The University Committee on Women (UCW) is a diverse group of women from across the Iowa State University campus. The University Committee on Women is a dynamic and involved network that responds actively to women's issues including monitoring and increasing the number of women in leadership positions at ISU, with special attention paid to low numbers of women department chairs, and also continuing work to improve the climate on campus for women students, staff and faculty.

The 2013-2014 academic year proved to be an active one which included hosting a number of guest speakers, writing a proposal for and hiring a quarter-time research assistant, completing a twelve-year Status of Women Report, completing a Status of Women Report for the College of Veterinary Medicine, writing and presenting a white paper to President Leath, forming joint subcommittees with the Women’s Leadership Consortium, and moving forward or completing subcommittee reports that had not been completed in the prior year.

Please note that the 2013-2014 membership list is included in Appendix A of this report and all information related to the University Committee on Women may be found on the UCW website: http://www.public.iastate.edu/~ucw/homepage.html.

The 2013-2014 Executive Board consisted of Michele Farnham, Chair; Anastasia Prokos, Vice Chair; Julia Sullivan, Past Chair; and Dawn Bratsch-Prince, Associate Provost (ex officio).

There were a total of six sub-committees this year including:
- Status of Women 2014 Report
- College Review- College of Veterinary Medicine
- Increasing Undergraduate Recruitment of Women
- Increasing Graduate Recruitment of Women
- Pathways for Leadership for Women at Iowa State University
- Taskforce to Study University Committees with Overlap on Issues Pertaining to Women

Two of the standing responsibilities of the UCW are: 1) to generate a Status of Women report, produced every five to ten years by the Status of Women Subcommittee, that spans all units of the university; and 2) to provide a comprehensive analysis of data on the status of women in each college through the work of the College Review Subcommittee.
Each subcommittee summary is included (below). Full reports for the Status of Women 2014 and the Status of Women for the College Review Subcommittee for the College of Veterinary Medicine (soon to be released) can be found on the University Committee on Women website at https://www-provost.sws.iastate.edu/what-we-do/committee-on-women/reports. The remaining full subcommittee reports are attached in Appendix B.

**Status of Women 2014 Report Subcommittee**
Members: Sandy Gahn and Tobie Matava, Co-Chairs; Anastasia Prokos; Dianne Bystrom; Craig Ogilvie; Jennifer Farley

The UCW convened a subcommittee to extend and update the 2002 Status of Women at Iowa State University Report. The report documents the representation and experiences of women at the university using statistical data and responses to several surveys of students, staff, and faculty. It examines women’s representation at the university, opportunities for mentoring and professional development, work/life balance concerns, and other issues relevant to specific populations and to supporting diversity.

**College Review Subcommittee- College of Veterinary Medicine**
Members: Katie Davidson, Chair; Jennifer Farley

The purpose of this study was to provide a comprehensive and objective presentation and analysis of data on the status of women in the College of Veterinary Medicine and across its five academic departments: Biomedical Sciences (BMS), Veterinary Clinical Sciences (VCS), Veterinary Diagnostic and Production Animal Medicine (VDPAM), Veterinary Microbiology and Preventive Medicine (VMPM), and Veterinary Pathology (VPATH). The goal of the study is to identify trends and challenges, while advocating strategies that will ensure equality and diversity for students, staff and faculty. The initial research began in 2010 and Katie Davidson took the lead this year to finish gathering data and write the final report. Jennifer Farley, the UCW graduate research assistant, assisted in updating tables and performing final edits.

