-centre politics and a nominal mainstream religion, if any (Thornton, 2013, p.128).

The shape of Benchmark Man is embedded in institutions, through systems that evaluate performance, cultural values and individual biases of both academics and students. Academics whose characteristics and identities align with Benchmark Man ride the tailwinds to career success and promotion, whilst those who do not resemble Benchmark Man battle the headwinds (Anderson et. al., 2019). The greater a person's divergence from Benchmark Man, the stronger the headwinds. 'Measuring up' against Benchmark man is integral to career progression. However, certain academics find it particularly difficult to achieve the qualities of Benchmark Man. Racially minoritized women in academia, for example, are subject to a combination of sexism and racism, limiting their opportunities (Gabriel & Tate, 2017). Thus, it is particularly hard for racially minoritized academics in the United States to be recognised as an academic and construct an academic identity (Ford, 2011; Marbley, Wong, Santos-Hatchett, Pratt, & Jaddo, 2011).

Measures of merit, now termed 'excellence', range across domains of research, teaching, governance, service and leadership. However, research continues to remain more prestigious than teaching and governance. Bell and Bentley (2005) examine where women are located in research, through a tripartite lens of participation, status and leadership. They find that the highest numbers of women academics are located at lower levels of the occupational hierarchy that are not research intensive. Approximately 70% of research assistants are women, and this role does not translate readily into a full-time academic researcher role. There are significantly more males as research-only staff as compared to female research-only staff. The number of part-time academic research staff is much lower, and more of these are women. Further, Bell and Bentley (2005) found that participation rates of women in ARC grant schemes are significantly lower than for men, although success rates are comparable. Similarly, women's participation rates in the more prestigious of the NHMRC schemes are

lower than men's participation rates. Women's involvement in collaborative research centres is also lower than that of men. Research has found that these issues are compounded for racially minoritized women, who are not taken as seriously as other academics, particularly as intellectuals or creators of knowledge (Gonzales, 2018).

Publishing is one measure of research excellence. Women have been shown to publish less, although the gap is narrowing (Bentley, 2012). In part, this may be due to tougher editorial standards or biased referee assignment, leading to a longer peer review (Hengel, 2017). Overall, women academics typically are of lower academic rank, less likely to have doctorate qualifications or international research collaborations, and devote less time to research, which are all the strongest factors associated with publication productivity (Bentley, 2012).

At the senior management level, a masculine management culture and 'boys' club' networks have long been identified as barriers to women's career progression (Chesterman, Ross-Smith, & Peters, 2003; White, 2003). This is exacerbated by the shift to a neoliberal university culture, and the rise of the academic 'technopreneur' (Thornton, 2013). A shift from a collegial model to a managerial model obscures gendered power relations and values masculine styles (Carvalho & De Lourdes Machado, 2010), and the increased business orientation of Australian universities may reinforce a male model of work (Strachan, Whitehouse, Peetz, Bailey, & Broadbent, 2008).

Workload allocation and teaching

While women are underrepresented in senior levels in research, women are overrepresented in teaching-focussed and teaching-only roles. This has created a second tier of academia, leaving the power to be autonomous and lead research projects to the senior 'Benchmark Man' (Thornton, 2013). Some universities, in an attempt to value women's work equally and promote women teachers to the professoriate, have created a separate teaching stream for academics. However, there is a concern that separating out teaching-only positions will only entrench women as the 'less-than-ideal academic' (Thornton, 2013).

As lecturers and unit coordinators, women do more of the pastoral, which consumes more time and emotional energy. As a result, women academics face higher work demands and special favour requests from students, particularly students who feel academically entitled (El-Alayli, Hansen-Brown, & Ceynar, 2018). Women are also evaluated less favourably by students, particularly white male students, through a gendered and racialized lens. A study of 600,000 student evaluations of academic staff found that women were rated lower than men in terms of student evaluations overall, with students referring more to the appearance and personality of women, while also using less respectful and less positive language (Arceo-Gomez & Campos-Vazquez, 2019). Racial minority staff are also rated more negatively by students as compared to Anglo academic staff (Reid, 2010). White male students, in particular, respond differently to women of colour academics, by challenging their authority, misrecognising their expertise, and expecting more support and nurturance (Ford, 2011).

Women do more emotional care work in departments, schools and faculties (Hu et al 2016), and more service work such as serving on selection panels or equity related projects. Women perform more service work internal to the university as compared to men, where service work includes activities related to faculty governance, recruitment, evaluation, promotions, student admissions and scholarships, and program supervision marketing (Guarino & Borden, 2017). Women perform more relational-oriented service than task-oriented service, and relational-

oriented service is valued less by institutions, going largely undocumented, unnoticed and unrecognised (Hanasono et al., 2019). The workload associated with the Athena SWAN and the Race Equality charter involves hidden emotional labour, falls disproportionately on women and Black and minority ethnic (BME) staff, and is not always recognized in workload models (Bhopal & Henderson, March 2019).

Workload allocation processes often disadvantage women, especially if they are not transparent. An experiment into department workload equity in the United States found that departments implementing transparent routine work practices, planned rotation of work allocation, opting-out of tasks rather than opting-in, with readiness of faculty to intervene had better equity results (Jaeger, Misra, & Lennartz, 2018). A study across three universities in the UK (Robertson & Moreau, 2017) found that timetabling and workload formulae were geared to the academics who had no responsibilities for caring for families or others. Robertson and Moreau also found that the informal flexibility of work arrangements, regarding both time and place, helped academics combine paid work and care work, but the long working hours and fuzzy boundaries between care and paid work affected carers' well-being. Additionally, the informal arrangements were dependent on the goodwill of individual managers and the most senior positions were the hardest to reconcile with caring responsibilities. Women face the majority of problems in managing parenting and family commitments with additional challenges arising for racially minoritized women who experience a lack of support (Kachchaf, Ko, Hodari, & Ong, 2015; Marbley et al., 2011).

The gender pay gap at level E is connected to a range of underlying factors. Setting formalised pay reduces gender pay differences at professorial level, but where discretionary market supplements are included, women are less likely to receive such supplements (Bailey, Peetz, Strachan, Whitehouse, & Broadbent, 2016; Doucet et al 2012). In Australia, there has been a reduction in the transparency of pay setting schemes through changes to industrial relations (Strachan et al., 2008).

The promotions process

The lower promotion rates to senior levels, and the longer time it takes women to achieve promotion (Doucet et al 2012), have been partially explained by women's interrupted careers due to family responsibilities, poorer access to research networks and funding, and differential patterns by discipline. However, even when these factors are taken into account, there is still an unexplained gap, that has been attributed to the promotions process (Weisshaar, 2017). Many women simply do not have the opportunity to apply for promotion. The majority of casual academic staff are women in Australia (May, Strachan, Broadbent, & Peetz, 2011) and professional development and career opportunities are not well structured for casual academics (Crimmins, Oprescu, & Nash, 2017).

Academics' perceptions of the promotion process mean that some women choose not to apply. At WSU, Francis (2017) identified nine key themes from focus groups with women academics that are barriers to promotion at levels B and C. These barriers include the size of current workloads and high expectations that leave no energy to apply for promotion; the multi-pronged promotion process that requires achievements across three areas (i.e., research, teaching, service/governance); a lack of mentoring and collaborative nurturing; gate-keepers in the promotion process; feeling devalued or undervalued, recognised or acknowledged for current roles dissuaded women from applying; the pressure of juggling work and children, particularly at times of overseas conferences and school holiday periods; the competitive

nature of promotion in contrast to working in a collegial environment; inconsistent and biased mentoring towards promotion; unwillingness to risk losing the happiness experienced in a current role and fear of a higher workload.

