

REPORT OF THE 2001-2003 SAWH AD HOC COMMITTEE
ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE PROFESSION
1 October 2003

Accepted by the SAWH Executive Council, November 2003

Judith F. Gentry (Chairperson), Eva Baham, June K. Burton, Barbara Schnorrenberg

The members of the 2001-03 committee are pleased to report the completion of their study of three aspects of employment conditions for women historians employed as full-time faculty members in four-year colleges and universities in the South. It has been twenty years since the profession has considered this very important topic. During that time, the number of female Ph.D.s in history has grown phenomenally while the total number of active historians has grown only minimally. How have women historians in the South fared during these decades of dramatic change, and where do we stand now?

The SAWH has a long and proud history of working for equity for women historians within the Southern Historical Association, as historians employed in the colleges and universities of the South, and as citizens. The Association was founded in 1970 and soon announced that among its purposes were "to advance the status of women in the historical profession in the South" and "to publicize and promote issues of concern to the SAWH membership." The Association has worked as an Association and as individuals active in the Southern Historical Association to increase the representation of women on the SHA Council, on SHA committees, as reviewers of books in the *Journal of Southern History*, and as presenters and commentators on the SHA annual program. The Association brought ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment before the SHA and succeeded, in concert with others in the SHA of like mind, in getting the SHA to endorse ratification of the ERA and to join the boycott of states that had not ratified the ERA.

Two of the three members of the 1982-84 ad hoc SHA Committee on the Status of Women in the Southern Historical Association (which produced the only study of the status of women as professors in Southern colleges and universities until now) were SAWH members. SAWH members worked successfully to get the SHA to make its Committee on the Status of Women a standing (rather than an ad hoc) committee. For many years the SAWH coordinated closely with the SHA Committee on the Status of Women. The SAWH has worked to improve conditions and opportunities for female students in history graduate programs and to assist women historians to develop session proposals for the SHA annual meeting program. About four years ago, the SAWH created this ad hoc committee to focus on current conditions for women historians employed as faculty members in Southern college and universities.

The early efforts of the SAWH to improve opportunity for women within the SHA met with disapproval from the almost entirely male leadership of the SHA. The members of the SAWH were perceived by many in the SHA to be trouble makers, demanding change when none was needed. Young members of the profession active in the SAWH were taken aside and advised by their mentors that their careers would be harmed by continued activism. The 1982-84 SHA ad hoc Committee on the Status of Women undertook a large statistical study of the status of women in the SHA and as faculty members in Southern colleges and universities in part to jolt the SHA leadership out of its complacency and certainty that there were no real problems. The 1984 SHA Committee report concluded that “women are not being hired into the entry level tenure track rank (assistant professor) at a rate commensurate with the percentage of new Ph.D.s”; that “women are not being promoted into the higher professorial ranks as rapidly

as men who earned their Ph.D.s at the same time”: that women are underrepresented as department heads”; that “women are even more underrepresented in those states which are in the mountain areas of the South”; that “women are underrepresented in large departments of history in the South”; and that “women are even seriously underrepresented in the institutions of several recent presidents of the Southern Historical Association.”

The SHA Council, to its credit, acknowledged the quality of the statistical study and approved the report. A condensed (and considerably toned-down) version of the statistical analysis was published in the *Journal of Southern History*. In particular, the SHA Council did not want to publicize the records of the SHA presidents’ institutions. And indeed, the SHA Council did not act on the four main recommendations of the 1982-84 committee: that the SHA Council encourage history departments in the South to take action to encourage equity in employment; that the Council request that the next SHA Committee focus on devising strategies to achieve equity; that the SHA send the 1984 report to departments of history and social studies in the South and urge action to remedy the inequities; and that “a special remedial effort concentrate on large departments of history in the South.”

Nevertheless, gradually, in the intervening decades, women came to play a greater role in the SHA, serving in larger numbers on the SHA Council and its committees, and presenting scholarly papers and commenting in greater numbers on the SHA annual meeting programs. The SAWH membership has increased dramatically since 1982, and its annual program and reception has become a popular event attended by hundreds of

men and women. So, on the surface, it would appear that the many women who have joined Southern history faculties have thrived in their departments.

By creating this SAWH ad hoc Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession four years ago, President Amy Thompson McCandless began a process that has allowed a follow-up study to be undertaken, to ascertain the extent to which employment opportunities and opportunities to advance within the profession may have improved during the intervening nineteen years for women historians employed as faculty members in Southern colleges and universities.