**Increasing Undergraduate Recruitment of Women**
Members: Julia Sullivan, Chair; Michele Farnham; Deb Larkin

Iowa State University consistently has had a lower than national average in undergraduate women on campus and also ranks in the lower tier amongst its peer institutions. The subcommittee wanted to ascertain if disparity impacted retention rates as women tend to retain at a higher rate than men. Data was collected for a six-year period for Iowa State and its ten peer institutions. The subcommittee also worked with ISU’s admissions office to better understand how the office is addressing the recruitment of undergraduate women to campus.
**Increasing Graduate Recruitment of Women**  
Members: Alissa Stoehr, Chair; Andrea Wheeler; Stacey Ross; Jan Friedel

One of the missions of Iowa State University is to recruit more graduate students and to ensure that the necessary services are in place to retain these students. In his installation address, President Leath stated that he wants to recruit at least 2,000 more graduate students to support basic and applied research at Iowa State. In light of this statement, the subcommittee wanted to look at the following issues:

- Are these students being recruited for specific programs, such as STEM, or are they being recruited for all programs? Will these recruitment efforts be gender balanced? How many of these potential students will be women?
- Are there specific programs and/or services that attract female graduate students more than others?
- How does Iowa State compare to the national average or to peer institutions when it comes to recruitment and retention of female graduate students?

**Pathways for Leadership for Women at Iowa State University**  
Members: Dianne Bystrom- WLC, Chair; Gloria Jones-Johnson- WLC; Tobie Matava- UCW; Jan Friedel- UCW

Goals:  
The original focus of this subcommittee was ‘Diversity at the Top’. The Women’s Leadership Consortium (WLC) became interested in this topic this year and asked to take the lead. The new subcommittee decided to shift the focus to “Pathways for Leadership for Women at Iowa State University.” The newly structured subcommittee is interested in looking at the culture, organizational structure, and opportunities at Iowa State that facilitate and/or hinder women seeking leadership positions.

Results:  
The subcommittee is charged with examining the overall campus climate and systems that are either in place or missing, which support women as they strive to attain and succeed in top administrative roles. Currently the committee is in the planning stages and focused on gathering existing information from previous studies done at Iowa State University and similar institutions.
The University Committee on Women strives to address relevant issues on campus for women. This year the UCW decided to examine other committees on campus that appear to have overlapping interests in issues that primarily affect women. The subcommittee determined the best way to become familiar with the missions and initiatives of these groups was to invite the committee chairs as guest speakers to regular UCW meetings. The subcommittee hosted four committee chairs this academic year and plans to host three additional chairs next year. Next year, the Taskforce to Study University Committees with Overlap on Issues Pertaining to Women will complete a report that will provide a comprehensive list of university committees that focus on women’s issues, as well as a visual web of connectivity to further explain the relationships between these groups.

A synopsis of this year’s guest speakers for this subcommittee is included in Appendix B.

UCW 2013-2014 Summary

A series of guest speakers for the 2013-2014 academic year included:

- Brad Freihoefer, Coordinator for LGBTSS Center
- Julia Graden, Program Coordinator for ISU Child Care and Family Resource Services
- Dawn Bratsch-Prince, Associate Provost
- Steven Leath, President of Iowa State University
- Dianne Bystrom, Director of the Carrie Chapman Catt Center for Women and Politics
- Julie Nuter, Associate VP for Human Resources
- Steve Carter, Director for the ISU Research Park
- Jay Ramsey, Clinical and Regulatory Compliance Officer at NewLink Genetics

Looking towards the 2014-2015 year, the University Committee on Women looks forward to continuing its mission to promote a university climate that fosters the full participation of women faculty, staff, and students. The College Review Committee will begin review of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and two subcommittees, Pathways for Leadership for Women at Iowa State University and Taskforce to Study University Committees with Overlap on Issues Pertaining to Women, will continue their work and provide full reports. To support UCW’s mission, the Committee will continue to have research assistance to help generate these final reports.
Appendix A
UCW Membership 2013-2014

Michele Farnham, Chair- Manager of Facilities Service, ISU Research Park (P&S)
Anastasia Prokos, Vice Chair- Associate Professor, Sociology (Faculty)
Julia Sullivan, Past Chair- Program Manager, Office of Student Financial Aid (P&S)
Dawn Bratsch-Prince- Associate Provost (Ex-Officio)