Further, 'academic excellence' is an inherently gendered concept, particularly in the evaluation of professorial candidates (van Den Brink & Benschop, 2011). Van den Brink and Stobbe (van Den Brink & Stobbe, 2014) identify the 'support paradox', where the support received by men in their academic careers is taken for granted, and women are expected to advance on their own to prove they have merit.

The Current Study

Given the gaps in the literature, this project: reviewed the international literature on women in academia and promotion; assessed current promotion policies and gender equity initiatives at WSU; and compared WSU with other institutions in the sector. The key research questions guiding this project were:

- a) How does WSU's promotion policy and process compare with other Australian institutions?
- b) How might WSU alter current policy and practice to reduce the gender promotion gap?

We hope that this project's findings will offer recommendations for improving policy and practice at WSU, with the aim of increasing women's promotion rates, particularly to senior levels, thereby reducing the gender gap. The comparison of WSU with sample institutions will be used to develop benchmarking criteria which can then be used for future assessment of policy and process.

Methods

The review of WSU promotions policy and process was undertaken using the following methods. Ten individual interviews with women academics who had progressed to Level D or E whilst at Western Sydney were conducted, five with Level E women and five with Level D. The interviews qualitatively examined their experiences of the promotion process and the barriers and supports women academics experience over the course of their careers, focussing on the pathway from Level D to E. Nine interviews were conducted with a sample of both internal and external members of the Western Sydney University Academic Promotions Committee to ascertain committee members' perception of the process as it relates to policy as well as committee members' perceptions of gendered patterns in applications for promotion to Levels D and E. These members had been active on the Promotions Committee at some point between 2008 and 2018.

The research also included an assessment of the WSU promotions policy and relevant promotions and gender equality process documents. A comparison was carried out between WSU promotions policy and procedures documents and those at two other institutions: Newcastle University and Griffith University. The WSU SAGE team were consulted on the selection of sample institutions. The institutions were chosen because they have a strong

reputation for gender equity practices and were in Cohort 1 of the SAGE Bronze Accreditation Process. Like WSU, Griffith University is a member of the Innovative Research Universities network. The institutions were also selected on the basis of the availability of their promotions policy and documentation. Due to a concern for the confidentiality of the participants, the interviews were conducted by the research assistant, who was relatively new to WSU, and only de-identified transcripts were made available to the rest of the research team.

The research team read through the transcripts individually and took notes. The research team met to discuss the themes present in the data part way through reading the transcripts. This analysis was continued through iterative writing of the draft report, reading of interview transcripts, and further discussion of themes.

Findings comparing WSU's promotion policy and procedure compared with other Australian institutions

In this section, we compared WSU's promotion policy and procedure with those at the University of Newcastle and Griffith University (see Appendix 1 for comparison table).

Policy

In order to prove that they are promotable, individuals must show that they meet the criteria in the following categories of performance – teaching (and learning), research (and innovation or scholarship), and service and engagement. These categories vary slightly from institution to institution but the content remains largely the same. For example, at WSU and Newcastle, there are three areas, whereas Griffith has disaggregated the categories into four areas. At WSU, applicants are required to show a 'high standard' in each, with promotion based on excellence. At Newcastle, applicants need to demonstrate their achievement in all areas, with promotion based on merit. At Griffith University, promotion is based on merit, and they have included a very detailed description of the four areas in an appendix to the procedures. All universities have an 'equity box' that allows applicants to provide a context for their performance/accomplishments relative to opportunity.

Procedure

In terms of timing of rounds, WSU allows applicants to apply for promotion at any time, however, applications are only assessed three times a year. Both Newcastle and Griffith have annual promotion rounds, although Newcastle will allow applications to be assessed at any time based on exceptional circumstances. In terms of eligibility, all three institutions allow both full-time and part-time staff to apply for promotion, although the additional criteria varies somewhat across institutions. Across all three universities, data is collected on each category such as student feedback reports, citations, and various publication metrics. As such the process is intended to be based on seemingly 'objective' indicators of success that are quantifiable. Individuals must write a statement which speaks to this data and argues for their promotability, their key publication outputs are assessed by anonymous external experts and WSU and Newcastle require an applicant interview. Before they apply for promotion, individuals are also encouraged to seek the support of their line managers and Deans or Heads of Departments who write statements of support. However, applicants across all three

universities are allowed to apply for promotion regardless of whether their application is supported or not. In terms of assessors, all three universities require three to four independent assessors. Applicants at WSU and Newcastle do not provide this list, their Dean or Head of Institute provides a larger list from which the assessors are chosen. At Griffith, the candidate is allowed to provide this list. Across all three universities, candidates are allowed to identify people they would prefer *not* to be an assessor. If the applicant's promotion is unsuccessful, they will have to wait two years at both Newcastle and Griffith, whereas there is no wait rule at WSU and applicants can apply again immediately. All three universities allow applicants to appeal on the basis of the process only.

Given the broad similarities in policies, procedures and practices across the three universities, analysis of the interview data from Level D and E female academics gives insight into the experiences of academics who negotiated these policies, procedures and practices when applying for promotion at WSU. These insights inform recommendations for action.

Findings from interviews with Level D and E female academics

Overall, while the participants reported that the promotions process appears to have improved in recent years, the study found that a number of practices and processes continue to block women from promotion, or at least slow their career progression. Major themes encountered in the interviews include: boys clubs, mentoring, career interruptions and caring obligations, pastoral care, self-confidence, gender bias in management, invisibility and stigma. Underlying these themes were concerns about the academic culture, in terms of the challenges that women experience in achieving benchmarks of excellence and the necessity for women to overwork in an attempt to overcome marginalisation, or their inability to participate in the culture of overwork. These themes, as identified from the data are elaborated in the discussion that follows.

Obstacles to Achieving 'Excellence'

Boys clubs and mentoring

All of the women we spoke with had been successfully promoted to levels D or E. However, all of the women also discussed the challenges that they experienced in achieving the markers of 'excellence' that were required for career progression. For example, the interviews revealed that women struggled to form the requisite international networks for scholarly development and therefore grant, presentation and publication opportunities because 'boys clubs' continue to be in place. One participant stated:

I was one of the very few female academics... so there were lots of PhD students who were female, some postdocs who were female, and the higher that you go up the fewer the females there were, and it felt very much like a boys' club, and that the males had these kind of friendships with each other, and they would invite each other to do things. They would invite each other on you know... to present at conferences that they might be organising, or they would invite each other to do collaborative research projects, or they would invite each other on grant applications and things like that. And I felt like I didn't get offered, many of those kind of opportunities, and that I had to make them... so I had to be the initiator of research grant, and then I had to invite

other people on them to work with me, rather than being invited by others (Interviewee 1, Level D).

In the absence of advantageous connections, women have to work harder to create opportunities for themselves and develop a track record of research success.

Unsurprisingly, as with other research, we found that the absence of mentors and role models were barriers to promotion. For example:

And I saw other people and like, I mean, this sounds really whiny. But I'm pretty sure all of the male PhD students in my cohort had sort of an older mentor in the department who would just take them under their wing and co-publish with them a lot. And so, they got their initial publications out that way. Whereas my initial publication was a sole authored one, and it was really scary to do (Interviewee 3, Level E).

