The Impact of COVID-19 on Academic Leadership and Decision-Making

AUTHOR
Adrianna Kezar, Ph.D. (1)

Affiliation: (1) Pullias Center and Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success, University of Southern California

Communicating Author:
Adrianna Kezar, Ph.D.
Professor and Director of the Pullias Center and Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success
University of Southern California
Waite Phillips Hall 703C
3470 Trousdale Parkway
Los Angeles, CA 90089
Tel 323-632-9413
kezar@rossier.usc.edu

This chapter is divided into three sections that explore the impact of COVID-19 on academic leadership and decision-making. The first section presents the long-standing leadership and decision-making contexts that have shaped gender inequalities in higher education. The second section focuses on decision-making and leadership since the pandemic started and ways the pandemic has exacerbated and brought into sharp relief historical inequalities. The third section focuses on decision-making and leadership approaches that can be used to promote better outcomes and equity and that are helpful for navigating in times of crisis.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF GENDER INEQUITY IN LEADERSHIP AND DECISION-MAKING

The decision-making context on campuses is an important backdrop to understand how gender equity has been in jeopardy for decades. This section first outlines long-standing gender disparities in leadership representation on college campuses followed by a description of the long-standing biases in employment practices that result from having largely white, male leaders. The section also reviews studies that demonstrate how when women assume leadership, they have been documented to eradicate gender inequalities, implying the importance of a diverse representation of leaders. As context for the current pandemic leadership and decision-making, forces that are amplifying and have increased gender and race inequalities, such as the "gig academy"[1] and responses to the 2008 global recession, are also reviewed. Finally, this section describes how the global pandemic has regressively shaped gender inequalities in the workforce.

---

[1] The Gig Academy was termed by Kezar, DePoala, and Scott (2019) to capture the ways that corporate gig economy practices, such as hiring contingent labor or outsourcing, have been adopted by colleges and universities across the country.

Historical Gender-Based Disparities in Leadership Representation

Within higher education, women have a long history of underrepresentation in academic leadership roles (Glazer-Raymo, 2001). For decades, presidents, provosts (chief academic officers), and deans across most fields have predominantly been men (Allan, 2008; Wenniger, 2002). Over time, the representation of women has slowly increased, from 9 percent of female presidents in the 1970s to 30 percent in 2017. The underrepresentation of female presidents is particularly puzzling because they are more likely to have a doctoral degree than their male counterparts and more likely to have served as provost or chief academic officer (ACE, 2017). Women who are appointed president, provost, or to other senior roles tend to be appointed at institutions with less prestige and fewer resources, which may exacerbate their management challenges and limit future leadership opportunities (ACAD, 2009; ACE, 2018). In terms of gender diversity among board leadership, the numbers are also low and have improved only slightly since 2010. Only 30 percent of board members are women and the proportion is higher among public boards (ACE, 2017).[2] The number of women on governing boards has not changed in over two decades. This suggests that at the very top of the institution where the primary authority for decisions rest, institutions have been unable to make progress towards equity (Rall, Morgan, and Commodore, 2020).

Data for other leadership roles have not been as consistently tracked. In 2008, 33 percent of women were in provost roles. The number of women in provost positions actually declined to 26 percent between 2008 and 2013, which may have been due to the last recession (ACE, 2016, 2017). In 2000, less than 25 percent of deans were woman (Wolverton and Gonzalez, 2000). In

---

[2] Women's initial numbers on boards were often based on their inclusion at religiously based institutions where nuns had leadership roles.

2008, 28 percent of deans were woman (ACAD, 2009). Deanships are often a pathway to further-up administration and their numbers have only gone up slightly over the years. When examining for differences by discipline, there are many schools where women historically are not well represented, including the science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and medicine (STEMM) disciplines and medicine. According to 2018 AAMC data, only 16 percent of medical school deans are women and 18 percent of department chairs (AAMC, 2018). In 2015, there were only 52 women deans of 358 total deans within schools of engineering. Additionally, women deans tend to make less money than their counterparts (AAMC, 2018; CUPA, 2019). Thus, when data is disaggregated, further inequities behind the representation of women are typically identified. Women have steadily increased in department chair roles over time. In 1991, 90 percent of department chairs were men. Department chairs were also largely white, with only 3 percent of department chairs being of color in 1991. A decade later, 25 percent of chairs were women, and that figure continues to increase (Carrol and Wolverton, 1991). In 2016, 45 percent of respondents to surveys of department chairs were men, suggesting significant gains in gender diversity among chairs over time (Flaherty, 2016).[3] It is believed that close to 40 percent of department chairs are women (Flaherty, 2016).

Women of color are highly underrepresented within leadership roles in higher education (ACE, 2017). They have been less than 5 percent of college presidents from the1980s through the 2000s and just recently met the 5 percent threshold. Woman of color are also less likely to emerge into and hold other senior academic positions and hold only 7 percent of all senior administrative positions. For example, they comprise only 3 percent of chief academic officers compared to 6 percent men of color and 33 percent for white women (King and Gomez, 2008).

---

[3] This is not the number of men, but the greater number of responses from women chairs was seen as a sign of their increased number.

As women rise into leadership positions, they report feeling overwhelmed and less compensated relative to men even when they report being more skilled at building relationships and working with people (Eddy and Ward, 2017). Women leaders also report that they are judged less fairly and evaluated more harshly when they are in leadership roles (Eddy and Ward, 2017). Additionally, there are expectations of women for emotional labor, relationship building, and service/support work that are not placed on men in leadership roles. Studies report dozens of different challenges such as role incongruence that leads to greater dissatisfaction (Eddy and Ward, 2017; Fitzgerald, 2013).

Various studies have explored and documented the reasons for women's historical underrepresentation in academic leadership positions. These reasons include the "chilly" climate where women are treated in a discriminatory fashion becoming even "colder at the top," to embedded attitudes in academia favoring men's advancement, to organizational work policies that make it challenging for women to succeed, such as work-life balance and tenure policies, which make it challenging for women to have families, to women also having less access to networks that would help them to move up in the ranks of administration, to being less likely to receive mentoring and support, to societal stereotyping of men and women that favors male traits, to women not neatly fitting into male cliques and becoming more isolated (Allen, 2011; Dean, Bracken, and Allen, 2009; Eddy and Ward, 2017; Glazer-Raymo, 2001). While they face numerous barriers, women have limited or no support structures as well. For example, there are a shortage of working-mother role models and women mentors (Eddy and Ward, 2017). Data about women presidents and provosts demonstrate that they are less likely than men in these roles to be married or to have children and more likely to have altered their career for a dependent or spouse, suggesting that women find it more difficult to balance a family and

leadership roles (ACE, 2017). Woman of color face additional challenges compared to white women. Bridges et al. (2007) cited biased perceptions of leaders of color and their capacity to lead; this is often the result of conscious or unconscious reliance on existing stereotypes. Women of color leaders in academe report tokenism and stereotyping as contributing to isolation, loneliness, and burnout (Bridges et al., 2007).

Gender Disparities in Decision-Making in Higher Education

Decades of data suggest that leaders who have been largely white men have made decisions that favor men and have created organizational structures that appear gender neutral, but that are biased to favor men (Bilimoria and Liang, 2012). Campuses maintain a masculine ideal worker myth in which faculty and staff can be fully devoted and unencumbered by outside familial obligations (Gardner, 2013; Morimoto and Zajicek, 2014). These ideal worker views are embedded into all of the academic structures such as narrow indicators of academic excellence and tenure and promotion policies (Bailyn, 2003; Sonnert and Holton, 1995). Evaluation criteria disadvantage women of color most of all, with women of color less likely than white women or men of any racial group to be awarded tenure (Leggon, 2006; Lisnic, Zajicek, and Morimoto, 2018). Evaluation criteria and the challenge of fairly receiving tenure may account for and be a road block for women of color going into academic leadership. While all academics with families must navigate competing demands of work and childrearing, women have particular difficulty negotiating tenure clock demands with the "biological clock" of childbearing (Bilimoria and Liang, 2012) and many institutions resist policies designed to pause tenure clocks during parental leave (Clarke, 2020). While publication is often the main criteria in many STEMM disciplines for tenure at research universities, advancement at other institutional types is also based on student evaluations, which consistently rate men higher than women due to

implicit bias (Nentwich, 2006). Women face pay and grant-funding disparities that also reflect

bias that favor men (Bailyn, 2003). These are just a sampling of the dozens of documented

disparities that affect women faculty in particular but have outsized impacts later as they rise into

leadership roles. These barriers to faculty are critical as they shape the pool for women leaders.