Katie Davidson- Coordinator of International Study Programs, College of Vet Med (P&S)
Jennifer Farley- Graduate Student, School of Education (Grad Assistant to UCW)
Janice Friedel- Associate Professor, School of Education (Faculty)
Sandra Gahn- Associate Director, Office of Institutional Research (P&S)
Deborah Larkin- Police Lieutenant, Public Safety (Merit)
Margaret LaWare- Associate Professor, English (Faculty)
Robinette Kelley- Director Office of Equal Opportunity (Ex-Officio)
Tobie Matava- Librarian, Parks Library (P&S)
Melissa Miller- Program Coordinator, Iowa Water Center (P&S)
Stacey Ross- Secretary, College of Business (Merit)
Alissa Stoehr- Graduate Student, School of Education (Grad Student)
Andrea Wheeler- Assistant Professor, Architecture (Faculty)
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UCW Subcommittee Final Reports

Increasing Undergraduate Recruitment of Women
Members: Julia Sullivan, Chair; Michele Farnham; Deb Larkin

Goals for 2013-2014:
- Identify potential reasons why Iowa State University (ISU) has a lower percentage of undergraduate women on campus than the national average.
- Are there any data indicating whether this disparity is reflective of recruitment or enrollment factors?
- Could this gap also have an impact on overall retention rates as research indicates women tend to retain at a higher rate than men?
- How does the Office of Admissions address the recruitment of undergraduate women to ISU?

Introduction:
The subcommittee’s primary goal was to identify factors that could be impacting the enrollment trend of women undergraduate students at ISU, placing the school well below the national average.

As noted in the 2014 Status of Women at Iowa State University report, “Women comprise only 43.4% of undergraduates. That is far below the national average of 57%.”

Peer Institution Data:
The focus was to compare ISU to its Land-Grant peer institutions as indicated on the ISU Institutional website. [http://www.ir.iastate.edu/peers.html](http://www.ir.iastate.edu/peers.html)

- University of Arizona   Tucson, AZ
- University of California-Davis  Davis, CA
- University of Illinois-Urbana  Urbana/Champaign, IL
- Michigan State University  East Lansing, MI
- University of Minnesota  Minneapolis/St. Paul, MN
- North Carolina State University  Raleigh, NC
- Ohio State University  Columbus, OH
- Purdue University-Main Campus  West Lafayette, IN
- Texas A&M University  College Station, TX
- University of Wisconsin-Madison  Madison, WI

Data were collected from peer institutions’ Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) for six years, from 2007-2008 through 2012-2013. This data was then compiled to obtain a six-year average for applications, offers, freshman enrollment, and undergraduate enrollment. See the charts below.
When comparing applications and offers, ISU ranks third from the bottom with 47.02% and 48.00% female applications and offers, respectively. The highest female statistics were 54.24% and 56.88%, respectively, both at the University of California-Davis.
Freshmen Enrollment:

![Freshmen Enrollment - 6-year average](image)

Undergraduate Enrollment:

![Undergraduate Enrollment - 6-year average](image)
For freshmen and undergraduate enrollment, ISU ranks second from the bottom with 45.34% and 43.63% respectively. Again, the highest percentage of females in both categories was from the University of California-Davis with 57.86% and 55.73%, respectively.

Admissions:
The subcommittee met with Admissions staff members this spring to discuss the initial data and seek information on initiatives, rational, and other sources of data. Kate Ralston is a Program Coordinator II and supports Admissions as a data analyst. Maura Flaschner is a Program Coordinator III and an Associate Director in the Office of Admissions.

The subcommittee discussion with Kate Ralston focused on the IPEDS data collected. With the data in hand from IPEDS, Kate partnered with the data analyst from the Office of the Registrar, Jonathan Compton, to provide information and perspective. Their report is included in Appendix C.

The discussion with Maura Flaschner focused on admission criteria, recruitment initiatives, and anecdotal effects that may have an impact on recruitment of female undergraduate students.

Admission Criteria:  
Admission to Iowa State University primarily is determined by the Board of Regents Admissions Index (RAI). These criteria apply to all Regents universities, including the University of Iowa and University of Northern Iowa. Details can be found at http://www.regents.iowa.gov/RAI/.