Without these mentors and role models, the women we spoke with did not feel that they could adequately develop a 'feel for the game' (Bourdieu, 1990), or acquire the social capital to compete in the contest culture, that they saw develop in their male colleagues. Again, they had to take harder, 'scariest', pathways to achievement, as Interviewee 3 did when she produced a sole authored publication rather than being mentored through this process.

This demonstrates the importance of formal mentoring programmes to complement organic mentoring relationships. Our interviews suggested that mentoring is crucial for women at all career stages, in order to mitigate structural and cultural bias and marginalization, and can assist in strategizing for progression to promotion:

We have a mentor process in the school but it's fairly new. It's not really up and running yet. It is for some people I think, but the other ... thing that might be interesting though, is this idea, certainly what I got told ... I have a mentor in (institution name), and I was told that level C, you're not yet, your head's not sticking up above, you know, everybody else. That's the space you have to really, you know, bed down your research. And if you go too quickly through the levels, and you start getting more governance roles ... you start being asked to sit on more panels and more committees, you know, you don't want to do that too soon, for fear that that time you have to really bed down your research, it's given away to administration and governance. You go too fast. That's the advice I was given, that I had gone from C to D too quickly (Interviewee 5, Level E).

Career interruptions and caring obligations

Maternity leave and career breaks as well as late career starts and ongoing care responsibilities hindered women from developing competitive research profiles and international networks via conference travel. The women we interviewed talked about how, in order to obtain promotion, an academic must work long hours and weekends regardless of responsibilities for children. For example, interviewee 9, a Level E stated:

(W)hen you've got children, it's still the woman that does the kind of social organisation, what happens during school holidays, engaging with the school, you know, all that kind of stuff. And the need to sort of do a lot of the pickups after school that, you know, so I think there has been a lot of changes. But I still think, despite the rhetoric, that if you're going to perform at the ... level D and E position, and to obtain

promotion, that you really have to ... work after hours, you have to work on the weekends ... the idea that we work 35 hours a week is, you know, is a joke ... standard practice through my career has been well, Sunday is a work day, and sometimes I have to work on part of Saturday as well. So, every so often I won't work on a Sunday, but the norm is to work. And you know, that that kind of additional labour is never, is never really factored in. And I think, particularly for women, it's an issue because of ongoing issues around childcare and the nature of parenting, which, however supportive a partner, the woman still has to shoulder most of that responsibility (Interviewee 9, Level E).

This narrative shows how women are disadvantaged in accessing promotion because the ideal worker continues to be the unencumbered worker who works overtime and does not experience the competing demands of home and work life.

As working weekends is the norm it is perhaps not surprising that maternity leave was articulated as a 'dampener' in this speedy contest culture and the quest for promotion. Interviewee 7, a level D stated:

Well, I guess, having children doesn't... I wouldn't say a stop on things, but definitely does put a dampener on things. And you do tend to have to address why you maybe haven't had the same output, as you had earlier years. And you would think that would be obvious. And then possibly, you know, in the year after that you come back from maternity leave. And yeah, so I think that was... I don't know if it was a barrier, but it was definitely a sticking point, people just assumed you just come back from a maternity leave, and you pick up where you left off straight away (Interviewee 7, Level D).

Those who discussed maternity leave felt that the extent to which it delays achievements is not adequately recognised within universities. In this culture of excellence, to speak of maternity leave on a promotion application, felt to some of the women, as a confession at best and at worst an excuse. For example, Interviewee 7, a level D, stated:

(A)nd you don't tend to want to harp on about, you know, your reason for not truly performing at that level, because it seems like you're, you know, offering an excuse for not performing at that level (Interviewee 7, Level D).

Again, the perception is that to be an ideal worker an academic must be unencumbered and autonomous. To fall short of this ideal is to let the institution down – this is why the interviewee feels shame and that they are making an 'excuse' for not keeping up, despite being entitled to leave.

Similarly, part-time work was recognised by our interviewees as an impediment to promotion:

And actually, because my eldest son had a lot of mental health problems in his teenage years that was very tight. And, ideally, I would have liked to work part-time at that time but really didn't feel like I could and be eligible for promotion. So, you might be able to kind of work part-time but then you feel like you're kind of stuck at where you are (Interviewee 1, Level D).

Interviewee 1 anticipated that to take up part-time work and dedicate more time to her family would be to forego promotion - the two were not viewed as compatible. According to our interviewees then, the institution only validates those who have the capacity to work full-time and over time.

Pastoral Care and Collegiality

We found that the emphasis on measurable outputs means that invaluable emotional and relational contributions to our institution, that are not quantifiable, are overlooked altogether. The women talked about their pastoral care achievements in relation to teaching, supervision and leadership. But in the academic audit culture, pastoral care successes are not recognized, and so it is difficult to make the case for these achievements 'fit' within narratives of excellence. For example, Interviewee 1 stated:

(It) was never just me doing it on my own. And so then describing my role in that. It feels uncomfortable to say well I did this, but I didn't do it on my own I did it with other people ... And so, it's the collaborative nature of how leadership works, I think in some ways makes it uncomfortable in trying to make that as a case for leadership because it's not traditionally how we think about leadership (Interviewee 1, Level D).

As the culture is based on individualized competition, it is difficult to articulate effective collaborative leadership as valuable.

What is more, women's propensity to take up teaching and pastoral care, and men's reluctance to engage in these activities, means that, without clear and transparent workload policy, women are overburdened with this type of labour:

And they go around and go, who's going to teach this who's going to teach this and everyone looks around the table until someone puts their hand up. And somehow ... somehow, all the women end up doing all the teaching. And It's really obvious, like I mean in the department I used to be in, I just visited there, like a month ago. And there's three, currently, four men and one woman ... the woman is doing four units this year. And the men are doing one unit each, like how does that even happen? (Interviewee 3, Level E).

Gender inequity can also arise in the ways in which postgraduate teaching is shared on supervision panels and this is reinforced by students' sexist understandings of their supervisors' skills:

(T)he students who I share with male colleagues come to me when they've got more personal stuff they need to talk about, or if they need assistance with, with stuff, that's not really necessarily the supervisors responsibility, you know, so they'll, they'll come to come to both of us, like the ones I share with a male colleague, xx, same guy, they go to xx with a research related question ... They go to xx with research. And I get it. But it does mean unfair distribution of labour and some extent, not getting to, not not so much doing the stuff that's visible and respected and rewarded. Because, you know, the research related question might turn into a publication that they write together... The rent question is not going to do that (Interviewee 3, Level E).

These gendered assumptions result in women giving up a lot of time, that could be dedicated to their own advancement, to pastoral care, and can lead to women being pigeonholed as administrators or teaching experts and overlooked for research leadership:

But I do feel like there is a gendered what's the word? It's just a gendered thing? I don't know what word to use. Where I feel like women are given those administrative focused roles and student focused roles. And men tend to be given those strategic or research focused. I think that still happens. And I think there's an expectation from students as well, not knowingly, that if a female lecturer is going to give them that pastoral care that they sometimes need, but they won't demand of or feel like they haven't got from a male lecturer. And that has huge implications for the way we use our time. That if we've been asked by different, you know, stakeholders in the universities to give more care, more pastoral time to whatever, whatever task, that that that takes us away from some of the other tasks that other people in the university aren't being asked to do... devote their time to and that allows some people to accelerate and others not. If that makes sense (Interviewee 5, Level E).

Women therefore experience multiple temporal disadvantages – in terms of career breaks, shorter working weeks and, finally, their uncounted pastoral care hours.