Women's representation in leadership is critical for closing equity gaps and making

institutions more equitable workplaces (Bilen-Green and Froelich, 2010). Scholars have

hypothesized that more women in strategic leadership positions would ameliorate work policy

obstacles due to their knowledge of these barriers, as well as improve networking possibilities

which might facilitate more equal participation of women within the academy (Bilen-green et

al., 2008; Langan, 2019). Data supports this hypothesis with Bilen-green et al. (2008) identifying

relationships between the prevalence of women in strategic leadership positions and the

associated impact on support for women in various professorial ranks. Bilen-green et al.'s study

(2008) documents that women presidents resulted in more women faculty in full and tenure-track

appointments.

Langan (2019) using data on department chairs in economics, sociology, accounting, and

political science from 200 institutions over 35 years shows that woman department chairs

narrowed three gender gaps: (1) assistant professors who work more years under a woman

department chair have smaller gender gaps in publication and tenure; (2) the gender earnings gap

decreases in the years after a woman replaces a man as a chair; and (3) as a result of replacing a

man with a woman as department chair, the number of women incoming graduate students

increased by 10 percent without affecting the number of men. As women have moved into

leadership roles, they have addressed work-life challenges due to the male norms that dominate

workplaces and policies by adopting tenure clock stop provisions and work-life balance policies

and centers (Wolfinger, Mason, and Goulden, 2008). These are examples of a larger body of work suggesting that the representation of women in leadership has important and meaningful implications for creating equitable college and university environments and reversing gender-neutral policies that have had detrimental impacts on women. The collective data about women in higher education leadership roles suggest long-term underrepresentation that has negatively affected progress toward equity, since data suggests woman are more likely to make progress on these issues than men (Bilen-green, et al., 2008; Langan, 2019).

Changing Nature of Decision-Making under Academic Capitalism and the Gig Academy

Part of the lack of progress of women moving into leadership during the last few decades can be associated with the rise of academic capitalism (starting in mid-1980s) and the gig academy (starting around 2000) (Kezar, DePaolo, and Scott, 2019; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004). Academic capitalism privileges the *marketization, individualism*, and *privatization* of institutional operations as organizing principles for higher education that favors managers, market-based interests, hierarchy, and elite's interests and at the same time a move away from a public or collective good, equity imperative, worker empowerment and participation in decision-making, community and organizing among workers. Marketization is promoted by adopting a corporate logic; that is, universities are best operated as businesses and through corporate approaches to management (Kezar, DePaolo, and Scott, 2019). Individualism is achieved by promulgating values of entrepreneurialism so that workers see themselves as solely responsible for revenue generation and competing with others. Privatization is achieved through market-based values that defund public higher education and encourage a competition for scarce resources.

Values of individualism/entrepreneurialism, marketization, and the privatization of higher education shape academic decision-making and work against goals of equity and therefore disfavor advancement of women and racialized minorities. This rationality can be seen in various changes on campus, particularly around employment practices and working conditions, such as the expansion of the contingent labor force. Nearly 70 percent of the faculty are not on the tenure track, and women are over represented in this group (AAUP, 2017). Additionally, this trend also manifests in the "outsourcing" of staff members, who are also predominantly women, especially among administrative staff as well as the large and rising number of postdoctoral scholars, research contingent faculty, and graduate students, now categorized as workers versus apprenticeships (Kezar, DePaolo, and Scott, 2019). Many part-time faculty contingent positions pay only $24,000 a year (the national average), fall below the poverty level, typically have no benefits, nor any other form of crucial support such as professional development. As women and racialized minorities are moving into the graduate student, postdoc, and professoriate ranks, all of these positions have become low pay, deprofessionalized, and contingent (Kezar, DePaolo, and Scott, 2019).

Under this framework, tenure-track faculty are now incentivized to be entrepreneurial faculty stars who are rewarded for bringing in substantial grants, patents, and licenses. Faculty that do service work, mentoring, and student support—typically women and faculty of color—are often less successful in tenure-track jobs. Fields that are harder to monetize, such as the humanities (also with much larger percentages of women) have gone into decline, and the growth has been in fields that can be monetized such as technology or chemistry, that are largely male (Berube and Ruth, 2015). Under the gig academy operating model, generating innovations

and pursuing their commercial dissemination via technology transfer becomes the most encouraged and rewarded activity for faculty.

As a result of corporate and market logics, decision-making power has been increasingly concentrated among administrators and academic managers who come into academe from other sectors of the economy and are largely white men (Kezar, DePaolo, and Scott, 2019). Gig academy logic is premised on a managerial class that maintains decision-making power to continue to maximize profits and institutional benefits. They are thus increasingly separate— both in terms of function and in terms of experience and knowledge base—from the actual processes involved in teaching and learning. The gig academy brings about a growing separation between the administration and faculty/staff through this growing class of middle management, which has grown over 400,000 workers in the last few decades. Simultaneously, there has been a decline of shared governance that is not seen as aligned with corporate management approaches. In prior decades, faculty and administrators made decisions jointly through a system of shared governance. Faculty members' professional expertise was considered important to making decisions about curriculum and teaching and learning environments. Shared governance helped to facilitate positive relationships and communication between administrators and faculty as they made decisions together about important areas related to academic programs. Yet in this new gig academy, shared governance has gone into decline. For example, national studies of faculty found a significant decline in tenure-track faculty participation in governance and consistently reported feelings of having less influence over important campus matters (Finkelstein, Conley, and Schuster, 2016; Schuster and Finkelstein, 2006). With faculty showing significantly less influence on issues like campus priorities and budgets, while being saddled with more local service responsibilities that underutilize their expertise, like course scheduling, decisions of

consequence come to rest with the exclusive and largely unchallenged authority of a few senior administrators, who are generally men.

IMPACT OF THE 2008 RECESSION AND THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC BEYOND HIGHER EDUCATION

In addition to the gig academy, the global recession from 2008 to 2013 also amplified gender inequities. This recession had several indicators of gender inequalities that emerged. The most significant changes in gender distribution from the recession relate to faculty member composition as campuses hired more adjunct faculty—the percentage went from 48 percent to 52 percent (AAUP, 2017; Kezar, DePaolo, and Scott, 2019). It also impacted women faculty salary; women faculty members earned 2.9 percent less than men faculty members, and when bringing in other factors the pay gap increased to 3.7 percent and occurs across all colleges and disciplines—with more than 4,500 institutions included, and controlling for rank (Calka, 2020). The 2008 recession saw many decisions being made that had gender and race disparity for students, particularly tuition increases that negatively impacted enrollment and retention of students of color and low-income students reducing the diversity of applicants into graduate school and for faculty positions (Mitchell, Leachman, and Masterson, 2017).

In terms of leadership representation, the historical trends of the steady, if limited, growth of women presidents and department chairs over time does not suggest that the previous recession had a dramatic impact on women's movement into all leadership roles. Yet, the decline of women provosts (from 2008 to 2013), no progress with women board members, and low rise in deans may indicate impact from the recession. Alternatively, given women's steady rise in number in educational settings and progressive movement into more advanced roles—

undergraduate and graduate enrollments, rise in tenure-track faculty and full faculty over time—the slowing down of women in leadership seems a possible indicator of the recession slowing women's progress into leadership roles. Additionally, faculty, staff, and administrative gender and racial disparities have not been examined much in the data related to the last recession (Zumeta, 2010). Further mining of the data may identify further inequalities (Mitchell, Leachman, and Masterson, 2017).