The committee understands that the SHA Committee on Women surveyed women members of the Southern Historical Association in 2002 on a wide variety of matters, including salaries, teaching load, tenure, and personal experience of gender discrimination or sexual harassment (or personally witnessing or receiving reports by students of the same). The SHA Committee on Women will be presenting the results of this ambitious and important study to the SHA membership at a workshop at 11:45 on Friday, November 7. It seems to this committee that there is a wonderful coincidence this year of the presentation of up-to-date information by the SHA Committee on Women and the SAWH ad hoc Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession. Taking two different approaches, utilizing two different methodologies, and studying (to some extent) different aspects of the experiences of women historians employed in Southern colleges and universities, these two committees together have produced important new insights related to equity for women historians within the profession.

Methodology and Data

The methodology for collecting and analyzing the data for this report was similar to the methodology of the statistical report prepared by the 1982-1984 SHA Committee on the Status of Women in the Southern Historical Association. Altogether, 3,186 historians employed full-time in 216 departments for the 2002-2003 academic year were studied. First names were used to identify the gender of most of the historians. For the remainder, an Internet search was undertaken to identify gender. Altogether, all but 17 of the historians were identified by gender, leaving only 0.53 percent of the total unidentified by gender. The total studied was therefore 3,169 historians employed as faculty in the South. This compares favorably with the 3,105 faculty members in 186 departments studied in 1983. The women studied in 1983 and in 2002 include women of all races and ethnic groups employed as historians in Southern colleges and universities; the data do not allow identification of African-American women historians for analysis as a sub-group of the total. The geographical South was defined in the same manner as in 1983, all fifteen slave states plus the District of Columbia. Emeritus faculty members were excluded, as well as adjunct faculty. The same definitions regarding size of institution were utilized: large 20 or more; mid-size 7-19; small 6 or less.

In some ways the methodology for this study of 2002 data differs from the 1983 study, which was based on college and university catalogs. The source for this 2002 study is the *Directory of History Departments and Organizations in the United States and Canada, 28th edition, 2002-03*. The AHA annually asks department chairpersons to submit the names, ranks, fields and other information about all members of the department as of June 15, 2002. The departments pay a small fee to be listed and receive two copies of the directory. Virtually all large departments participate regularly in the

process, but many small departments and departments at historically black colleges and universities do not. All of the data on fulltime permanent historians provided by departments in four-year colleges and universities were analyzed for this study.

The 2002 data (like that in 1983) support a study of hiring into the assistant professor and instructor/lecturer ranks, promotion to the associate and full professor ranks, and selection of department chairpersons.

The Pool of Available Women History Ph.D.s 2002

History Faculty Members	27 % ¹
Chairpersons (1970-1995 cohort)	31.2 %
Full Professors (1970-1988 cohort)	24.7 %
Associate Professors (1989-1995 cohort)	37.7 %
Assistant Professors (1996-2002 cohort)	39.2 %
Instructors/Lecturers (1996-2002 cohort)	39.2 % ²

The committee developed the above statistics in order to be able to assess the extent to which the history departments in Southern colleges and universities have a pool of women with doctorates in history and appropriate experience to draw upon when they

¹ Robert Townshend, "New Data Reveals a Homogenous but Changing History Profession," *Perspectives* 40 (January 2002): 16; and Robert B. Townshend, "The Status of Women and Minorities in the History Profession," *AHA Perspectives On-Line*, April 2002, www.theaha.com, accessed September 2003

² AHA Guidelines for Hiring Women Historians in Academia, 3d Edition; 1982-1984 Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women in the Southern Historical Association, "A Statistical Report on the Participation of Women in the Southern Historical Association, 1935-1985," *Journal of Southern History* 52 (May 1986): 287 (hereafter cited as the June K. Burton report); 1999 Report of the SHA Committee on the Status of Women in the SHA; "History Ph.D. Production Hits 20-Year High," *AHA Perspectives On-Line*, January 2000, www.theaha.com, accessed 10 October 2001; Townshend, "The Status of Women and Minorities in the History Profession"; and Robert B. Townshend, "Slight Drop in the Number of New History Ph.D.s but Some Good News on Employment and Diversity," *AHA Perspectives On-Line*, January 2003, www.theaha.com, accessed September 2003.