Recruitment Initiatives:  
Along with Office of Admissions directed initiatives, Admissions also serves as a proactive partner to recruitment efforts administered by the colleges. One example is the Women in Science and Engineering (WISE) program in the College of Engineering. The WISE program sponsors a career conference for female students in grades 6-12 titled “Taking the Road Less Traveled”, so prospective students can visit ISU at different times of the year to explore careers in science, technology, engineering, and math. Other colleges have scholarship offerings including the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the College of Human Sciences, which also could serve to support recruitment of female undergraduate students.

Another factor that could aid in the recruitment of women as undergraduate students to ISU is housing options. ISU currently offers more than 80 different learning communities, freshman honors program housing, and an active Greek community.

Anecdotal Questions:
- Does availability of various majors impact a woman’s decision process? As an example, ISU doesn’t offer a nursing program, but it does offer a fashion design program.
- Do local business offerings affect recruitment? Availability of certain businesses such as shopping choices, child care availability, or hair salons marketed to ethnic female students might have some influence.
○ Is the size of the Ames community an issue when peer institutions are located in major metropolitan areas?
○ Do faculty and instructors in ISU classrooms represent women to the same level that men are represented?
○ Do tour guides for Experience Iowa State (EIS) days adequately represent female students?
○ ISU Admissions recruiters are predominantly female. Does this have an impact?
○ ISU has some majors where enrollment is managed, because of either instructional or accreditation limits. Does this have an effect?
○ There also was a recent article from “News from the ISU College of Human Sciences” on 4/22/2014 regarding the effect of homesickness on first-year students. Could the distance from home be negatively impacting a woman choosing an undergraduate school in another state?

Conclusion:
There are a number of grass roots efforts on campus that could have a positive impact on female undergraduate recruitment and enrollment at ISU. College and departmental programs should devise specific outreach plans to enhance existing Office of Admissions programs to gain more ground in this area.

There may be opportunities through the corporate community as ISU’s involvement in the Capital Corridor expands. The Capital Corridor or Capital Crossroads: A Vision Forward looks to “leverage the stretch of Interstate 35 between the Des Moines and Ames metropolitan areas for well-planned, sustainable and high-value growth and development for all industries, particularly animal science that could be transformational for Central Iowa’s economy and population base. Enhancing the relationships between public and private leaders in Ames and Des Moines also holds tremendous benefit for the advancement of Central Iowa cluster-building, policy, transportation, land use, smart growth, and natural-resources initiatives.” What new and expanded internship opportunities will arise and could these offerings spark an upsurge in female undergraduate students? This report is only a talking piece that could help to address what may be involved in increasing the female undergraduate population on the Iowa State University campus. Further research could be done through surveys and compiling data from outside resources to better identify specific plans of action.

The information obtained through this subcommittee report can be used as a foundation to continue efforts to better understand female undergraduate school decision-making. Consequently, the subcommittee recommends that the University Committee on Women consider convening a new subcommittee to further review the topic of female undergraduate enrollment in the 2014-2015 academic year.
Increasing Graduate Recruitment of Women  
Members: Alissa Stoehr, Chair; Andrea Wheeler; Stacey Ross; Jan Friedel

Goals:
One of the main charges of President Leath and his administration is to recruit more than 2,000 graduate students and to ensure that the necessary services are in place to retain these students. The subcommittee recommends that the following questions be part of the discussion during this recruitment phase:

- Are these students being recruited for specific programs, such as STEM, or are they being recruited for all programs? Will these recruitment efforts be gender balanced? How many of these potential students will be women? How many will be women of color?
- Are there specific programs and/or services that attract female graduate students more than others?
- How can faculty members help support this recruitment effort through planning and training on recruitment strategies?

Research:
Most women in academia face the challenge of a negative campus climate. Female graduate students, staff, faculty, and administrators may experience unfriendly and/or hostile behavior from peers, colleagues, and superiors. In addition to a negative campus climate, female graduate students can face challenges related to recruitment and retention (National Research Council, 2006). The underrepresentation of women is most visible at well-known research universities (National Research Council, 2001). Women science faculty members are more likely to be employed by community colleges or institutions that do not offer a doctoral degree program (Schneider, 2000).