The current pandemic appears to be quite different in terms of its pronounced impact on women, and economic data appear to show impact immediately on women. While other chapters in this volume focus on the larger economic impact on women, a summary of one study suggests how these broader trends are likely shaping academe as well. McKinsey's study (2020) identified that COVID-19 is having a negative effect on gender equality. Their study identified that women's employment is 1.8 times more vulnerable to this crisis than men's employment. Women make up 39 percent of global jobs but account for 54 percent of overall job losses. In the United States, women made up 46 percent of workers before COVID-19; however, unemployment data indicate that women make up 54 percent of the overall job losses to date. The burden of unpaid care for children and elderly are shaping these figures. Women do an average of 75 percent of the world's total unpaid care work, including childcare, caring for the elderly, and household work. Attitudes also shape how women experience the economic consequences of a crisis relative to men. Stereotypical views about the role of women make it more likely for them to feel pressure to leave work as well as be more likely to be let go. These biases are reflected in current decisions about who keeps their job and does not, at the organizational level and within the family (McKinsey, 2020). Various international policy organizations have been recommending that businesses, industries, governments, and other

groups should be attentive to and respond to these gender inequities (International Labor Organization, 2020).

The history of gender underrepresentation in leadership, gender inequities in academic decision-making, gig academy context, recent global recession, and current pandemic findings outside higher education suggests that the pandemic will likely exacerbate long-standing gender inequalities in women's advancement into leadership as well as decisions that shape gender inequalities. Women's advancement into tenure-track faculty lines has been significantly altered by academic capitalism and the gig academy. These trends are also likely responsible for the slowdown in diversifying leadership such as boards and provosts, where we have seen no or little progress on gender parity. All these forces culminate in a set of reactions that played out on campuses over 2020.

PANDEMIC DECISION-MAKING, IMPACTS ON GENDER INEQUALITIES, SUGESTED IMPROVEMENTS

Pandemic Governance and Decision-Making

With the gig academy pushing decision-making more to boards and administrations that are largely white and male, campuses had already seen a retraction on equity that is now being further exacerbated during the pandemic (Flaherty, May 21, June 30, and September 22, 2020). Shared governance has been in decline for years, but has now receded even more on most campuses. Since the pandemic occurred, there have been dozens of examples of reported overreach among governing boards making unilateral decisions without input from faculty, staff, and sometimes even the administration (Flaherty, June 30 and September 22, 2020; Friga, 2020). Significant financial decisions have been made at a variety of institutions unilaterally and

resulting in AAUP sanctions. For example, Canisius College, Illinois Wesleyan University, Keuka College, Marian University, Medaille College, National University, and Wittenberg University, at the time of this writing, are all being investigated by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) to determine whether these colleges and universities have overstepped their purview and deviated from AAUP's widely followed principles of academic governance during the pandemic, particularly when laying off tenured faculty members (Redden, 2020). The AAUP has received dozens of complaints from faculty members about unilateral decisions and actions taken by their governing boards and administrations related to finances, return to campus, how courses are taught, suspending key institutional regulations, reducing and closing departments and majors, compelling faculty members to teach in person, reducing or cutting payments into retirement plans, and laying off long-serving faculty members (Flaherty, May 21 and September 22, 2020).

According to COACHE data,[4] faculty generally rated leadership and academic governance better in late March and April than in September (COACHE, 2020). This early positive rating was due to the quick response of campuses to close down in the face of an emergency. However, since May, as administrations have not returned to seeking input after the immediate emergency turned into a longer-term plight, faculty have registered concerns of being left out of decision-making processes for months, particularly on decisions that shape domains of teaching and learning but also more broadly to significant decisions about program closures, finances, and layoffs. Researchers noted based on follow-up interviews to understand trend data: "faculty were generally appreciative of college leadership and the decision-making processes

---

[4] COACHE (Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education) is a database of faculty and academic leader's views among several hundred college campuses administered out of Harvard. It is a research-practice partnership between academic institutions and COACHE that administers surveys to participating institutions and provides data to them to support the improvement of faculty work-life.

producing decisions that protected their health and safety (e.g., shifting to remote teaching) and career anxieties (e.g., extending tenure clocks and suspending student evaluations of teaching)." However, these same COACHE partners hypothesized "that attitudes towards leadership and the machinery of governance probably worsened as the pandemic continued" (10). There was a decline in the rating of senior leadership, governance trust, governance purpose, governance understanding, governance adaptability, governance productivity, as well as ratings of appreciation and recognition from leadership. Health and retirement benefits and personal and family benefits were noted as areas of concern. Additionally, there were concerns about being able to effectively conduct the work of research, service, and teaching. It is also important to note faculty perceptions related to leadership and governance were similar across all institutions regardless of institution type. COACHE data about leadership explores issues such as trust, engagement, and relationships with senior leaders, all of which were seen to be in decline in their later survey. Departmental leadership was seen in a more positive light and did not experience the same downturn as senior and division administration.

As noted earlier, members of boards and administrators are no longer largely coming up through the ranks of the professoriate and therefore may not be as knowledgeable on issues around teaching and learning. The administrators that lead institutions are increasingly accountants, lawyers, and human relations personnel that are from outside academe. One story in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* showcased this dilemma at Rutgers University (Taylor, 2020). The story profiled how that institution's adoption of corporate logic eroded faculty governance and increased administrative bloat. In its last report to the Department of Education, Rutgers said it had 312 management-level non-medical staff, most of those—233—were not and had not been faculty members. The Rutgers case indicates that almost no teaching faculty were

involved in any of the critical decisions made around COVID-19. Johns Hopkins University was also profiled for the hiring of academic managers and recent unilateral cuts (Furstenberg, 2020; Flaherty, September 22, 2020). These stories are examples of an overall trend of campuses making decisions that may compromise equity because those who are making decisions do not represent demographically or experientially the skills needed to make decisions. Current governance trends are working in opposition to best practices in crisis and equity leadership. In fact, these trends work against the best practices of effective organizations that typically have a more shared leadership and governance approach described later in the chapter (Kezar and Holcombe, 2017).

Impact of Current Decision-Making on Gender Inequalities

The gender dynamics that are playing out in the global economy and within the United States across economic sectors are also playing out in higher education in terms of gender inequality in the workplace (Flaherty, August 20, 2020; Pettit, 2020). Decision-making on campuses is being made in a gender-neutral way, which generally reflects past patterns of inequitable decisions by academic leaders noted above. Because shared governance has been compromised within higher education, many campuses are experiencing a heightening of gender inequalities.

Various initial studies identified the impact of the pandemic on women faculty's productivity that mirrors the general pattern for women in other professions and in the data noted above for the global economy, which are documented in other chapters (Flaherty, April 21, 2020; Viglione, 2020; Vincent-Lamarre, Sugimoto, and Larivière, 2020). In addition to productivity issues, there are also economic concerns. Data suggests initial financial decisions are already having a negative impact on gender equity. The Bureau of Labor Statistics identified that

360,000 part-time positions were eliminated between March 2020 and August 2020 (Bureau of

Labor Statistics, 2020). As noted earlier, women are overrepresented in part-time or adjunct

faculty and staff roles. The majority of these job losses were part-time faculty members. Moving

women into contingent positions put them in danger of losing their positions, which they did.

These declines in hiring of tenure-track faculty and the increased hiring of women in non-tenure-

track faculty lines that are losing their job, suggests that there are fewer women that will be

available for leadership roles in the future and may affect the future diversification of women

into faculty and leadership roles. Additionally, faculty and academic affairs are being asked to

take the brunt of many budget reductions, and faculty leaders have been questioning why they

have not seen equivalent proposals for downsizing administration and other cost centers and

greater transparency with the budget (Flaherty, September 2020). Budgetary decisions favoring

the administrative interests over faculty inherently favors men who occupy many more

administrative positions and the most secure faculty positions.

Additionally, full-time faculty faced reduced incomes due to furloughs and decreased

contributions to retirement. Longstanding data shows pay disparities between men and women in

academe (AAMC, 2018; AAUP, 2018), so salary inequities are being compounded by the

pandemic and recession—particularly for households headed by women or single women. There

are a myriad other prior inequities that are exacerbated by women having to take on additional

responsibilities during the pandemic—ability to obtain grants, receiving awards, fewer resources

for laboratories and the like (Flaherty, August 20, 2020).