hire, promote, and select chairpersons. The committee has utilized women as a percentage of total history faculty members in the nation as a benchmark for gauging the long-term record of Southern institutions in hiring women historians. For gauging the recent record for hiring women at the assistant professor rank, the committee has used national data for the production of history Ph.D.s during the most recent seven years. The committee has agreed that seven years at the assistant professor level is a reasonable estimate of the experience generally required before promotion to associate professor and that fourteen years at the assistant and associate professor level is a reasonable estimate of the experience generally required before promotion to full professor. The committee has agreed that departments of history generally draw their chairpersons from among associate and full professors. Based on these understandings of general requirements for minimum experience, the committee has used national data to calculate the percentage of women among the history doctorates with eight to fourteen years experience as the pool for promotion to associate professor, the percentage of women among the history doctorates with fourteen to thirty-two years experience as the pool for promotion to full professor, and the percentage of women among the history doctorates with eight to thirty-two years experience as the pool from which to select department heads.

**Women as Percentages of Full-time History Faculty
By Rank and Geography**

	1983	2002
Available Pool	16.6 %	27 %
All Departments	N=3105 14.6 %	N=3,169 28.2 %
Large Universities	N=1125 12.4 %	N=1,623 28.0 %
Middle-sized Univs and Colls	N=1214 14.7 %	N=1,195 27.5 %
Small Univs and Colls	N=732 16.9 %	N=276 28.6 %
Mountain States	N=466 9.9 %	N=461 25.8 %
Deep South		N=1,401 27.4 %
States with Highest Percentages (2002):	Maryland (N=277)	37.0 %
	D.C. (N=133)	36.1 %
States with the Lowest Percentages (2002):	Del. (N=49)	20.4%
	W.Va. (N=46)	21.7 %
	Ala. (N=145)	22.1 %
	Ky. (N=139)	22.3 %
	Mo. (N=197)	22.8 %

Women as a Percentage of Chairpersons in Southern Institutions 2002-03³

Available Pool	31.2 %	
All Departments N=212	17.0 %	
Large Universities N=60	8.3 %	
Middle-sized Us and Cs N=95	16.8 %	
Small Univs and Colls N=57	26.3 %	
Mountain States N=35	11.4%	
Deep South N=92	15.2 %	
States with Highest Percentages:	Delaware N=2	50.0 %
	D.C. N=9	42.9 %
	Arkansas N=9	40.0 %
	Maryland N=19	36.8 %

States with Lowest Percentages: There are **zero** women department chairpersons. in Ala. (N=12), Fla. (N=11), Ky. (N=11), Miss. (N=4), Mo. (N=14), and West Va. (N=4).

³For departments that include other fields, only those with historians as chairpersons were studied.

Women as Percentages of Full Professors 2002-03⁴

Pool		24.7 %
All Departments	N=1,256	15.1 %
Large Universities	N=659	14.1 %
Middle-sized Univs and Colls	N=486	15.6 %
Small Univs and Colls	N=101	20.8 %
Mountain States	N=201	9.0 %
Deep South	N=534	14.2 %
States with Highest Percentages:		
	Maryland N=102	31.4 %
	Delaware N=25	24.0 %
	D.C. N=52	23.0 %
States with the Lowest Percentages:		
	Ky. (N=66)	4.5 %
	W.Va. (N=21)	5.0 %
	Fla. (N=75)	9.3 %
	Ala. (N=51)	9.8 %
	Mo. (N=77)	11.7 %
	Ark. (N=34)	11.8 %
	S.C. (N=59)	11.9%

⁴The committee counted those holding academic chairs with no rank indicated as full professors.

**Percentage Female of All Full-time Historians in the South 2002-03
Studied by Academic Rank and Size of Department⁵
(N=3,120)
And 1982 Comparison Data**

Size	Chairs	Full Prof	Assoc Prof	Asst Prof	Inst/Lect
Available Pool	31.2 %	24.7 %	37.7 %	39.2 %	39.2 %
Large 20 or more N=1,649	8.3 %	14.1 %	32.2 %	44.6 %	45.0 %
Medium 7-19 N=1,195	16.8 %	15.6 %	31.5 %	38.9 %	48.5 %
Small 1-6 N=276	26.3 %	20.8 %	28.0 %	39.0 %	0 %
All Sizes (2002-03)	17.0 %	15.1 %	31.6 %	41.5 %	44.2 %
All Sizes (1982)	10.8 %	8.0 %	13.7 %	25.2 %	38.7 %

⁵ One large university has no ranks for faculty and is not included in this data.