Throughout the literature on women in STEM fields, there are three common themes that describe the experiences of these women. First, according to a 2006 report from the National Research Council, ...” from undergraduate matriculation through a doctoral program and into an academic career, the number of women decline, thereby reinforcing a pattern of underrepresentation of women in academia” (p. 7). Second, the overall climate of departments and even institutions is considered chilly for women. Third, efforts to recruit and retain women in science and engineering can only be successful if university administrations emphasize the institutionalization of change and rapid implementation on their respective campuses.

A study conducted by the National Academy of Sciences also found that the number of female graduate students in science and engineering disciplines has increased. In the 1990s, the number of women enrolled in U.S. graduate schools increased from 133,737 to 168,468, and the percentage of female graduate students in these disciplines increased from 34% to 41% (National Science Foundation, 2003).
According to the study conducted by the National Academy of Sciences, there are three main challenges that hinder efforts by colleges and universities to enhance recruitment of women. First, departmental culture can be problematic. Male professors in STEM fields may feel more comfortable working with male graduate students, and could unintentionally make female graduate students feel less welcome in the department. Second, family-friendly policies can be a very important issue for female graduate students, especially for those women who did not enter graduate school immediately after earning a bachelor’s degree. With their academic responsibilities increasing as they advance through their academic programs, female graduate students who want to start a family or already have dependents experience issues of work-life balance. Third, women may not have much interest in STEM fields where they do not think they will receive the level of support or mentoring they need to be successful.

In terms of retention, evidence suggests that there could be some gender differences between completion rates of doctoral programs. Duke University found that male graduate students were more likely to complete their doctoral programs in the biological sciences (76%) than their female counterparts (67%). However, both male and female doctoral students had similar completion rates in the physical sciences and engineering (Siegel, 2005). Overall, women tend to enter their graduate programs at an older age than male graduate students (Farabaugh-Dorkins, 1991), and usually take longer to complete their degrees (Gillingham, Seneca, and Taussing, 1991).

According to a report published by the National Science Foundation (NSF), longitudinal data show that there is no more attrition for females than for males between earning their bachelor’s degrees and enrolling in graduate school (National Science Foundation, 2003). In a survey administered to 3,300 graduate students in chemistry, computer science, electrical engineering, and physics during the 1993-1994 academic year, results showed that female graduate students were less likely than their male counterparts to report being treated with respect by faculty members, being comfortable speaking in research groups, and collaborating with male students and faculty. Results also uncovered that male graduate students were more likely to receive help with writing grant proposals, and designing and publishing their research (Fox, 2001).

As was mentioned earlier in this report, female graduate students can experience a lot of negative issues when trying to start their academic career, as well as advancing to earn a doctorate. Individual characteristics and specific life experiences of female students make them more at risk for attrition. Female graduate students also may face issues of marginalization, isolation, and/or harassment. Department culture also plays a factor in the decreased retention rates of female graduate students. This could include more instances of negative, unsupportive, or even nonexistent relationships with both female and male advisors and mentors. Another study found that family and marriage issues, interactions with faculty and other students, difficulty with coursework, and financial problems, including issues with financial aid, were all considered barriers for women trying to complete graduate degrees (Hagedorn, 1999).
According to the “To Recruit and Advance” study conducted by the National Research Council, the academic department plays a rather large role in the lives of all graduate students. Faculty members, especially thesis and dissertation advisors, have an extremely important impact on the retention of female graduate students. “A student’s relationship with his or her advisor is probably the single most critical factor in determining who stays and who leaves” (Lovitts, 2001, p. 270). Institutions need to emphasize the contributions of female graduate students within their departments to help the culture become more positive and accepting. Advising and mentor relationships need to be formulated early in female graduate students’ careers so that they can better navigate their academic careers and become involved in beneficial professional development opportunities. According to Boyle and Boice (1998), mentoring may be the most important variable related to academic and career success for graduate students. Other strategies that are important in institutional efforts to increase retention rates of female graduate students include increasing engagement opportunities between faculty and students, creating more professional socialization opportunities within departments and institutions, and securing more funding for assistantships and research.