The impacts of inequalities are further compounded for women of color. For women of

color, being asked to return to campus to teach in person has more dire impacts given more

people of color are dying during the pandemic. Faculty of color take on more mentoring of

16

students, which could also lead to greater exposure to the disease (Sprague and Massoni, 2005). Women of color are often excluded from informal networks, and this may mean they miss out on important communications, decision-making, and opportunities to collaborate that assist in a more rapid return to research productivity (Lampman, Crew, Lowery, and Tompkins, 2016). They are also more likely to be negatively evaluated in their teaching and to experience bullying in the classroom, creating additional stress and potentially further impacting their productivity (Galbraith and Jones, 2010; Lampman, Crew, Lowery, and Tompkins, 2016).

As a result of these negative impacts on women faculty and staff, a variety of recommendations have been made for supporting them. Campuses as well as state systems have issued recommendations to guide local decision-making and include the following areas:

1. Do not utilize student evaluations that have been shown to be gender biased.
2. Examine promotion and tenure processes for ways women's slowed productivity will not hurt them in the long run.
3. Provide emergency childcare and family care.
4. Provide faculty with care responsibilities with greater flexibility around research and teaching demands.
5. Waive the demand for nonessential campus service for those with caretaking demands.
6. Have the leaders acknowledge the increased demands on women faculty.
7. Clarify expectations for faculty to relieve stress and provide options for their workload.
8. Search and hiring committees should ask future candidates to include a statement regarding if and how COVID-19 affected their research, publishing, or teaching opportunities.

9. Invest additional resources in mentoring programs to support new scholars that may have a more difficult transition given disruptions in their academic programs and research and the potential for continued disruption (Gonzalez and Griffin, 2020).

Other chapters in the report look more deeply at these policies and practices and they are noted here as areas that leaders and decision-makers should be focused on and aware of. Specific advice about tenure clock policies, for example, are offered in other papers. Yet, it is important for leaders to understand the broad range of issues that should be considered and the many policies that could currently benefit from alteration. Leaders have several resources to support them in these decisions including Gonzalez and Griffin (2020), who describe appropriate ways to implement stop-the-clock policies, approaches to faculty evaluations that are often biased toward women and scholars of color, ways to support faculty and their transition to online learning, and acknowledge and reward women/women of color who are often taking on the majority of service and emotional labor to support students during this difficult time. Yet there is some emerging advice and lessons around decision-making processes and leadership to guide the development of these policies and practices so needed at this point in time.

Suggestions for Improving Decision-Making during the Pandemic

There are some emerging data points about ways that leaders can make decisions, govern, and be accountable in ways that are gender inclusive and help to eradicate growing equity gaps. The predominant approaches include at least three strategies: (1) utilizing the expertise of existing diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) staff to inform decision-making processes; (2) creating new structures to address decision-making needs; and (3) altering existing processes to include more voices and decision-making. A few campuses have begun to think about the long-

term implications of the pandemic and to recommend strategies to address this issue such as revised strategic plans aimed at ameliorating equity gaps.

Utilizing Existing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Staff

A case study of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, exemplifies the approach of capitalizing on existing DEI staff as well as some other key practices that can be instructive for other campuses (Clark, Mickey, and Misra, 2020). The changes made at the University of Massachusetts included altering tenure, promotion, and review policies; creating a modified evaluation process highlighting the need for documentation and adapted teaching expectations and evaluations; suspending teaching evaluations, establishing emergency funds for childcare and technology, and accommodating salary increases at the time of promotion based on productivity losses; and formally recognizing the intensified caregiving demands. An optional Pandemic Impact Statement was provided for faculty to include in their annual review, promotion, and tenure cases. It is important to note that they are one of the few campuses to have such a comprehensive array of changes responding to the pandemic and gender inequality issues (Clark, Mickey, and Misra, 2020).

Clark, Mickey, and Misra's (2020) analysis of the leadership that resulted in these changes is that units across campus sought out the advice of the ADVANCE[5] staff, as well as other staff members on campus with expertise in diversity, equity, and inclusion. Additionally, there was a great deal of coordination across campus units to share ideas about equity recommendations for supporting women faculty and staff. They identify this openness as part of the culture change that ADVANCE had been able to create in terms of a shared commitment and

---

[5] ADVANCE is a program funded by the National Science Foundation to increase the number of and support for women faculty and faculty of color in STEM.

leadership to sustainable equity. They also had strong senior leadership who vocalized and made equity a priority, who met regularly with the ADVANCE team, and that both listened to faculty needs and was responsive. Another effort to include the expertise of existing DEI leaders on campus is illustrated in the letter from Chief Diversity Officers to academic leaders within the University of California system (https://diversity.universityofcalifornia.edu/policies-guidelines/covid-19.html). Campus leaders can also benefit from advice offered by the National Association for Chief Diversity Officers on addressing inequalities during the pandemic—https://nadohe.memberclicks.net/assets/PressReleases/_NADOHE%20Statement%20on%20DEI %20Training.pdf.

Creating New Structures

Some institutions have underscored the need for new structures that can support better decision-making and leadership during this critical time. For example, Indiana University is investing in additional racial justice research and is creating a task force to address the negative impact COVID-19 has had on women faculty and researchers. The Gender Equity in Research Task Force at IU explores the negative impact the pandemic has had on research productivity and suggests both short- and long-term actionable solutions within the IU research context. Other leaders have recommended implementing Rapid-response Leadership Teams that include DEI experts (Goodwin and Mitchneck, 2020); formation of a Pandemic Response Faculty Fellow; or Pandemic Faculty Merit Committee (Flaherty, April 2020). For these new structures, the faculty and administrative leaders designing them are aiming to ensure better decision-making since this group is specifically tasked with ensuring gender equity, taking a gender advocacy and equity not neutral approach.

Altering Existing Processes

In terms of existing processes and structures at UCLA, a group of concerned faculty recommended that the administration be proactive on and reach out to various existing policy groups such as tenure and promotion committees, in how to handle the impact of COVID-19. But they also advocated for a new group to develop policies for existing decision groups that may not have this expertise: "Faculty will need guidelines on how to quantify impacts of COVID-19 on their three academic pillars (e.g. teaching, research and service). Clear metrics, tangible benchmarks, and effective communication are critical for decreasing bias in merit and promotion decisions. Here, we (the faculty) specifically ask that administrations empower either faculty governing bodies or designated faculty member(s) (e.g., creating a Pandemic Response Faculty Fellow or coordinating body) to ensure the implementation of equity metrics and policies at their institutions" (UCLA, 2020).

Other suggestions also build on this notion of processes for supporting existing institutional decision-making structures but altering these processes so they include different individuals who might be more sensitive to gender equity issues. For example, Goodwin and Mitchneck (2020) recommend that academic leaders create "inclusive communication, continued monitoring for equitable distribution of resources and conscientious attention to differential impacts on the workplace climate are essential." They recommend exploring who is at the decision-making table as it will affect whether gender equity emerges. Also, engaging campus leaders and experts in diversity, equity, and inclusion, which will broaden participation in decision-making and ensure needed attention to faculty DEI concerns. Another strategy is ensuring funding for DEI work so this continues even during the pandemic and inequities do not become larger and more exacerbated. Several efforts are paired with broad-based surveys of

faculty and staff in order to understand specific needs and concerns on a campus related to caregiving, workload, and productivity during the COVID-19 pandemic.

There have also been dozens of recommendations from campuses for a combination of new structures as well as new decision processes that would ensure greater accountability and transparency in decision-making. One instructive example is from the University of Toronto where a process was recommended for clear internal policies and guidelines aimed at protecting workers. It included increasing the frequency of open stakeholder meetings to ensure that worker perspectives were considered in decision-making as it pertains to operations during both lockdown and reopening. It also established "a joint pandemic response committee with representatives from unions, faculty and employee associations, and administration to ensure clear and effective communication with all University of Toronto constituencies as per the University Policy on Crisis and Routine Emergency Preparedness and Response. For staff and faculty who are working at home even as they have had to assume what are highly gendered responsibilities for care and schooling of children (while schools, daycares, before/after school programs, and summer camps remain closed or sparsely and unsafely reopened) and/or those with elder care responsibilities, they asked that a consultative committee, with staff and faculty representation, as well as involvement of the Family Care Office, be created to establish universal, generous, and equitable policies to accommodate the situation/needs of working caregivers" (University of Toronto, 2020).