Record in 2002-03 of the Departments of History of 1994-2003 SHA Presidents

Not one of these departments has women department chairs.

	President	Institution	Profs	Assoc	Asst	All Ranks
2003	Darlene Clark Hine	Michigan State U.	23.5%	60.0%	44.4%	42.6%
2002	Jacqueline Dowd Hall	UNC-Chapel Hill	17.6%	28.6 %	80.0%	26.1%
2001	Bertram Wyatt Brown	U. of Florida	7.1%	27.8%	37.5%	22.5%
2000	Drew Faust	U. of Pennsylvania	22.7%	55.6%	55.6%	35.0%
1999	James C. Cobb	U. of Georgia	0.0%	35.7%	40.0%	25.0%
1998	Carol L. Bleser	Clemson U.	10.0%	37.5%	33.0%	23.8%
1997	Paul K. Conkin	Vanderbilt U.	0.0 %	23.0%	60.0%	21.4%
1996	Harold D. Woodman	Purdue U.	6.3%	27.3%	83.3%	27.3%
1995	Dan T. Carter	Emory University	15.4%	53.8%	0.0%	30.0%
1994	Numan V. Bartley	U. of Georgia	0.0%	35.7%	40.0%	25.0%

This committee has confined its detailed analysis to universities located in the South, for it is opportunity for women historians in Southern colleges and universities that is the focus of this report. The committee cannot however help noting the outstanding records of Michigan State University and the University of Pennsylvania in hiring and promoting women historians. The committee also notes that whereas none of these ten departments have women department chairpersons, Darlene Clark Hine is an academic dean at Michigan State University. These two northern universities stand as a reminder to those of us who labor in the South that equity for women in the profession is achievable now.

Analysis

The committee is pleased to report that Southern colleges and universities, taken as a whole, have substantially improved their record of hiring women historians during the last nineteen years. In 2002-03, women's representation among historians employed in Southern colleges and universities is essentially equal to their representation in the profession. The mountain South and Deep South, however, have not yet met this goal.

The most serious finding was that women have not advanced to the rank of full professor nor have they been selected to serve as department chairpersons in proportion to availability within history departments in the South or in proportion to the national pool of Ph.D.s of appropriate experience. The mountain states, Deep South states, and large universities throughout the South have the worst record in these two areas. The most positive finding was that the large universities in the South have been recently hiring women Ph.D.s at a rate higher than the percentage of women in the Ph.D. historian workforce and have the highest in the South availability of women associate professors from which they can promote women to the full professor rank and select them as departmental chairpersons.

Regarding overall employment rate. Colleges and universities in the South, taken as a whole, have improved dramatically over the past nineteen years with regard to women as a percentage of the historians they employ. They have gone from about 2 % below the available pool of women historians to higher than the percentage of women available in the workforce with doctorates in history. Large departments have improved from a gap

of 4.2 % below the available pool to a percentage of women among their historians to 1 % above the percentage of women available in the workforce with doctorates in history. The committee calls on the profession to recognize this dramatic improvement.

The overall percentages, however, are somewhat distorted by the outstanding record of Maryland and Washington, D.C. (with 37.0 % and 36.1 % respectively of their historians being female). Colleges and universities in Delaware (20.4 %), West Virginia (21.7 %), Alabama (22.1 %), Kentucky (22.3 %), and Missouri (22.8 %) are well behind the rest of the South, with their percentages of women among historians employed by colleges and universities in their states more than 5 % below the pool of available women historians.

Regarding promotion to full professor. The committee compared the percentage of women who had earned doctorates in history fifteen to thirty-four years ago (24.7 %) to the percentage of women in 2002-03 at the rank of full professor (15.1 %), and a significant difference became apparent. When we broke down these statistics further, we got a fairer picture of the great variations among southern institutions. For example, among small colleges and universities in the South, 20.8 % of full professors are women, and among middle-sized universities, 15.5 % of full professors are women. But among the large universities taken as a whole, only 14.1 % are women. Large and middle-sized departments are well below the pool of women historians available for promotion to full professor. Large institutions have promoted to full professor only 57.1 % of the available pool of experienced women in the history doctorate workforce. Middle-sized have promoted to full professor only 62.8 % and small colleges 84.2 % of the pool available.