**Female Graduate Student Survey:**
During the spring 2012 semester, a task force comprised of graduate students, staff, and faculty created and administered a survey to gather information from female graduate students about their experiences at Iowa State University. The survey was separated into four sections: campus climate; professional development and academic services; student workload and student services; and wellness, family, and housing. It was sent to 1,922 female graduate students and garnered a 22.8% response rate. The responses were astonishing. Here are some of the main points brought forth by the survey respondents.

- 51% of women in graduate school reported that issues of gender, ethnicity, nationality, and/or sexual orientation presented a negative impact on their studies and scholarship.
- 44% of women in graduate school have experienced inappropriate or negative stereotypes in their respective departments or research groups, while 46% have observed inappropriate or negative stereotypes.
- Only 50% of women in graduate school have access to a mentor.
- Several areas of student services are only known to approximately 50% of women in graduate school.
- Over 70% of women in graduate school stated that low pay was a great concern to them, while 60% mentioned that workload was also a concern.
- Women in graduate programs in the College of Design (35%) and the College of Business (42%) reported the lowest sense of community among female students at Iowa State.
- Women in graduate programs located in the Graduate College, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the College of Human Sciences all expressed higher levels of hesitation in sharing their concerns with administration and/or staff than did graduate students in other colleges.
- Women in graduate programs in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (81%) and the College of Business (79%) reported no discussions in their respective department or research group related to gender, race, sexuality, and age.
Women in graduate school were asked to select three issues that were most important to them. Assistant pay/stipends and assistantship workload were the two issues most mentioned in the survey. These issues remain most important across colleges and graduate levels. Survey respondents also were asked to select three family issues that were most important to them. Family leave benefits and availability of daytime childcare were selected as the two most important issues.

**Related Campus Activities:**
In September 2013, international diversity consultant and trainer Dr. Kathy Obear visited Iowa State to conduct trainings for interested students, staff, and faculty who wanted to facilitate discussions about diversity issues within their respective departments and research programs. As of February 2014, approximately 50% of participants had implemented training programs in their departments.

In January 2014, a position was created in the Graduate College specifically for graduate student support that would help identify and address certain issues that may be affecting recruitment, enrollment, and/or retention of graduate students, including post-doctoral students. This position also is responsible for recognizing specific resources necessary for graduate student success, including adequate housing, childcare, work-life balance, etc. There still is discussion about creating a graduate career staff person with the Graduate College to help students and advisors with job search issues, etc.

In April 2014, the Graduate College administered a climate survey to all graduate students. The results of that survey have not been analyzed as of May 2014.

**Conclusion:**
As mentioned previously, one of President Leath’s missions is to recruit more graduate students, which should include women and underrepresented groups. Concerned constituents need to hold the administration accountable to bringing all of these students to campus and ensuring that resources to retain them are available.

There have been some common themes that have been repeated throughout the literature. The first theme was the responsibility of institutions to publicly emphasize and support efforts to promote the success of female graduate students, especially in disciplines where they are underrepresented such as STEM. The second theme was for institutions to recognize the importance of the reports and studies they fund that reinforce the need for more emphasis on best practices for recruiting and retaining diverse populations, such as women and underrepresented minorities. Another theme was the emphasis placed on dialogue and communication. Female students, staff, and faculty who have issues should be guaranteed a safe space to address their concerns, and also be promised that those concerns will be listened to and addressed. Future versions of this report will include how Iowa State compares to the national average or to other peer institutions when it comes to recruitment and retention of female graduate students.
It is crucial that new graduate students who are recruited to Iowa State have the necessary tools in order to be successful, especially women, and students of color. The recommendations that have been presented can be implemented to help increase recruitment and maintain retention of these graduate students.

Recommendations:
Here are priorities this subcommittee is proposing to support the recruitment of more graduate students, especially women and other underrepresented groups, to Iowa State University. Some of these recommendations are reiterations from the 2013 Graduate and Professional Student (GPSS) Senate survey administered to senate members and the 2012 survey administered to 1,922 female graduate students through the Graduate College.