In terms of longer-term accountability and transparency, UCLA leaders are encouraging the university to respond to this pandemic by developing a strategic action plan, which includes metrics and accountability for dealing with changes in faculty productivity because of COVID-19 over the long haul. To date, faculty leaders across the country have been offering

recommendations for combating the growing gender inequalities that are being documented in emerging news stories. These approaches align with the key attributes of leadership and governance approaches that best help campuses to weather a crisis.

LEADERSHIP AND DECISION MAKING TO ADDRESS CRISIS AND INEQUITIES

Based on studies of the type of leadership needed to make equitable decisions and decisions in complex environments like the pandemic, three key areas—equity-minded, shared, and crisis leadership—can help inform the leadership of administrators, governing boards, and other governing groups and decision-making entities. While a growing body of research provides suggestions about how to create equitable changes in "normal" times (equity and shared leadership), it is important to also look at the literature on crisis leadership to help inform decision-making during the COVID-19 pandemic and similar disruptions. Perhaps surprisingly, some key practices that work during normal times can also work during a crisis.

Equity-Minded Leadership

In order to reverse the gender inequity trends that have emerged both prior to and as a result of the pandemic, leaders in higher education would be well served with an equity-minded leadership approach. Equity-mindedness is defined as being evidence-based (i.e., using data to explore inequalities), race conscious, institutionally focused, systemically aware, and equity advancing (Dowd and Bensimon, 2014). When practicing equity-mindedness, individuals question their own assumptions, recognize biases and stereotypes that harm the advancement of equity goals, become accountable for closing equity gaps, and see closing racial, gender, and other gaps as their personal and institutional responsibility. In order to understand and become

23

equity-minded, various practitioners (faculty, administration, staff, etc.) assess and acknowledge that their practices may not be working as well as understand inequities as a dysfunction of the existing structures, policies, and practices that were not created to serve today's students and that they can change (Dowd and Bensimon, 2014). A lack of awareness of these issues is what keeps reproducing the gender inequalities over time. While we certainly need to continue to change the representation of leaders so that they have greater awareness of different circumstances such as race and gender, equity-mindedness focuses on leaders of any background being able to adopt an equity mindset (Kezar and Posselt, 2019). Since the race and gender of current leaders is unlikely to change anytime soon, equity-mindedness is particularly important at this point in time to make needed changes.

Equity-minded leaders have both immediate and lasting impacts on a campus's ability to close equity gaps and goals (Galloway and Ishimaru, 2015; Kezar and Posselt, 2019; Shields, 2010; Theoharis, 2007). For example, Dowd and Bensimon (2014) document how leaders that adopt an equity-minded approach have been successful in closing equity gaps for students in college. In schools and colleges, equity-minded leaders dismantle discriminatory policies, use data and assessment to understand inequity, and shift the consciousness among educators when it comes to discrimination and bias (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 2010; Colorado Department of Education, 2010; Felix et al., 2015; Galloway and Ishimaru, 2017; Santamaría, 2014). Several of the recommended structures offered by campuses in section 2 of this chapter, such as rapid response teams, pandemic task forces, and the like, suggest the importance of a mechanism for integrating equity-minded thinking into decision-making processes at campuses (Goodwin and Mitchneck, 2020). As they are forming, it may be helpful

for these rapid response and pandemic teams to look at the equity-minded leadership literature to help support their work.

Shared Leadership

Shared leadership is "the dynamic, interactive influence process among individuals in groups for which the objective is to lead one another to the achievement of group or organizational goals or both" (Pearce and Conger, 1).[6] Kezar and Holcombe's (2017) review of literature on shared leadership found five key elements that characterize shared leadership. First, a greater number of individuals take on leadership roles than in traditional models. Second, leaders and followers are seen as interchangeable. In some cases, this may mean that leadership occurs on a flexible and emergent basis, while in others it rotates more formally. Third, leadership is not based on position or authority. Rather, individuals with the expertise and skills needed for solving the problem at hand are those that lead. To that end, multiple perspectives and expertise are capitalized on for problem-solving, innovation, and change. And finally, collaboration and interactions across the organization are typically emphasized (Kezar and Holcombe, 2017). Inherent in this perspective is a greater honoring of the multiple perspectives that make up a campus which typically leads to much more inclusive decision-making and equitable outcomes. Decentralization and the promotion of local autonomy increase the adaptability of organizations and allow them to creatively and quickly respond to changing environmental conditions (Heifetz, 1994; Wheatley, 1999).

Studies of shared leadership demonstrate that it tends to develop decisions that are more inclusive, equitable, and represent more diverse perspectives (Pearce and Conger, 2003;

---

[6] This section draws largely from Kezar and Holcombe, 2017.

Wheatley, 1999). Researchers have examined shared leadership across a variety of contexts, finding positive outcomes in cognition and problem-solving quality (Pearce, Yoo, and Alavi, 2004) and performance on specific tasks (Small and Rentsch, 2010; Drescher et al., 2014), and overall organizational performance (O'Toole, Galbraith, and Lawler, 2003). Studies also explored the potential of shared leadership for improving gender equity and found that it is associated with better performance for students and creating a better work environment for teachers and administrators (Hrabowski III, 2019; Ross and Berger, 2009; Shakeshaft, Brown, Irby, Grogan, and Ballenger, 2007). Many of these studies suggest that shared leadership is especially beneficial in complex environments that require frequent adaptations, such as a pandemic (Feyerherm, 1994; Pearce and Sims, 2002; Pearce, 2004). Additionally, complex environments require shared leadership that help campuses become more nimble and responsive to needed changes and to synthesize multiple perspectives (Senge, 1990; Wheatley, 1999). Traditional scientific management principles of leading—bureaucracy, top-down decision-making, authority, and social control—are unsuccessful strategies in times of environmental turbulence (Allen and Cherrey, 2000; Wheatley, 1999). The case study of the University of Massachusetts, reviewed in the last section, noted shared leadership as one of the primary reasons for the success of their COVID-19 response and ameliorating gender inequalities. The authors spoke about the collaboration between diversity, equity, and inclusion staff and senior leadership, as well as the collaboration across various units on campus.

Crisis Leadership

There have been several studies specifically focused on crisis leadership in higher education (Fernandez and Shaw, 2020; Gigliotto, 2020). Fernandez and Shaw (2020) synthesized three of the best leadership practices for navigating a crisis: (1) connecting with

people broadly as individuals and establishing mutual trust, (2) distributing leadership

throughout the organization, and (3) communicating clearly and often with all stakeholders.

There is some overlap of these findings with the existing literature, specifically the

recommendation to distribute leadership aligns with approaches of shared leadership described

above. Connecting broadly with people on campus and developing trust reflects many of the

recommendations made by faculty and staff leaders on college campuses across the country over

the months since the pandemic began. Reports in the press suggest that faculty and staff have

been advocating for regular meetings with senior university leaders and the creation of spaces for

communication between decision-makers at those affected by the decisions (Flaherty, May 21,

June 30, and September 22, 2020). Fernandez and Shaw (2020) document how studies have

reported that academic leaders should build relationships by "inquiring, advocating, and

connecting (Ancona, Malone, Orlikowski, and Senge, 2007) with individuals as people first, to

gain their perspectives while leveraging the many benefits of diversity and establishing a mutual

trust for decisions" (20). Through connecting broadly, a consensus about direction and priorities

can be established. It is important to note that their research synthesis builds from key studies of

crises such as Hurricane Katrina. Second, effective leadership during a crisis benefits from

shared or distributed leadership so that those with expertise about policies and practices at the

ground level can easily communicate with those who have decision-making authority and, in

instances, these individuals can be given authority over making local decisions during a crisis.

During a crisis, leaders are best served when they emphasize empowerment, involvement, and

collaboration, which allows them a greater degree of agility and innovation than is possible with

an outdated and inflexible hierarchical leadership paradigm (Kezar and Holcombe, 2017).