Geography is even more important than size of institution as a variable related to promotion to full professor. Kentucky (4.5 %) and West Virginia (5.0 %) need to approximately quintuple their percentages of women among full professors to equal the available pool of experienced women historians. Florida (9.3 %), Alabama (9.8 %), Missouri (11.7 %), Arkansas (11.8 %), and South Carolina (11.9 %) would need to more than double their percentages of women full professors.

At institutions in the South where recent presidents of the SHA were employed, two (University of Georgia and Vanderbilt University) have no full professors, and the percentages of women among full professors at the others range from 7.1 % to 17.6 %. This is well below the percentage of women among history Ph.D.s who earned their doctorates fifteen or more years ago (24.7 %). The records with regard to promotion of women to full professor of the southern universities where recent presidents of the SHA were employed are underwhelming.

The published version of the 1982-84 SHA ad hoc Committee on the Status of Women's report noted that "the lower percentage of women Ph.D.s ten to thirty years ago (10 to 16 percent) shows up in the low proportion of full professors who are women (7 percent) and the percentage of department heads who are women (10.8 percent)." The problem nineteen years ago of a low availability of experienced women available for promotion to full professor is to a large extent behind us now that women are approximately one-quarter of history faculty with fifteen or more years in the profession. The problem of women being underrepresented at the highest rank in Southern colleges and universities has, however, not only persisted but even worsened. Whereas nearly 25 % of the history faculty members with fifteen or more years of experience are women,

only a little more than 15 % of those promoted to full professor are women (60 % of the pool). At the largest universities, a little less than 14 % have been promoted to full professor. The difference between 14 or 15 % having been promoted and an available pool for promotion of nearly 25 % is substantial. Clearly, history departments at Southern colleges and university are not promoting women to full professor at anywhere near the rate that they are promoting men to that rank.

The committee notes that at least a few large universities in the South have worked hard to groom within their departments a woman assistant or associate professor of exceptional promise, providing support and perhaps reduced time from teaching, so that she would have a good prospect of publishing sufficiently for eventual promotion to full professor, only to find that she accepted a position elsewhere. This left them with no return on their investments, and they still have no or few women full professors. This committee applauds their efforts and urges them to continue and expand their programs to provide this kind of support. The profession in general has benefited from their efforts and will benefit more if more Southern universities provide, as they did, the kind of support that can enable young scholars to make a contribution to knowledge while enhancing their career opportunities.

Regarding selection as chairpersons of departments. The committee compared the percentage of women who had earned doctorates in history 8 to 34 years ago (31.2 %) to the percentage of women in 2002-03 serving as chairpersons of history departments (17.0 %), and an even greater difference became apparent. Here, there were major differences according to size of departments: 26.3 % of small colleges and universities have women chairpersons, whereas only 8.3% of large universities have women chairpersons. Large

universities (at 8.3 %) would need to nearly quadruple the number of women departmental chairpersons to equal the pool of experienced women historians available (31.2 %). Geographically, the mountain states (11.4 %) and the Deep South (15.2 %) are below average among southern colleges and universities. To provide equity, the mountain states would need to nearly triple their percentages of women as departmental chairpersons, and the Deep South states would need to double their percentages of women as departmental chairpersons.

In 1983, women were 10.8 % of department chairpersons in comparison to a 16 % availability (67.5 % of the pool); today women are 17 % of department heads but the availability of experienced women for the position is 31.2 % (54.5 % of the pool). Opportunity for women historians in the South to be department chairpersons has actually declined.

The fact that none of the history departments in the South where recent SHA presidents are employed are headed by women and that Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi and Missouri also have zero women department chairpersons demonstrates that the problem is serious. There is much work to be done in order to provide equal opportunity for women historians to work as departmental chairpersons in Southern colleges and universities.