Governance is also sometimes interpreted as pastoral care, in that it involves both people work and administrative labour that looks after the functioning of the university. This governance work has the potential to weigh women down at the Level D position as much as it can at more junior levels:

Yeah, yeah, yeah, I've certainly had informal comments like that made that "we don't give these sorts of jobs to level Es because they take up more time that a level E will want to give to it" ... But in the limited experience I have, look ... it seems like that there may be the case to be made that men find it easier to let those administrative jobs fall by the wayside if it's preventing them from getting on with the research. Whereas the females that I'm seeing in these roles cannot do... can't do that, they just can't not answer their emails or fill in the form that was due today (Interviewee 5, Level E).

Solutions to the propensity to devalue this kind of labour could include explicit criteria in relation to pastoral care on the promotion application:

I noticed recently when applying for funding through the (name of funding body): they have a section on the application form where you have to explain and give examples of how you have supported early career academics and students. They specifically say you should list things like co-publications you have done with students, ECRs you have provided research opportunities to, as well as more informal mentoring and support. But they wanted hard evidence and details, not just a statement that you "support your postdocs" or whatever. I thought at the time that it would be very interesting if we were expected to provide this kind of information in both selection criteria for jobs here and also at the promotion process. It would help make some of the invisible labour I mentioned more visible, and maybe make men more active in seeking out opportunities to mentor and support their students of all genders, and it would also mean we could try to hire and promote only those researchers who actually have soft skills as well as the research skills. That would help with situations

like the one I mentioned where people always come to me instead of to the senior men who actually lead our group because they feel I'm "easier to talk to" (Interviewee 5, Level E).

Gender Bias in Management, Invisibility and Stigma

The study also showed how gender bias can work *around* norms of excellence, demonstrating that benchmarks are not operationalized in an objective manner. We discovered that promotion is very much dependent on the support of individual Deans and line managers. These are the gatekeepers who encourage staff to apply and also write letters of support. Deans and line managers choose when to recognize performance as excellent and when to discourage applicants. They therefore have the power to exercise their own discretion and advocate based on personal judgement. As such, the pursuit of promotion is a career stage where gender discrimination, whether it be overt or covert and unconscious, is most visible. For example, one participant stated that her Dean communicated a lack of support for her first bid for promotion without clear reasoning:

And he said sometimes it's not about ticking the boxes, it's just a gut feeling I have (Interviewee 3, Level E).

In this aspect of the process then, metrics and rationality are legitimately traded for a 'feeling', even though, in other instances, such as in relation to pastoral care, the affective does not count. In this case, the interviewee described how the Dean declined to advocate for her, despite supporting a male colleague who she outperformed. The same woman ended up applying for an external job and leveraging the offer from that university for a promotion – she literally had to work around the promotion process in order to obtain advancement.

The lack of support women experienced from management meant that some of the women we spoke with delayed their applications much longer than they should have, despite being benchmarked as equivalent to their peers. For others, it meant that they needed to apply a second time, as they were knocked back on their original applications, and for some women this took a substantial toll on their mental health. The gender bias exhibited by Deans and line managers meant that, despite the use of supposed objective measures, like citation count and impact of journals as indicators for promotion readiness, many women reported equivalent or lesser men accelerating ahead in their promotion and careers. Again, in this way, gender bias does not only work through the metrics, but also *around* them.

Deans and line managers are therefore gatekeepers who can inhibit gender equity, regardless of formal policy. Their networks of power decide not only what counts but *who* counts. Output benchmarks are aligned with masculinity and therefore have a gender and in addition to this, perhaps because male bodies have for so long been associated with rationality and the mind, women's bodies are themselves invisibilised in academic institutions. Interviewee 7 articulated this most clearly. She stated:

And then people forgetting how many years out ... So how many years experience you have, and that might generally be from ... me being this small kind of short female? Tend to, to kind of forget that you have had this experience, all these many years of experience, and they even might not even think that you're ready to go to a level D (Interviewee 7, Level D).

Interviewee 7 therefore suggests that intellectual capacity and scholarly experience are attributed to men's bodies, regardless of achievement, and so she had to work harder to 'alert' others to her successes.

Interviewee 1 also reported being invisibilised, and even aligned with domesticity, in the academy:

Sometimes within the research context which is very male dominated I feel invisible, or they will talk to you but they talk to you about your family. Not research. Oh well, that's nice (interviewee 1, Level D).

The women were therefore acutely aware of how they may be overlooked for promotion, because of the bodies they inhabit.

Interviewee 6 found that, when she outperformed men she was stigmatised rather than invisibilised for performing inappropriately for her gender:

I believe I gave most of my colleagues 10 years head start because I didn't actually do my PhD till I was in my 30s. So, I had been out in industry, had my kids, all that sort of stuff. And then I came back. So, I gave them a head start. And when you start behind someone and you go forward ahead of them, publishing and in doing research, they tend to get a little bit... especially guys, get quite pissed off.

Interviewer: ...And so, in what ways would you attribute that, if at all to gender?

Oh, I was an uppity woman! (Interviewee 6, Level E).

Women who do compete and compete quickly, as the culture dictates, risk being put in their place and defined as 'uppity'. In other words, and this is from the dictionary, as having 'inflated self-esteem', being 'rebelliously self-assertive' or as 'not inclined to be deferential', as perhaps gender stereotypes suggest a woman should. A competitive disposition is not viewed as a good fit for a woman – to be uppity, rebellious or inflated in some way is to be 'too big for your boots', to not know your place in the social order. Whilst Reeve (2011) has pointed to how uppity has racist connotations when condescendingly directed at people of colour who are public figures, here the word captures sexist assumptions.

The circulation of these types of biases in our institutions was affirmed by the promotions committee members we spoke with. For example, Interviewee 4 stated that there is a 'general bias' that they see in people in leadership:

I mean, you could say that men are more likely to identify men to encourage promotion. And that's certainly been a historical problem. But it's also a historical problem that people may be more likely to identify men as being suitable cases for promotion. So, it could be just the general, the general bias. Even if we have more women in positions of influence, which I don't know whether that's the case, it could still be the case that we need to more actively encourage people to identify groups, people from groups that might be more reticent, than others to apply (Interviewee 4, Promotions Committee).

Therefore, the same promotion committee participant suggested that a broader mentoring system to promotion, beyond Deans is needed, as is actively identifying people who might be ready for promotion but marginalized in some way, in order to overcome both racial and gender exclusion:

So, I think ... ideally, there is a network of mentoring ... there should be some more conscious, I think, encouragement of senior people to identify who might be suitable for promotion. I mean, I would love it, if there would be conversations, I would, I would love somebody to come and say to me, 'who? Who around school, Or ... even the University, Have you identified?' Or 'can you identify who's not an Anglo guy?' Although there are probably Anglo guys, to, to say, 'yeah he is fine to go'. But just to encourage people to think, because actually, you know, people are not asked the question, then sometimes they just don't think so. But I would like to see that beyond the Deans (Interviewee 4, Promotions Committee).

Deans are recognized in this narrative as possible bottlenecks in women's progress to promotion.

Another participant suggested that bias training explicitly for Deans is required. Promotions Committee member interviewee 3 stated:

(If a training were to be offered, I'd like that training to consider equity considerations ... because essentially, the Dean, directors are gatekeepers in this, have control of the process in this level (Interviewee 3, Promotions Committee).