The third area of consensus related to crisis leadership is clear, frequent communication with stakeholders. Leaders should also consider the appropriate communication modality and tone (Fernandez and Shaw, 2020). During a crisis, it is important to use multiple communication channels (Robbins and Judge, 2018). In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, when people are unable to engage in face-to-face communication because of social distancing practices, Fernandez and Shaw (2020) recommend that leaders consider the live streaming of updates or messages of encouragement. The choice of communication approach should also consider stakeholders' preferences. Faculty and staff may prefer updates from leadership through email, while students may prefer a variety of social media platforms or text messages. Kezar et al. (2018) studied campuses in crisis and identified active listening as another area of communication important for quality decisions. Active listening is a structured form of listening and responding that focuses the attention on the speaker—instead of on one's own perspectives—and improves mutual understanding without debate or judgment. Many of the emerging recommendations from faculty and staff during the pandemic have also related to more transparency with decision-making and increased communication. From all accounts in the media, the current communication approach on campuses is failing and is exacerbating inequities (Flaherty, May 21and September 22, 2020).

Many of the recommendations emerging from campuses (reviewed in section II) for responding to the pandemic are also aligned with the best practices from crisis, shared, and equity leadership such as seeking out feedback, active listening, collaborating, transparent communication, acting with others, and seeking out and establishing quality relationships to inform decisions. The decision-making processes documented in the last 6 months on campuses

largely do not follow the approaches reviewed in section III related to shared, equity, and crisis leadership.

DATA GAPS ON ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP AND DECISION-MAKING

It is important to review some of the limitations in the literature. First, there is very limited data related to academic leadership, decision-making, and governance. There are no national data sources on academic leadership and decision-making. It has been almost a decade since the National Center for Education Statistics stopped collecting data for the National Survey on Postsecondary Faculty. As a result, it is not surprising that there is very limited data about decision-making and leadership related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Studies of best practices during the pandemic are often based on single case studies, and we need more comparative and multiple case studies to ensure generalizability and trustworthiness. For example, the COACHE data source remains one of the only sources of faculty members' views on governance and leadership. We have intermittent data collection related to leadership representation in higher education and the focus has been on presidents and board members, which leaves critical gaps in knowledge related to other administrative roles. Similarly, there are not enough data collected on leaders of color or studies that evaluate the impact of decision-making on gender as well as racial inequalities. Few studies have incorporated an intersectional perspective, grounding race and evaluating the intersection with other identities such as gender (Harris and Patton, 2019).

CONCLUSION

Historically, gender inequalities are pervasive among leaders in higher education leadership and their decision-making process. The emergence of the gig academy and the 2008

29

global recession have exacerbated gender inequalities. Leaders who are focused on addressing gender equity should be strategically working to combat the emerging gender inequalities of the COVID-19 pandemic. Within the first 9 months of the pandemic, there is evidence of worsening gender inequalities, and we know the strategies necessary for reversing these trends. To address this issue, academic governance and leadership should be altered, including the following short- and long-term recommendations:

Short-term:

1. Leaders and governance groups need to be aware that gender inequalities are currently developing; without immediate alteration of policies, the impact of gender inequalities will be long-lasting. Using other chapters in this report can help guide decisions and policies.

2. To inform and improve decision-making, leaders should maximize the inclusion of individuals who have expertise in diversity, equity, and inclusion. Inclusion could take the form of a new administrative structure like a rapid response team or integrating individuals into existing decision-making processes.

3. Campus leaders should share information about equity-minded leadership for decision-making and governance groups.

4. Administrators should embrace shared governance structures on campus rather than making unilateral decisions particularly on the key areas of priority setting, budget, admission, specifically as it relates to changes in programs and faculty.

5. Develop more inclusive governance processes that seek stakeholder input, actively listen, and act with the campus community and its various constituents.

6. Administrators should adopt a shared leadership approach and delegate decision-making authority to those closer to key decisions about faculty policies and practices and teaching and learning such as deans and department chairs.

7. Administrators and governance groups need to develop mechanisms for communication about decisions and more transparency.

8. Survey faculty and staff about their on-going needs and actively seek information.

Long-term:

1. Support and mentor women into leadership positions; create mentoring programs and grow your own leadership to facilitate women's movement into campus leadership.

2. Particular attention should be given to the composition of university governing boards, where the gender balance has remained largely unchanged, yet power, influence, and decision-making are concentrated within these bodies. Boards have been responsible for the move to more corporate management and changing the composition might alter this direction.

3. Administrators should incorporate goals, objectives, and metrics related to equity into strategic plans, coupled with annual reports and audits. Strategic plans should address pandemic-related inequalities.

4. Utilize key efforts/offices to work on changing the culture on campus (e.g., ADVANCE, WISE programs, DEI offices), which can support equity over the long term. If such

offices do not exist, create them. Challenge norms of gender and race neutrality and recommend gender and race advocacy through equity mindedness.

5. Campus leaders and governance groups should be trained on diversity issues, including equity-minded, shared leadership.

6. Campuses need more mechanisms for bringing together faculty and administrators around decision-making and leadership. Rebuilding shared governance will help to restore relationships within governance; campuses need to be thinking about other structures to help faculty and administration to have a greater contact, particularly non-tenure-track faculty that are often excluded from governance.

7. Campuses should explore ways to involve non-tenure-track faculty members in governance, particularly as women are overrepresented in this group.

8. Campuses should re-examine the corporate and managerial logic dominating governance groups which works against equity and is driving campuses in perverse directions counter to their mission.

9. Government agencies must ensure data collection to identify gender-based inequities, including the national survey of postsecondary faculty. Such efforts should include questions about academic decision-making and leadership. There should be consideration of a survey of postsecondary leaders, particularly around the diversity of those in positions.

10. Government agencies should continue to support and expand programs that promote the advancement of women into leadership positions.

REFERENCES

AAUP (2017). Data Visualization of Faculty by Contract Type and Institutional Type. https://www.aaup.org/data-visualizations-contingent-faculty-us-higher-education.

AAUP (2018). *Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession*. https://www.aaup.org/news/report-highlights-stagnant-pay-gender-inequity-and-retirement-security-crisis-among-higher-ed#.X7gUkpNKgjg.

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (2010). *Practices that Promote Equity in Basic Skills in California Community Colleges*. https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/promote_equity_basicskills-spr2010_0.pdf.

ACAD (2009). Survey. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

ACE (2018). *Leading the Way to Parity American Council on Education Preparation, Persistence, and the Role of Women Presidents. Survey of Presidents*. https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Leading the-Way-to-Parity.pdf.

ACE (2017). "Pipelines, Pathways, and Institutional Leadership: An Update on the Status of Women in Higher Education." http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/HES-Pipelines-Pathways-and-Institutional-Leadership-2017.pdf.

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender & Society,* 20(4): 441–64. https://doi:10.1177/0891243206289499.

Allan, E. J. (2008). *Policy Discourses, Gender, and Education: Constructing Women's Status*, vol. 11. Routledge.

Allan, E. J. (2011). *Women's Status in Higher Education: Equity Matters* [Special Issue]. *ASHE*, 37(1): 1–163.

Alon, T., Doepke, M., Olmstead-Rumsey, J., and Tertilt, M. (2020). "The Impact of COVID-19 on Gender Equality" (NBER Working Paper Series: No. 26947). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Allen, K. E., and Cherrey, C. (2000). *Systemic Leadership: Enriching the Meaning of Our Work*. University Press of America.

Amano-Patiño, N., Faraglia, E., Giannitsarou, C., and Hasna, Z. (2020). Who is doing new research in the time of COVID-19? Not the female economists. *VoxEU* (May 2). https://voxeu.org/article/who-doing-new-research-time-covid-19-not-female-economists.

Ancona, D., Malone, T. W., Orlikowski, W. J., and Senge, P.M. (2007). In praise of the incomplete leader. *Harvard Business Review*, 92–100.

Bailyn, L. (2003). Academic careers and gender equity: Lessons learned from MIT. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 10(2): 137–53.