Regarding promotion to associate professor rank. Analysis of the data at the associate professor rank indicates that opportunity for women in southern colleges and universities to be promoted to associate professor is limited but provides hope for the future. The available pool of women historians who earned their doctorates in the most recent eight

to fifteen years is 37.7 %, and the representation of women among associate professors at Southern colleges and universities is 31.6 %. Southern colleges and universities are promoting more of their male assistant professors to associate professor and fewer of their women assistant professors. Although women are thus underrepresented among associate professors at Southern colleges and universities taken as a whole, the difference of 6 % is smaller than at the full professor rank and among chairpersons. It appears that the senior faculty members who make recommendations for promotion of their colleagues have been comfortable with promoting a large number of women to the associate professor rank. The pattern at the associate professor rank by size of department is the opposite of the pattern for full professors and departmental chairpersons. The largest universities have a larger representation of women among associate professors (32.2 %) than the smaller colleges (28.0 %). Unfortunately, with the exception of Emory University (54.8 %), Clemson University (37.5 %), and the University of Georgia ((35.7 %), the universities where recent presidents of the SHA are employed have not promoted women to the associate professor rank at the average rate of large universities in the south (32.2 %) nor of the available pool (37.7 %). The range of women as a percent of associate professors at these universities is from a low of 23 % at Vanderbilt University to a high of 28.6 % at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. By geography, the percentages of women among associate professors at colleges and universities in the mountain states (33.3 %) and in the Deep South (31.8 %) are below the available pool (37.7 %) of women historians with seven to fourteen years of experience in the profession. Overall, southern departments of history have improved dramatically the number of women at the associate professor rank, but they have not

promoted women to associate professor at a rate equal to the available pool of women Ph.D.s with appropriate experience.

An important conclusion is that history departments in Southern colleges and universities have a rather large pool of women associate professors on their campuses from which to recommend promotion to full professor and selection as chairpersons. This is especially true at the large universities and in the geographical regions of the South where the under-representation of women among full professors and departmental chairpersons is the greatest. Calculations based on data from a small random sample of large state universities in the South indicate that between 17 and 46 % of the full professors earned their doctorates in 1970 or earlier; between 33 and 69 % earned their doctorates in 1973 or earlier. It appears that within the next five to ten years, there is likely to be room at the top in history departments. Perhaps by the time the next study of the status women historians employed in the South is undertaken in five or ten years, women will have found their place within the top echelons of history departments in Southern colleges and universities.

Regarding hiring at the assistant professor level. The committee notes with pleasure that women are slightly over-represented among historians at the assistant professor rank (41.5 %), when compared with the percentage of women among Ph.D.s earned in the most recent seven years (39.2 %). The American Historical Association attributes this to affirmative action. Given the fact that women are underrepresented at the associate and professor ranks, as well as among departmental chairpersons (in comparison to the pool of experienced women Ph.D.s), it is desirable that they be over-represented at the rank

from which future associate professors (and eventually) full professors and chairs will most likely be drawn. Here, at the assistant professor rank, in a pattern similar to that at the associate professor level, it is the large universities that have taken the lead in hiring women historians. Two of the universities where recent presidents of the SHA are employed—UNC at Chapel Hill (80 %) and Vanderbilt University (60 %)--have exemplary recent records of hiring women assistant professors (ranging from 42 % to 80 % of their assistant professors); only Emory University (0 %), Clemson University (33 %), and the University of Florida (37.5 %) are below the percentage in the pool of recently granted Ph.D.s (39.2 %). The middle-sized institutions (38.9 %) and small colleges (39.0 %) have hired women assistant professors very nearly at the rate that they are available (39.2 %). The mountain states (46.0 %) have hired women historians at greater than the available pool and the Deep South states rate of hiring women historians is less than 1 % below the available pool of recent women history Ph.D.s (39.2 %).

Conclusions

As we look back on the intervening nineteen years since the last study of the experiences of women historians employed in southern colleges and universities, we note the much larger pool of women Ph.D.s in history at the entry level as well as among those with long experience in the field. We are pleased to note the increase in the opportunity for young women historians to be employed in the professorial ranks at southern colleges and universities, evidenced by the rate of hiring into the assistant professor rank. This is an extremely important step toward providing equity for women historians in employment.

As was the case nineteen years ago, small colleges have the best overall record for hiring and promoting women historians and for selecting women as department chairpersons. And compared to nineteen years ago, the large universities and those in the mountain states still have the worst record for promoting women historians and for selecting women as department chairpersons. The Deep South has emerged as a lagging region in providing equity for women employed in history departments in southern colleges and universities.