Committee member participants also recognised that our various measurements of excellence may be discriminatory. For example, one participant, along with a number of the academic women interviewees, critiqued the ways in which SFUs and SFTs can be a platform for sexist attitudes and voiced concern that an emphasis on these measures further marginalises women within the academy. One promotions committee member made the following comment in relation to SFUs and SFTs:

You know, a guy is, you know, he, a man, a male teacher can be, you know, tough, but that's respected. A woman is similarly tough, and she's a bitch. It's biased against older women as well. So, you either have to be the kind of motherly grandmotherly figure. Or you know, I mean, I think I think that that whole student evaluation of teaching is a really dubious measure, and the gender bias has been there from the beginning (Interviewee 5, Promotions Committee).

However, not all promotions committee members agreed with this articulation of the challenges faced by women. As interviewee 3 suggested, there might be a reluctance to understand inequity as systemic:

Well, look, I don't I don't know if this would be it'd be fair to say, but I sense a reluctance to consider the issues systemically as the possibility of systemic. But when I say, a sense of reluctance. What I'm trying to disambiguate here is between perhaps, concerns I raise or, you know, approaches I might take, and the responses of other members of the committee (Interviewee 3, Promotions Committee).

If there is reluctance to recognise systemic bias then promotions committees may miss opportunities to make a real intervention into gender inequity. The committees are in a unique position to make invisible bias visible. This is the case, for example, in relation to Dean's reports:

...it's a hard slog for an applicant as an individual applicant responding to specific comments to address their case as a form of systemic bias. I mean, it's very, I mean, I imagine that people in those circumstances, think that they will be accused, for example, playing a gender, you know, or ethnicity card, that they were trying it on it, even if they reported that. And of course, even that it's, yeah, it's not it's only available to the committee to see these statements with these different levels. The individual applicants don't see, they may not even spot or detect or suspect that it could be systemic bias (Interviewee 3, Promotions Committee).

Self-Confidence

By far the most standout obstacle to promotion was articulated as lack of self-confidence or self-esteem. For example, interviewee one stated:

I didn't feel like I was likely to be successful in applying for a promotion... that's why I was reluctant, but partly, lack of confidence thing, I think, just never feel like I'm good enough (Interviewee 1, Level D).

Similarly, Interviewee 5 commented:

I think some people who just decide themselves "I'm ready to go" and other people wait to be told, and I'm a wait to be told person (Interviewee 5, Level E).

Given the challenges that women face in achieving measures of excellence, or even when they do, in being recognised for obtaining those measures, it is not surprising that women experience a lack of self-confidence. In fact, this seems like a reasonable response in the face of adversity.

Self-confidence is a disposition to the self but also a performance and women reported failing on both accounts:

Well I find very uncomfortable and I think what a lot of other female colleagues find uncomfortable, it's kind of promoting your own self and what you have done (Interviewee 1, Level D).

The need for self-confidence becomes problematic when it is part of the process of application:

(S)ome of what people were expected to be able to say ... leadership and about their role, and their contribution ... probably, served, worked better for people who are very, very assertive, and to the point of being self-aggrandizing and very, very, very, very, very confident. So, sort of answer seen to be compelling ones that would be consistent with being very, very confident, very self-confident. And, again, I think it was someone who nailed an answer or didn't nail an answer for a particular question on particular things in relation to leadership or, governance, would probably more

likely to ... be reflecting a form of answer that would be more to sort of stereotypical male speech patterns and business practice, orientations (Interviewee 3, Level E).

Some of our participants also gave testimony to the notion that this type of self-promotion is raced as well as gendered:

(S)o the femaleness is not a thing to me, it's everything else, you know, when I sort of walk into a room now, other, a promotions committee or sort of university executive because I was a deputy Dean last year, how many Asian people are there? And the Asian way has always been that, you know, my generation was that you make yourself a small target. You go about your business and you prove yourself to be better than other people. By just by simply being but you don't go out and bang your trumpet (Interviewee 10, Level E).

The consequence of the prioritization of this disposition is that, once again, success is masculinized and so men go for promotion more frequently and earlier than women, whether they are ready or not. Interviewee 7 stated that this insight was affirmed by the promotion committee:

I... the one feedback that I've gotten from ... and I thought it was, was poignant, and I would now keep saying it to the female colleagues ... is that the females and you know, obviously, she's chaired quite a few of these panels ... and the idea is, males tend to go for promotion, even if they're not ready. And the females don't tend to go until they're more than ready. That's a problem (Interviewee 7, Level D).

Self-confidence is therefore a primary issue identified by participants. However, we need to be very careful in how we respond to this insight. It needs to be clear that this not an individual deficit but a collective experience. The concept of confidence has been critiqued as a postfeminist concept by contemporary feminists. Gill and Orgad (2017, p. 16) describe confidence as a 'technology of the self, exhorting women and girls to act upon themselves'. It is 'individualising technology which demands intense labour, places the emphasis upon women's self-regulation and locates the source of the 'problems' and their 'solutions' within a newly upgraded form of confident subjectivity, thus rendering insecurity and lack of confidence abhorrent' (Gill and Orgad, 2017, p. 16). As such, to see gender inequality as a self-confidence issue is to compromise equity as this approach sidesteps cultural and structural inequalities.

Self-confidence also needs to be conceptualized as a requirement of the individualized environment of academic capitalism, rather than a good in itself. It requires that an individual knows how to play the academic game, and this requires something more than simply knowing the rules; to be able to play the game is to embody the disposition of the entrepreneurial academic. Self-confidence is not a measure of quality research and it undermines collaboration and the recognition of relational endeavours such as pastoral care. The prioritization of self-confidence must be understood as an aspect of the culture of excellence that is inherently masculinist.

There may be, however, strategies put in place to help identify promotion-ready women, so that there is less reliance on self-selection such as regular reflection on self-development with feedback from management:

It seems to me that if you're not in one of those governance roles where you are required anyway to meet face to face with the Deputy Dean, and that's one of the, one of the sheets that the school uses, the school uses a particular set of columns and things to fill in before you have that performance review and the last box is personal development. And unless if you have that as part of your annual development and review process, I don't know how you would reach the decision that you are ready to go? (Interviewee 5, Level E).

Alternatively, one of our interviewees suggested that the professoriate and management could be tasked to act as 'patrons' and identify 'quiet achievers':

Is there a better way to celebrate or recognise the quiet achievers? I don't know. They need, they need patrons. If they don't have a patron on the panel, it doesn't work. So there was a couple of applications and I've seen this before, and someone on the panel says "oh I've been trying to get them", or the dean may write an affidavit thing saying this person has been a quiet achiever for a long time, "I've been trying to get them to apply for promotion for a long time they really deserve it, but they just won't put themselves forward and risk a rejection or risk whatever". It might be them but also you know, it's trouble it's not my normal business to go around selling themselves to do that. So, if they don't have someone speaking up for them, it's it's, it's hard for them to sell or encouraging them to sell themselves (Interviewee 10, Level E).

This suggestion from interviewee 10 is similar to the recommendation from one of the promotions committee members to instate a broader mentoring system, that extends beyond Deans, that can identify promotion-ready individuals. Although, as the previous section argued, checks need to be in place so that those who are the gatekeepers to promotion do not harbor bias.

There could also be strategies in place to further support women through the promotions process. Some of these supports are already available. For example, the same interviewee did not have the confidence to share her application bid with colleagues but did find the assigned promotions mentor helpful:

Only after that did I then reach out to xxx who's listed on the website as a mentor for people to level E. I just asked her what the interview process involved, she was very quick to reply. It sort of ... if you don't have that confidence yourself, so you, certainly I didn't tell anyone I was going for fear that I wouldn't get it. And so very few people knew (Interviewee 10, Level E).