1. Formal mentorship program
   - Mentoring should become a high priority for programs and departments.
   - This type of program would help graduate students navigate through the first year of their program. This also would be a great opportunity for older and more experienced graduate students.
   - Professors should encourage their students to be more involved in outreach, tutoring, and committee service in order to be better prepared professionals.
   - Senior graduate students could share their research, and help first-year students with paperwork questions, academic writing, etc.

2. Graduate student wellness center and a Graduate student success center.
Students should take advantage of current Iowa State programs, such as through the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT), Preparing Future Faculty (PFF), Center for Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning (CIRTL), National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD), Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS), departmental trainings, and other professional development opportunities.
   - Presenting at conferences
   - Writing and submitting articles for publication
   - Providing connections to business and industry for research and/or mentoring opportunities; using senior administrators for mentoring and/or research contacts
   - Academic job hunting
   - Mental illness
   - Women’s success in academia
   - Female graduate students in non-traditional disciplines
   - Conflict resolution
   - Grant writing
   - More emphasis on part-time and distance education students
   - Resources for graduate student families
3. Faculty involvement
   - Faculty should be involved in the recruitment process, and this task should be added to their PRS (personnel responsibility statement). Faculty need to believe in the importance of recruiting a diverse group of graduate students, as well as staff and other faculty members. They should also be cognizant of the representatives they are sending to recruit this diverse group. Furthermore, the process for recruiting a diverse body of graduate students needs to be improved. Faculty need to receive training on how to recruit diverse applicants, and/or how to develop an inclusive applicant pool.

4. Increase in funding opportunities, stipend amounts, child care resources, and more comprehensive health insurance.
   - The current cost of student health insurance is approximately one-third of a student’s monthly salary.
   - Colleges and universities should be cognizant of the many barriers that affect female graduate students who are trying to complete their degrees, and create and support policies to assist mothers who are pursuing these degrees.

5. Recruiting materials for graduate students should be revised to reflect inclusiveness, positive stereotypes, and the broad range of opportunities available to female graduate students (Cuny and Aspray, 2000). This also would include college and university websites and all other forms of social media.

Resources:


The Taskforce to Study University Committees with Overlap on Issues Pertaining to Women subcommittee invited four university committee chairs to speak at the regular meetings of the University Committee on Women. A summary of each speaker follows.

Brad Freihoefer, Coordinator of the LGBT Student Services Center, gave an overview of the services LGBTSS provides to the student body, as well as faculty/staff initiatives. LGBTSS serves as a safe space for all members of the university community to explore aspects of sexual identity, gender identity, and gender expression, and strives to promote full inclusion LGBTIQ (lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender/intersexed/questioning) persons and their allies at Iowa State and to eliminate homophobia, heterosexism, transphobia, cisgenderism and sexism on campus. The center offers training programs, “gathering groups” for further defined communities (e.g. Queer People of Color), organizations and interest groups. LGBTSS urged UCW to consider “What does it mean to be a woman at Iowa State University?” and through a partnership with LGBTSS, focus on inclusion of all genders to the Iowa State University experience and promote visibility of LGBTQQIA (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Questioning, Intersex, and Asexual) experiences.

Julia Graden with ISU Child Care and Family Resource Services presented on the child care options at Iowa State University and the University Child Care Committee (UCCC). The UCCC works with the university to evaluate the need for child care by ISU families and make recommendations to policy, services, and programs related to child care. The UCCC celebrates Week/Month of the Young Child on campus. Currently, the biggest issue on campus and in Ames is the availability of affordable childcare, particularly for infants.

Dawn Bratsch-Prince, representing the University Committee on Diversity (UCD), shared that the committee was currently in a period of anticipatory planning, awaiting the release of the 2013 Diversity Audit conducted for the Office of the President by an outside consultant. Many committees across the Iowa State campus are recommending the establishment of a Chief Diversity Officer to carry out strategic objectives identified by the diversity audit. The UCD is charged with working to support the design of new policies, improved recruitment, increased retention and advancement of equity. They also review applications for the Women’s and Diversity Grants Program as well as support diversity-related events and activities that occur across the university.