In contrast with nineteen years ago, however, the large universities have recently taken the lead in hiring women historians at the assistant professor level and in promoting them to associate professor. The substantially larger number of women at the associate professor level (when compared with the smaller number nineteen years ago) provides a sizeable group of experienced women historians at the large universities from which to promote to full professor and select department chairpersons. One can hope that the large departments of history will capitalize on this window of opportunity to increase opportunities for women to be promoted to full professor or selected as chairpersons.

We regret to report that, taking the south as a whole and comparing the record at institutions of all sizes, women have not been promoted in proportion to the available pool of women historians. Looking at geography, only Maryland has equaled the available pool in promoting women to full professor; only Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina have equaled the available pool in promoting women to associate professor. Opportunity for women historians to advance through the professorial ranks in history departments in southern colleges and universities is still less than the opportunity for advancement enjoyed by male historians.

We are struck by the failure of southern colleges and universities, taken as a whole, to substantially increase the opportunity for women historians to advance to the rank of full professor or to serve as departmental chairpersons, despite the fact that the pool of women available for promotion to full professor is now about 25 % of active historians and for chairpersons is about 31 %. This under-representation of women among full professors is most evident at southern universities from which the SHA presidents have emerged, at large departments, and in the mountain south. The paucity of women serving as chairpersons is evident in all categories of colleges and universities studied, and is most evident at the institutions from which SHA presidents have been selected and at institutions in Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, and West Virginia, where there are no women department chairpersons. The scarcity is also obvious at large universities and in the mountain south, where institutions would need to nearly quadruple or triple (respectively) the number of women chairpersons to equal the available pool.

In most educational institutions, full professors or department chairpersons (or both) have the greatest role within the department in deciding or recommending to the university administration who will be appointed to open positions, who will be reappointed, who will be tenured, and who will be promoted. They also generally have a considerable role in the allocation of merit raises, travel funds, graduate assistants, financial support for research, appointment to committees within the department and elsewhere in the university that will enhance one's career (rather than absorb valuable hours with no favorable impact on career), and in countless other decisions made within departments that greatly influence the livelihood and future of today's young historians.

The opportunity to share in the exercise of this power within history departments should be open to women as well as men historians.

We regret to report that power (as measured by percent of full professors and of department chairs) in departments of history in the South at this time remains disproportionately in the hands of males. This is despite the increased pool of mature female historians that has developed since the 1982 study.

The under-representation of women among full professors and department chairpersons has likely contributed to the persisting salary gap between male and female historians employed in higher education in the nation and in the South. In virtually all colleges and universities, full professor average pay is higher than that of the lower ranks. In many colleges and universities, department chairpersons are rewarded for their service to the university with salaries higher than the average for their rank. Equal opportunity for promotion and for selection as department chairperson is important to improving equity for women in compensation.

Recommendations

1. That a special ad hoc SAWH Committee on the Status of African-American Women Historians of the South be created to develop a collaborative effort with the Association of Black Women Historians. Its purpose will be two-fold: to develop a database that will enable statistical analysis of the status of African-American women's experiences as faculty in history and social studies departments in Southern colleges and universities and to focus on African-American women who study the history of the South regardless of their geographic location to determine the level of their participation in the Southern

Historical Association and in the Southern Association for Women Historians. That the ad hoc SAWH Committee on the Status of African-American Women Historians of the South, in its joint effort with the ABWH, work with historians active in other professional organizations, such as but not limited to the SHA Committee on Women, the SHA Committee on Minorities, the American Historical Association, and others interested in improving the status of African-American women in the history profession, as well as with African-American women employed in history and social studies departments in historically minority and historically majority colleges and universities. That the ad hoc committee include among its members historians who have sufficient clout and contacts with African-American historians who study the South and those who are employed in the South. And further, that the officers of the SAWH lend their personal and professional support to this ad hoc SAWH committee.

Rationale: This committee is aware of the dearth of studies focused on the experiences and status of African-American women historians employed in colleges and universities in the South. We heeded the request of the SAWH Executive Council that this committee expand its study of the status of women historians to include African-American women employed in colleges and universities in the South. The study we have produced and now present for the approval of the SAWH Council, based on conclusions that can be drawn from the *Directory of History Departments and Organizations in the United States and Canada, 28th edition, 2002-03*, is a study of all women historians employed in Southern colleges and universities, including African-American, Asian, Hispanic and

other minority women. The data, however, provides no way to identify the race of the historians listed.