Discussion

What we would like to argue then is that firstly, we must become more aware, in this period of academic capitalism where we are increasingly measured, audited and therefore compared with others, is that the metrics that indicate our academic worth are not objective or neutral. They are produced in what Fine (2019) calls 'masculinity contest cultures' where the ideal worker is unencumbered and the benchmarks are always gendered. To prioritise quantity above quality, and to place a value on quantity in isolation from context, is to facilitate the

success of specific types of bodies and dispositions – it is to value those who can work at speed and with self-confidence and those who are *perceived* as intellectual and authoritative.

Women are therefore at a disadvantage in achieving measures of excellence in academic competitions for promotion. What is more, gender bias also works around these measures, so that even when women do successfully compete in terms of the metrics, they are blocked by institutional gatekeepers or marginalized and stigmatized for attempting to play a game for which they are seen to be corporeally mismatched. These processes were recognized by the women who bid for promotion but also by several of the promotions committee members.

Therefore, we would like to suggest that, although there is some useful policy and processes in place in our institutions in relation to promotion, gender bias continues to work through cultural practices. There is also evidence of a reticence to see the metrics of excellence, that serve academic capitalism very well, as anything but neutral or to see gender inequities as systemic. In order to redress the promotion gap, we therefore need to challenge these perceptions and look to cultural and educative solutions.

Recommendations:

The university should be congratulated on the changes it has made to the promotions process in recent years as our participants confirmed that the process has improved and has become more equitable. There are, however, further changes that could be implemented in order to continue the university's commitment to gender equity:

- **Mentoring:** the university should continue with the promotions mentoring programme as this is helpful to those who do not have access to mentors or lack the confidence to seek guidance. Formal mentoring programmes also need to be established across all Schools and Institutes where mentors are trained in conscious and unconscious bias and educated on structural inequalities in the academy. Mentors would be expected to give career progression advice and would have the authority to recommend individuals for promotion. Discipline Leads may play an important role in this process. The mentee experience should be extended to women at senior levels as women at Level D continue to require mentoring through career decisions.
- **Part-time work and caring obligations:** full-time work and overwork need to be disrupted as the most valid models of achievement. The private sector is investigating the effectiveness of shorter working weeks (Stronge, 2019). There is evidence that long hours do not necessarily translate to quality labour outputs. Part-time workers need to be supported in full participation in institutional life and governance aspirations. This support needs to occur at the level of Schools and Institutes.
- **Career interruptions and caring obligations:** the university could better communicate to carers that they do not see equity considerations as an 'excuse'. The website could provide a clearer explanation of how equity issues are considered and feedback to applicants should describe how equity considerations were taken into account in the decision-making process. Promotions committees should also be educated on the impact of career interruptions and caring

obligations on academic careers. These processes would move the onus away from applicants to ‘confess’ equity issues.

- **Pastoral Care:** pastoral care and collaborative practice is integral to the functioning and wellbeing of the university. Pastoral care is all the more paramount in a culture of individualised competition. An engaged professoriate is a professoriate that takes up pastoral care and the promotions process could better recognise this in its measures of excellence. Pastoral care and collegiality could be a fourth category of achievement listed alongside teaching, research and governance. As one of our interviewees suggested, applicants should provide evidence to speak to pastoral care achievements. This process would also serve to reward those who mentor others. If the university chooses not to take this process up, then a fourth section on the written application could ask applicants to explain the context of their successes. The time spent on pastoral care could be acknowledged in this section.
- **Support for Deans and Alternative Promotions Pathways:** Deans and their Institute equivalents are clearly capable of conscious and unconscious bias. Deans need to be educated by gender experts who research the sector, on where their own perceptions and practices may reproduce inequities. One of our participants suggested that a formalised checklist should be put in place for Deans to follow when responding to an applicant’s bid for promotion. Deans should provide a clear rationale for not supporting staff members. Deans may also need some training on how to produce a convincing letter of support. Promotions committees require the tools and authority to identify patterns of discrimination in Schools and Institutes. Complementing these activities, we could see broader mentoring systems to promotion put in place, just as one of our interviewees suggested, so that Deans are not the only gatekeepers to promotion. Personal development and promotions pathways should also be discussed annually with line managers.
- **Educational Support for Committee Members:** promotions committees should be educated on the structural and cultural inequities that exist in their institutions and the wider sector. As stated above, this should include knowledge of the impact of caring obligations and career interruption. Of course, there is a place for applicants to describe their circumstances, but for equity concerns to be thoroughly addressed it is necessary to move beyond the discourse of confession and apology and promotions committee members should become knowledgeable, reflexive participants of, and disrupters to, inequitable cultures.
- **Alternative Promotion Narratives:** the cultural specificity of writing and speaking a self-selling promotion application should be acknowledged and alternatives considered. Women are not socialised to ‘blow their own trumpet’ and, as one of our participants pointed out, many cultural groups are not socialised to this type of performance either. The acceptance of alternative narratives is important in a university that values diversity.
- **Metrics of Excellence:** the gendered, raced and classed dimensions of the metrics that we use to assess academic labour need to be acknowledged and better understood. We need to do away with the presumption that they are objective. For example, there is now international evidence that student evaluations are gendered. The university should reconsider including these evaluations as a measure of excellence for promotion.

Finally, our project pointed to several issues that could be further researched by the university. These include:

- Are women in particular shouldered with governance at Level D? Does this prevent their progress to E?
- How does gender bias feature in measures of excellence in STEM and non-STEM disciplines (eg. in SFUs and SFTs, citation rates, publications, grant income)?
- What are the gendered differences in step and salary negotiations for Level E academics and new hires at all levels?

References

- Anderson, L., Gatwiri, K & Townsend-Cross, M. (2019). Battling the “headwinds”: the experiences of minoritised academics in the neoliberal Australian university. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*. 1-15.
- Arceo-Gomez, E. O., & Campos-Vazquez, R. M. (2019). Gender stereotypes: The case of MisProfesores.com in Mexico. *Economics of Education Review*, 72, 55-65. doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2019.05.007
- Bailey J, Peetz D, Strachan G, et al. (2016) Academic pay loadings and gender in Australian universities. *Journal of Industrial Relations* 58: 647-668.
- Bell S and Bentley R (2005) Women in Research Discussion paper. *Prepared for the AVCC National Colloquium of Senior Women Executives*. Office of the Pro Vice Chancellor Equity and Community, Griffith University.
- Bentley P (2012) Gender differences and factors affecting publication productivity among Australian university academics. *Journal of Sociology* 48: 85-103.
- Bhopal, K., & Henderson, H. (March 2019). Advancing Equality in Higher Education: An Exploratory Study of the Athena SWAN and Race Equality Charters. In (Vol. Birmingham): University of Birmingham, Centre for Research in Race and Education.
- Bird, S. R. (2011). Unsettling Universities' Incongruous, Gendered Bureaucratic Structures: A Case-study Approach.(Report). *Gender, Work and Organization*, 18(2), 202.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990) *The Logic of Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Caprile, M., Addis, E., Castaño, C., Klinge, I., Larios, M., Meulders, D. Müller, J., O’Dorchai, S., Palasik, M., Plasman, R., Roivas, S., Sagebiel, F., Schiebinger, L., Vallès, N., Vázquez-Cupeiro, S. (2012). *Meta-analysis of Gender and Science Research*. Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, European Commission: Brussels
- Carrington K and Pratt A (2003) How far have we come? Gender disparities in the Australian Higher education System. Social Policy Group, Parliament of Australia.
- Carvalho, T., & De Lourdes Machado, M. (2010). Gender and shifts in higher education managerial regimes. *Australian Universities Review*, 52(2), 33-42.
- Chesterman, C., Ross-Smith, A., & Peters, M. (2003). Changing the landscape? Women in academic leadership in Australia. *McGill Journal of Education*, 38(3), 421-435.
- Crimmins G, Oprescu F and Nash G (2017) Three pathways to support the professional and career development of casual academics. *International Journal for Academic Development* 22: 144-156.
- Doucet C, Smith MR and Durand C (2012) Pay structure, female representation and the gender pay gap among university professors *Industrial Relations* 67: 51.
- Eggs H (ed) (2016) *The Changing Role of Women in Higher Education: Academic and Leadership Issues*. Springer. ProQuest Ebook Central, <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uwsau/detail.action?docID=4716207>.
- El-Alayli, A., Hansen-Brown, A., & Ceynar, M. (2018). Dancing Backwards in High Heels: Female Professors Experience More Work Demands and Special Favor Requests, Particularly from Academically Entitled Students. *Sex Roles*, 79(3-4), 136-150. doi:10.1007/s11199-017-0872-6
- Ford, K. A. (2011). Race, Gender, and Bodily (Mis)Recognitions: Women of Color Faculty Experiences with White Students in the College Classroom. *Journal Of Higher Education* 82(4): 444
- Francis, L. (2017). *Exploring Barriers and Facilitators to Seeking Promotion: Level C and Above Academics and Level B to Level C Academics*. Retrieved from