Dianne Bystrom gave the history of the Women’s Leadership Consortium, which was established in 2002 as an offshoot of UCW. The WLC supports the coordination of women’s programs across campus and membership constitutes sixteen campus offices, usually the director of that office. The WLC supports efforts related to advancement of women in leadership positions. The UCW and WLC have always worked closely together and will continue this relationship into the future.
Appendix C
Recruitment and Retention of Women at Iowa State

By Kate Ralston, Office of Admissions and Jonathan Compton, Registrar's Office
Spring 2014

Over the past ten years, the share of female and male applicants from the overall pool remained relatively stable averaging 46.6% women and 53.4% men. The shares of applicants also remain stable for different colleges, with women leading in applying to college of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Design, Human Sciences and LAS. Male applicants lead in Engineering and Business. Proportionally, the share of female applicants in a traditionally male-associated field such as engineering is somewhat similar to the share of male applicants in a traditionally female-associated field such as human sciences.

1. New Direct High-School Freshmen

Considering the potential differences in recruiting women, it is important to look at comparable schools. Using the national ranking of schools with engineering programs, four large public universities similar to Iowa State were selected. These are institutions that are located in the Midwest, have a nationally recognized-engineering program and are large public research universities. They are different in that, generally speaking, the other institutions are highly selective in their admissions process, while Iowa State has a transparent admissions process and offers admission to all academically-qualified applicants.

Using available IPEDS data, a two-year average (2010, 2011) for the application share by gender was calculated. While there is some difference in female and male share, Iowa State performs on par with the similar schools.
### Application share, 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2-year Average, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>F: 48, M: 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University-Main Campus</td>
<td>F: 43, M: 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana</td>
<td>F: 45, M: 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota-Twin Cities</td>
<td>F: 53, M: 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>F: 52, M: 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, when comparing the offer and yield rates across similar schools using available IPEDS data, Iowa State is leading in offering admission to female applicants and demonstrates higher yield of female students than some of the selected comparable institutions.

### Offer and yield rate, 2010-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>3-year Average, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University-Main Campus</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota-Twin Cities</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Important consideration:** There are a lot of unknown factors that could help explain the difference in yield rates by gender. The existing data have many limitations, which make them susceptible for deriving a faulty, overgeneralized conclusion. Therefore, we suggest that these data are interpreted with caution and with strong consideration of the context and the potential variety of unknown characteristics.

Despite the differences in male/female application share to certain colleges, the yield difference for female and male applicants across all colleges at Iowa State averages 4.4%. The largest yield difference occurs in AGLS (~10%), while the gap in traditionally male-associated fields such as Engineering and Business is at average or below (4.6 and 1.5%, respectively).
2. Ten-year yield average at Iowa State University, by college, 2003-2013

![Yield Graph]

The academic profile for the incoming freshman class, both across the university as a whole and within each college, shows that female and male students have comparable scores with females demonstrating a slightly higher average in most areas.

3. Ten year academic scores average at Iowa State, by gender, 2003-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshmen, Enrolled</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>AGLS</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Human Sciences</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>LAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS GPA</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Rank</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Comprt</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Engl</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Math</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, looking at retention and graduation rates at Iowa State, female students retain and graduate at higher rates than their male counterparts. Additionally, women tend to have a slightly higher first semester and first year GPA as well as other entering academic characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Direct from High School--Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### New Direct from High School--Male

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Year</th>
<th>Cohort Size</th>
<th>Entering Characteristics</th>
<th>ISU 1st term</th>
<th>ISU 1st year GPA</th>
<th>Retention Rates</th>
<th>Graduation Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>HS Rank</td>
<td>HS GPA</td>
<td>1-Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2198</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2097</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2134</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2190</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2418</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2460</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2366</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2467</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2789</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2920</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3365</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Direct from High School--All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Year</th>
<th>Cohort Size</th>
<th>Entering Characteristics</th>
<th>ISU 1st term</th>
<th>ISU 1st year GPA</th>
<th>Retention Rates</th>
<th>Graduation Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>HS Rank</td>
<td>HS GPA</td>
<td>1-Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3896</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3728</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3769</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3983</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4347</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4545</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4356</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4552</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5048</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5366</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6089</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>