This committee notes that the American Historical Association has regularly concluded that a sufficiently large enough sample for analysis by race/ethnicity has not been achieved. We also note that the 2002 SHA Committee on Women survey instrument asks faculty members to identify the respondents by race/ethnicity, raising the possibility that a sizeable sample of African-American responses has now been developed.

At our 2002 meeting in Baltimore, this committee discussed at length strategies for developing a database on African-American historians in the South large enough for analysis. Given the concentration of large numbers of African-American historians in historically black colleges and universities, and the fact that departments of history and social studies in these historically black colleges and universities have been disproportionately unlikely to respond to national surveys,⁶ we discussed possible ways to engender responses from these institutions. Given the relatively small number of African-American women Ph.D.s, we considered studying faculty members with Master of Arts degrees in history as well as those with doctorates in history. We discussed the possibility of attempting to obtain mailing lists from African-American associations of historians and of women historians.

Devising a way to induce nearly all African American women historians employed in the South to participate in a study appears to us to be the key to developing a sufficiently large database to produce significant statistical results. In our judgment, this

⁶ Historically black colleges and universities are underrepresented in the American Association of University Professors annual salary survey, in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* annual salary survey, and in the *American Historical Association Directory of History Departments*.

will require personal contact with African-American women historians employed at historically black colleges and universities as well as with African-American women historians employed at historically white colleges and universities in the South, to gather employment data similar to that in the *AHA Directory of History Departments* and to encourage the prompt return of questionnaires on other topics to be designed and distributed.

Recognizing that many African-American women historians studying Southern history reside outside of the South and yet are active members of the Southern Historical Association and the SAWH, this committee suggests that the proposed ad hoc SAWH Committee on the Status of African American Women Historians of the South, in coordination with the Association of Black Women Historians, undertake a study of African-American women historians' role in the Southern Historical Association similar to the more inclusive study done in 1982 of all women's participation in the Southern Historical Association. The 1982 study examined women's representation among SHA members, on the SHA Executive Council and Committees, as presenters, chairs and commenters on the SHA program, as recipients of prizes, and as authors, reviewers, and members of the Board of Editors of the *Journal of Southern History*.⁷ The ad hoc committee may also wish to study similar issues with regard to African-American women's participation in and opportunity within the SAWH. It may well wish to develop a survey instrument that would address other important issues.

This ad hoc Committee on the Status of Women in the South perceives this effort as a three-step process. First, we have prepared a report regarding certain aspects of employment opportunity for women historians employed in Southern colleges and

⁷ June K. Burton Report.

universities that includes all races and ethnic groups. Second, we propose a study of the status and opportunities of African-American women employed in Southern colleges and universities. Third, we propose a study of all African American women historians engaged in the study of the history of the South. These studies overlap each other in many ways. Each, we expect, will take several years of effort. The studies, each disseminated widely at the time of completion, will together provide a rich understanding of the role of women historians of the South.

2. That this report be widely disseminated.

A. That it be sent to the SHA Council and the SHA Committee on the Status of Women in the SHA.

B. That it be sent to the AHA.

C. That it be published in the SAWH Newsletter.

D. That it be sent to all chairpersons of departments of history at four-year colleges and universities in the south.

3. That the SAWH leadership engage with the SHA Committee on the Status of Women and the SHA Council to devise strategies for utilizing the considerable influence of the SHA to work toward increasing opportunities for promotion for women historians working in southern four-year colleges and universities.

4. That the SAWH call on former presidents of the Southern Historical Association to bring the results of this study to the attention of promotion and tenure committees and

departmental chairpersons at their home universities and to use their considerable prestige to work toward equity for women in the departments in which they work.

5. That the SAWH draw to the attention of its members, the Southern Historical Association, departments of history in southern colleges and universities, and women historians employed at southern colleges and universities the importance of mentoring assistant professors during their first seven years employed at a professorial rank, to ease their transition from graduate student to practicing professional and assist them in making choices that will affect their tenure and promotion prospects.

6. That a SAWH ad hoc Committee on the Status of Women Historians in the South be appointed for a two-year term (by agreement of the incoming President and Vice-President) to work toward publicizing this report.

7. That the SAWH establish by its by-laws a standing Committee on the Status of Women in the South to function two years out of every five years, beginning in 2005 (i.e., 2005-07, 2010-12, and so on).