https://www.westernsydney.edu.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0019/1407223/FOR_WEB_-_Promotion-Dr_Lyn_Francis.pdf

- Fine, C. (2019) 'Women's Value: beyond the business case for diversity and inclusion, *The Lancet*, 393, February 2019.
- Gabriel D and Tate SA (2017) *Inside the Ivory Tower: Narratives of Women of Colour Surviving and Thriving in British Academia*.
- Gill, Rosalind & Orgad, Shani. (2017). Confidence culture and the remaking of feminism. *New Formations*. 91. 10.3898/NEWF:91.01.2017.
- Gonzales, L. D. (2018). Subverting and Minding Boundaries: The Intellectual Work of Women. *The Journal of Higher Education* 89(5): 677-701.
- Guarino, C., & Borden, V. (2017). Faculty Service Loads and Gender: Are Women Taking Care of the Academic Family? *Journal of the Association for Institutional Research*, 58(6), 672-694. doi:10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2
- Hanasono, L. K., Broido, E. M., Yacobucci, M. M., Root, K. V., Peña, S., & O'Neil, D. A. (2019). Secret Service: Revealing Gender Biases in the Visibility and Value of Faculty Service. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 12(1), 85-98. doi:10.1037/dhe0000081
- Hengel, E. (2017). Publishing while Female. Are women held to higher standards? Evidence from peer review. *IDEAS Working Paper Series from RePEc*.
- Hu, Wendy C Y, Eleanor Flynn, Rebecca Mann, and Robyn Woodward-Kron. (2017) From Paperwork to Parenting: Experiences of Professional Staff in Student Support. *Medical Education* 51(3): 290-301.
- Jaeger, A., Misra, J., & Lennartz, C. (2018). Undoing disparities in faculty workloads: A randomized trial experiment. *PLoS One*, 13(12), e0207316. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0207316
- Kachchaf, R., Ko, L., Hodari, A. & Ong, M. (2015). Career-Life Balance for Women of Color: Experiences in Science and Engineering Academia. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 8(3): 175-191.
- Kahn, S. (2012). Gender Differences in Academic Promotion and Mobility at a Major Australian University*. *Economic Record*, 88(282), 407-424. doi:10.1111/j.1475-4932.2012.00828.x
- Knights, D., & Richards, W. (2003). Sex Discrimination in UK Academia. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 10(2), 213-238. doi:10.1111/1468-0432.t01-1-00012
- Marbley, A., Wong, A., Santons-Hatchett, S., Pratt, C. & Jaddo, L. (2011). Women Faculty of Color: Voices, Gender, and the Expression of Our Multiple Identities within Academia. *Advancing Women in Leadership* 31: 166-174.
- May, Robyn & Strachan, Glenda & Broadbent, Kaye & Peetz, David (2011). The Casual Approach to University Teaching; Time for a Re-Think? *HERDSA 2011: Higher Education on the Edge*. Gold Coast, Australia, 188-197.
- McKay K (2019) Athena Swan Institution Application, Bronze Award. Western Sydney University.
- O'Sullivan, S. (2019). First Nations' Women in the Academy: Disrupting and Displacing the White Male Gaze. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy: higher education, gender and intersectionality* (pp. 115-127). Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Peetz, D., Strachan, G., & Troup, C. (2014). Discipline, Change and Gender in the Academic Workforce. Conference paper at *The 28th AIRAANZ conference*, Melbourne, Australia: Association of Industrial Relations Academics of Australia and New Zealand

- Probert, B. (2005). 'I Just Couldn't Fit It In': Gender and Unequal Outcomes in Academic Careers. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 12(1), 50-72. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2005.00262.x
- Reeve, E., (2011). Yep, 'Uppity' is Racist *The Atlantic* Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2011/11/yep-uppity-racist/335160/>
- Reid, L. D. (2010). The Role of Perceived Race and Gender in the Evaluation of College Teaching on RateMyProfessors.com. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 3(3), 137-152. doi:10.1037/a0019865
- Robertson, M., & Moreau, M.-P. (2017). Carers and careers: Career development and access to leadership positions among academic staff with caring responsibilities. In. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Science In Australia Gender Equity (no date). Putting Gender on your Agenda: Evaluating the introduction of Athena SWAN into Australia.
- Strachan, G., Whitehouse, G., Peetz, D., Bailey, J., & Broadbent, K. (2008). Gender equity in universities: should we be worried? Conference paper at *Workers, Corporations and Community: Facing Choices for a Sustainable Future*, Melbourne, Australia: Association of Industrial Relations Academics of Australia and New Zealand
- Strachan, G., Whitehouse, G., Peetz, D., Bailey, J., & Broadbent, K. (2012). *Work & Careers in Australian Universities: Executive Summary*. Retrieved from <https://www.griffith.edu.au/work-organisation-wellbeing/research/projects/work-and-careers-in-australian-universities>
- Stronge, W., (2019) A four-day working week is common sense – but the state must make it happen. *The Guardian* Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/sep/12/four-day-working-week-report>
- Thornton, M. (2013). The Mirage of Merit. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 28(76), 127-143.
- van Den Brink, M., & Benschop, Y. (2011). Gender practices in the construction of academic excellence: Sheep with five legs. *Organization*, 19(4), 507-524. doi:10.1177/1350508411414293
- Van Den Brink, M., & Stobbe, L. (2014). The support paradox: Overcoming dilemmas in gender equality programs. *Scand. J. Manag.*, 30(2), 163-174. doi:10.1016/j.scaman.2013.07.001
- Weisshaar, K. (2017). Publish and Perish? An Assessment of Gender Gaps in Promotion to Tenure in Academia. *Social Forces*, 96(2), 529-560. doi:10.1093/sf/sox052
- White, K. (2003). Women and Leadership in Higher Education in Australia. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 9(1), 45-60. doi:10.1023/A:1022218403113
- White, K. (2004). The leaking pipeline: Women postgraduate and early career researchers in Australia. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10(3), 227-241. doi:10.1080/13583883.2004.9967129
- Winchester, H. P. M., & Browning, L. (2015). Gender equality in academia: a critical reflection. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 37(3), 1-13. doi:10.1080/1360080X.2015.1034427