Bauman, G. L. (2005). Promoting organizational learning in higher education to achieve equity in educational outcomes. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (131): 23–35.

Bensimon, E. M., and Neumann, A. (1993). *Redesigning Collegiate Leadership: Teams and Teamwork in Higher Education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bérubé, M., and Ruth, J. (2015). *The Humanities, Higher Education, and Academic Freedom: Three Necessary Arguments*. Springer.

Bilimoria, D., and Liang, X. (2012). *Gender Equity in Science and Engineering: Advancing Change in Higher Education*. Routledge.

Bilimoria, D., and Liang, X. (2014). "Effective Practices to Increase Women's Participation, Advancement and Leadership in US Academic STEM." In *Women in STEM Careers*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Bilen-Green, C., Froelich, K. A., and Jacobson, S. W. (2008). "The Prevalence of Women in Academic Leadership Positions, and Potential Impact on Prevalence of Women in the Professorial Ranks." Paper presentation at Women in Engineering ProActive Network (June 2008). https://www.ndsu.edu/fileadmin/forward/documents/WEPAN2.pdf.

Bilen-Green, C., and Froelich, K. A. (2010). "Women in University Leadership Positions: Comparing Institutions with Strong and Weak Gender Equity Track Records." Paper presentation at Women in Engineering ProActive Network.

Blackmore, J. (2008). "Re/positioning Women in Educational Leadership: The Changing Social Relations and Politics of Gender in Australia." In *Women Leading Education across the Continents: Sharing the Spirit, Fanning the Flame*, H. C. Sobehart, ed., 73–83). Rowman and Littlefield Education. Deakin University's Research Repository.http://dro.deakin.edu.au/eserv/DU:30016969/blackmore-repositioningwomen-2008.pdf.

Boncori, I. (2020). The never-ending shift: A feminist reflection on living and organizing academic lives during the coronavirus pandemic. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 27(5): 677–682. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12451.

Bragg, D., and McCambly, H. (2017). Using "Adaptive Equity-Minded Leadership" to Bring About Large-Scale Change. Bragg & Associates, 1–8.

Bridges, B. K., Eckel, P. D., Cordova, D. I., and White, B. P. (2007). *Broadening the Leadership Spectrum: Advancing Diversity in the American College Presidency*. American Council on Education.

Brooks, J., and Jean-Marie, G. (2007). Distributed leadership for social justice: Exploring how influence and equity are stretched over an urban high school. *Journal of School Leadership*, 17(4): 378–408.

Buckee, C. (2020). Women in science are battling both Covid-19 and the patriarchy. *Times Higher Education* (September). https://www.timeshighereducation.com/blog/women-science-are-battling-both-covid-19-and-patriarchy. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Calka, A. (2020). Why do female faculty members still earn less? Gender pay gap in higher education in science, health and engineering fields. Doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University. Seton Hall University Digital Archive. https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/2775.

Carrol, A. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34(4): 39–48. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(91)90005-G.

Carroll, J. B., and Wolverton, M. (2004). Who becomes a chair? *New Directions for Higher Education*, 126: 3–10.

Clark, D., Mickey, E. L., and Misra, J. (2020). Reflections on institutional equity for faculty in response to COVID-19. *Navigating Careers in the Academy: Gender, Race, and Class*, 92. Special Issue. Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence and ADVANCE. https://www.purdue.edu/butler/working-paper-series/2020/special%20issue.html.

COACHE Data (2020). *Covid-19 Impact Study Technical Report*. Harvard University COACHE. https://coache.gse.harvard.edu/files/gse-coache/files/covid-19_impact_study_technical_report_final.pdf.

Colorado Department of Education (2010). *Equity Toolkit for Administrators*. https://www.cde.state.co.us/postsecondary/equitytoolkit.

Costa, K. (2020). Women's emotional labor in higher ed and the COVID-19 crisis. *Women in Higher Education*. https://www.wihe.com/article-details/147/women-s-emotional-labor-in-higher-ed-and-the-covid-19-crisis/.

Cui, R., Ding, H., and Zhu, F. (2020). Gender inequality in research productivity during the COVID-19 Pandemic. https://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/gender-inequality-in-research-productivity-during-the-covid-19-pandemic.

CUPA (2019). *Annual Salary Survey*. Washington, DC: College and University Professional Association.

Dean, D. R., Bracken, S. J., and Allen, J. K. (2009). *Women in Academic Leadership: Professional Strategies, Personal Choices*. Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Dowd, A. C., and Bensimon, E. M. (2014). *Engaging the Race Question: Accountability and equity in U.S. Higher Education.* Teachers College Press.

Drescher, M. A., Korsgaard, M. A., Welpe, I. M., Picot, A., and Wigand, R. T. (2014). The dynamics of shared leadership: Building trust and enhancing performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(5): 771–783. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0036474.

Eddy, P. L., Ward, K., and Khwaja, T. (eds.). (2017). *Critical Approaches to Women and Gender in Higher Education*. Springer.

Ensley, M. D., Hmieleski, K. M., and Pearce, C. L. (2006). The importance of vertical and shared leadership within new venture top management teams: Implications for the performance of startups. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(3): 217–231.

Felix, E. R., Bensimson, E. M., Hanson, D., Gray, J., and Klingsmith, L. (2015). Developing agency for equity-minded change. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 172: 25–42.

Fernandez, A. A., and Shaw, G. P. (2020). Academic leadership in a time of crisis: The coronavirus and COVID-19. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 14(1): 39–45.

Feyerherm, A. E. (1994). Leadership in collaboration: A longitudinal study of two interorganizational rule-making groups. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5(3): 253–270.

Finkelstein, M. J., Conley, V. M., and Schuster, J. H. (2016). *The Faculty Factor: Reassessing the American Academy in a Turbulent Era*. JHU Press.

Fitzgerald, T. (2013). *Women Leaders in Higher Education: Shattering the Myths*. Routledge.

Flaherty, C. (2016). "Forgotten Chairs. *Inside Higher Education* (December 1). https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/12/01/new-study-suggests-training-department-chairs-woefully-inadequate-most-institutions.

Flaherty, C. (2020). "No Room of One's Own: Early Journal Submission Data Suggest COVID-19 is Tanking Women's Research Productivity" (April 21).https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/04/21/early-journal-submission-data-suggest-covid-19-tanking-womens-research-productivity.

Flaherty, C. (2020). "Colleges Lower the Boom on Retirement Plans. *Inside Higher Education* (May 21). https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/05/21/more-institutions-are-suspending-or-cutting-retirement-plan-contributions.

Flaherty, C. (2020). "Mounting Faculty Concerns about the Fall Semester." *Inside Higher Education* (June 30). https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/06/30/faculty-concerns-about-fall-are-Mounting.

Flaherty, C. (2020). "Not Expendable." *Inside Higher Education* (August 12). https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/08/12/new-aaup-statement-urges-institutions-not-treat-their-adjuncts-expendable.

Flaherty, C. (2020). "Something's Got to Give." *Inside Higher Education* (August 20). https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/08/20/womens-journal-submission-rates-continue-fall.

Flaherty, C. (2020). "AAUP to investigate COVID-19 'crisis in academic governance.'" *Inside Higher Education* (September 22). https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2020/09/22/aaup-investigate-covid-19-%E2%80%98crisis-academic-governance%E2%80%99.

Friga, P. N. (2020). The great recession was bad for higher education. Coronavirus could be worse. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-great-recession-was-bad-for-higher-education-coronavirus-could-be-worse/.

Furstenberg, F. (2020). University leaders are failing: The pandemic reveals an aptitude at the top. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (May 19). https://www.chronicle.com/article/when-university-leaders-fail.

Galbraith, M. W., and Jones, M. S. (2010). Understanding incivility in online teaching. *Journal of Adult Education*, 39(2): 1–10.

Galloway, M. K., and Ishimaru, A. M. (2015). Radical recentering: Equity in educational leadership standards. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 51(3): 372–408.

Gardner, S. K. (2013). Women faculty departures from a striving institution: Between a rock and a hard place. *The Review of Higher Education*, 36(3): 349–370.