Appendices

Appendix A. Cross-institution comparisons of policy and process

	Western Sydney University	University of Newcastle	Griffith University
Policy			
<i>Areas considered for promotion</i>			
	Teaching and learning	Teaching and learning	Teaching
	Research, scholarship and development	Research and innovation	Research
	Leadership service and engagement	Service and engagement	Scholarship
			Service and Engagement
	'high standard' required in each	achievement in all three areas	Very detailed description of the four areas as an appendix to procedures.
	Promotion based on excellence	Promotion based on merit	Promotion based on merit
	Achievements relative to opportunity	Performance relative to opportunity	Accomplishments relative to opportunity
Procedure			
<i>Timing of rounds</i>			
	Applications always open	Annual promotion rounds	Annual promotion rounds
	Promotions committee meets 3 times a year	(or any time in exceptional circumstances)	

Western Sydney University	University of Newcastle	Griffith University
<i>Eligibility</i>		
FT or PT academic staff	FT or PT academic staff with continuing or consecutive fixed term appointments of no less than 3 years	FT or PT academic staff
There must be funds available if externally funded		There must be funds available if externally funded
Completed 2 years at the university	Completed 2 years at the university, or 2 years since most recent promotion at the university "in order to demonstrate sustained excellence"	Served in current appointment at least two years (unless exceptional circumstances)
Can be on probation by exception	Must have completed probation Fixed term staff with <3 year contract can apply for an exemption	Can be promoted on probation
Based on last promotion, appointment, activities at the university, maximum 5 years	Meet the criteria based on activities in current position of since last promotion, all at the university Completed 2 years after a research fellowship	Based on performance since appointment or last promotion
No wait rule on reapplying after rejection	Two year wait rule	Two year wait rule
<i>Approval of Dean</i>		
Encouraged to discuss with Dean	Candidate must consult with Head of School and PVC through Performance Review and Development conversations before applying	Must discuss intention with Head of School, supervisor, Dean and Group PVC
Can apply regardless of Dean's view/support	Head of School or PVC may not withhold an application	Dean and PVC decide whether to support. May meet applicant.

Western Sydney University	University of Newcastle	Griffith University
		Candidate can still apply without support
<i>Independent assessors</i>		
Three external independent assessors	Four independent assessors (at least two external of international standing)	Four assessors (at least two external of international standing, ideally independent)
Dean nominates 10 external independent assessors	Head of school suggests at least 4 assessors	Candidates nominate up to 6 assessors, internal and external
Candidate can provide a list of people they would prefer not to be assessors	Candidate can provide a list of people they would prefer not to be assessors	Candidate can provide a list of people they would prefer not to be assessors
<i>Teaching evidence</i>		
Student feedback reports used	Student feedback reports used	Student feedback reports used
<i>Feedback and appeal</i>		
Right of reply to Dean's report	If unsuccessful, applicant invited to meet PVC for feedback	Gets feedback from Head of School if unsupported Can submit a 1-page response to adverse report or non-endorsement from Head of School / supervisor Meet with chair of promotions committee
Appeals only on basis of process	Appeals only on basis of process	Appeals only on basis of process

Western Sydney University	University of Newcastle	Griffith University
<i>Composition of Promotions committee</i>		
Promotions committee considers B and above	Promotions committee considers D and E	Senior promotions committee considers D and E
Director Equity and Diversity attends as non-voting member	Equity observer, Promotions officer observer	
Chaired by DVC and VP; PVC research and innovation; PVC learning transformations; Chair Academic Senate; Four internal academics; one external academic	DVC Academic (chair), DVC research and innovation, President of Academic Senate, PVC academic excellence, PVC from each faculty, 2 internal level E, 1 external level E, Director People and Workforce strategy	VC chairs Level E; DVC (Academic) chairs Level D; Dean (Academic) from each group chairs Level B & C
Makes recommendations to the VC and President		
Deans and directors can't be members		
Mandated minimum 40% female representation on Academic Promotions Committee (APC)		
<i>Interview</i>		
Level D and E	Level E academics invited for interview	No mention of an interview by the promotions committee
	Level D invited for interview at committee discretion (however, it seems to be standard practice to invite Level D applicants for an interview)	(although candidate has to meet Dean and PVC in the process above)

Western Sydney University	University of Newcastle	Griffith University
<i>Documentation</i>		
Application form	CV, portfolio, one-page leadership statement	Application form
CV - standard format	Application form	Academic portfolio
Supporting documentation	CV - standard format (on the form)	
Key achievements	Portfolio (on the form)	
Percentage contribution in multi-authored papers	Including one-page leadership statement	
Works cited must be in the university systems	Can provide supplementary material	Supplementary material will not be considered
Five significant works		2 (D) or 3(E) best research papers
Information capped at five years		
The Equity statement box	The Equity statement box	The Equity statement box
		Non-traditional patterns of achievement may be demonstrated by women, Indigenous people, people w/ disabilities, or those from non-English speaking backgrounds are taken into account.
Personal statement: can detail career impacts of personal circumstances (e.g., family responsibilities, PT, work/career breaks, disability, ill-health, and/or relevant cultural circumstances)	Relative to opportunity statement (e.g., parental leave, carers leave)	Particular consideration is given to the impact of career breaks, PT employment, & carer responsibilities & accomplishments relative to opportunities provided in all applications.

Western Sydney University	University of Newcastle	Griffith University
Candidate to provide TICE, REDI, SFT reports	Performance Expectation Framework report provided by the university (research outputs, grants, supervisions and student evaluations of teaching) Candidates can get one prior to submission to check	Candidate to provide teaching experience survey summary pages
Promotions coordinator requests recommendation reports from the Dean/Director		Candidate supplies supervisor / Head of School report

Appendix B: Demographics of the women academics

Level D or Level E

	Frequency
Level E	5
Level D	5
Total	10

What is your Employment Status?

	Frequency
Full-Time, On-going	10

When were you promoted to Level D or E?

	Frequency
Less than two years ago	6
2-5 years ago	3
10-20 years ago	1
Total	10

What is your age?

	Frequency
30-39	1
40-49	4
55-60	2
61 and above	3
Total	10

Which of the following best describes your current gender identity?

	Frequency
Female	10

Do you consider yourself to be:

	Frequency
Lesbian, gay or homosexual	2
Straight or heterosexual	7
Undefined	1
Total	10

What is your cultural identit(ies) or ethnic background? (eg Anglo-Australian, Aboriginal and / or Torres Strait Islander, Chinese, Hispanic)

	Frequency
Anglo-Australian	6
Anglo-NZer	1
Middle Eastern	1
European-Australian	1
Asian Australia	1
Total	10

Where were you born? - Selected Choice

	Frequency
Australia	7
Outside of Australia	3
Total	10

Language(s) spoken at home

	Frequency
English	8
Other	2
Total	10

Do you have a disability/ies?

	Frequency
No	10

What is your current relationship status?

	Frequency
In a relationship	10

Do you have or have you had caring responsibilities while working in academia (eg child care, elder care)?

	Frequency
Yes	7
No	3
Total	10

How many children do you have?

	Frequency
1	1
2	5
3	1
None	3
Total	10

How old are your children?

	Frequency
12-24 months	2
5 to 9	2
10 to 19 years	4
20 to 29	4
Over 29	1
Total	13

Note, one of these children is a grandchild for whom the academic has caring responsibilities, and one adult child has a disability and requires care.