Gigliotti, R. A. (2019). *Crisis Leadership in Higher Education: Theory and Practice*. Rutgers University Press.

Glazer-Raymo, J. (2001). *Shattering the Myths: Women in Academe*. JHU Press.

Gonzalez, L. D., and Griffin K. A. (2020). *Supporting Faculty during & after COVID-19: Don't Let Go of Equity.* Aspire Alliance. https://www.mtu.edu/advance/resources/articles-books/supporting-faculty-during-and-after-covid.pdf.

Goodwin, S. A., and Mitchneck B. (2020). STEM equity and inclusion (Un)interrupted? *Inside Higher Ed*. https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2020/05/13/ensuring-pandemic-doesnt-negatively-impact-women-stem-especially-those-color.

Guarino, C. M., and Borden V. M. H. (2017). Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family? *Research in Higher Education*, 58: 672–694. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2.

Harris, J., and Patton, L. (2019). Un/doing Intersectionality through higher education research, *The Journal of Higher Education*, 90:(3) 347–372. doi: 10.1080/00221546.2018.1536936.

Heck, R. H., and Hallinger, P. (2010). Testing a longitudinal model of distributed leadership effects on school improvement. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(5): 867–885. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.07.013.

Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without Easy Answers*. Harvard University Press.

Hoynes, H., Miller, D. L., and Schaller, J. (2012). Who suffers during recessions? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 26(3): 27–48.

Hrabowski III, F. A. (2019). *The Empowered University: Shared Leadership, Culture Change, and Academic Success*. JHU Press.

Hunt, V. H., Morimoto, S., Zajicek, A., and Lisnic, R. (2012). Intersectionality and dismantling institutional privilege: The case of the NSF ADVANCE program. *Race, Gender & Class*, 19(1/2): 266–290. http://www.rgc.uno.edu.

International Labor Organization (2020). Policy brief. The COVID-19 response: Getting gender equality right for a better future for women at work. Geneva: International Labor Organization. https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/coronavirus/WCMS_744685/lang--en/index.htm.

Jedd, T., Goldman, G., Henry-Moss, D., Wagner, C., Lescak, E., Metcalf, J. L., Hufbauer, R., and Brander, S. (2020). "Scientist Mothers Face Extra Challenges in the Face of COVID-19." *Scientific American Blog*.

https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/voices/scientist-mothers-face-extra-challenges-in-the-face-of-covid-19/.

Jones, S., Lefoe, G., Harvey, M., and Ryland, K. (2012). Distributed leadership: A collaborative framework for academics, executives and professionals in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 34(1): 67–78. http://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2012.642334.

Jones, S., Hadgraft, R., Harvey, M., Lefoe, G., and Ryland, K. (2014). *Evidence-based Benchmarking Framework for a Distributed Leadership Approach to Capacity Building in Learning and Teaching*. Sydney, Australia: Office for Learning and Teaching, Department of Education. http://ro.uow.edu.au/sspapers/592/.

Kezar, A., DePaola, T., and Scott, D. T. (2019). *The Gig Academy: Mapping Labor in the Neoliberal University*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kezar, A., Fries-Britt, S., Kurban, E., McGuire, D., and Wheaton, M. M. (2018). *Speaking Truth and Acting with Integrity: Confronting Challenges of Campus Racial Climate*. American Council on Education.

Kezar, A., and Holcombe, E. (2017). *Shared Leadership in Higher Education: Important Lessons from Research and Practice*. American Council on Education.

King, J. E., and Gomez, G. G. (2008). *On the Pathway to the Presidency: Characteristics of Higher Education's Senior Leadership*. American Council on Education.

Lampman, C., Crew, E. C., Lowery, S. D., and Tompkins, K. (2016). Women faculty distressed: Descriptions and consequences of academic contrapower harassment. *NASPA Journal about Women in Higher Education*, 9(2): 169–189.

Langan, A. (2019). "Female Managers and Gender Disparities: The Case of Academic Department Chairs." Princeton University Job Market Paper. https://scholar.princeton.edu/sites/default/files/alangan/files/langan_jmp_current.pdf.

Leggon, C. B., (2006). Women in science: Racial and ethnic differences and the differences they make. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 31(3): 325–33.

Lisnic, R., Zajicek, A., and Morimoto, S. (2018). Gender and race differences in faculty assessment of tenure clarity: The influence of departmental relationships and practices. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 5(2): 244–260.

Malisch, J. L., Harris, B. N., Sherrer, S. M., Lewis, K. A., Shepherd, S. L., McCarthy, P. C., and Ramalingam, L. (2020). Opinion: In the wake of COVID-19, academia needs new solutions to ensure gender equity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(27): 15378–15381. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2010636117.

McKinsey (2020). *The Impact of Covid on the Global Economy: Woman and the Workplace*. McKinsey & Co. and LeanIn. https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/diversity-and-inclusion/women-in-the-workplace.

Minello, A. (2020). The pandemic and the female academic. *Nature* (April 17). https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-01135-9.

Mitchell, M., Leachman, M., and Masterson, K. (2017). *A Lost Decade in Higher Education Funding State Cuts Have Driven Up Tuition and Reduced Quality*. Center on Policy and Budget Priorities. https://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/a-lost-decade-in-higher-education-funding.

Morimoto, S. A., and Zajicek, A. (2014). Dismantling the 'Master's House': Feminist reflections on institutional transformation. *Critical Sociology*, 40(1): 135–150.

Nentwich, J. C. (2006). Changing gender: The discursive construction of equal opportunities. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 13(6): 499–521.

Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) (2020). "Working Together to Build a Vibrant Future for Ontario's Universities." The Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations. https://ocufa.on.ca/blog-posts/working-together-to-build-a-vibrant-future-for-ontarios-universities/.

O'Toole, J., Galbraith, J., and Lawler III, E. E. (2003). The Promise and Pitfalls of Shared Leadership: When Two (or More) Heads Are Better Than One. In *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership*, Pearce, C. L., and Conger, J. A., eds., 250–267. Sage.

Pearce and Conger (2003). *Shared Leadership: Reframing the How's and Why's of Shared Leadership*. Sage

Pearce, C. L., and Sims Jr., H. P. (2002). Vertical versus shared leadership as predictors of the effectiveness of change management teams: An examination of aversive, directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering leader behaviors. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 6(2): 172.

Pearce, C. L., Yoo, Y., and Alavi, M. (2004). Leadership, social work and virtual teams: The relative influence of vertical vs. shared leadership in the nonprofit sector. In I*mproving Leadership in Nonprofit Organizations*, R. E. Riggio and S. Smith-Orr, eds., 180–203. Jossey-Bass.

Peters, D. (2020, July 7). Women academics worry the pandemic is squeezing their research productivity. *University Affairs*. https://www.universityaffairs.ca/news/news-article/women-academics-worry-the-pandemic-is-squeezing-their-research-productivity/.

Pettit, E. (2020). Being a woman in academe has its challenges. A global pandemic? Not helping. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (May 26). https://www.chronicle.com/article/being-a-woman-in-academe-has-its-challenges-a-global-pandemic-not-helping.

Potvin, D. A., Burdfield-Steel, E., Potvin, J. M., and Heap, S. M. (2018). Diversity begets diversity: A global perspective on gender equality in scientific society leadership. *PLOS ONE*, 13(5): e0197280.

Rall, R. M., Morgan, D. L., and Commodore, F. (2019). "Invisible Injustice: Higher Education Boards and Issues of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusivity." In *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusivity in Contemporary Higher Education*, 261–277. IGI Global.

Rall, R. M., Morgan, D. L., and Commodore, F. (2020). Higher education governance and decision-making: Toward culturally sustaining governance in higher education: Best practices of theory, research, and practice. *Journal of School Public Relations,* 38(1): 139–164.

Redden, E. (2020). COVID-19 roundup: Virtual falls and faculty pink slips. *Inside Higher Ed* (July 21). https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/07/21/covid-roundup-colleges-revert-virtual-fall-canisius-and-carthage-plan-faculty.

Robbins, S., and Judge, T. A. (2018). *Organizational Behavior (What's New in Management).* Pearson.

Ross, J. A., and Berger, M. J. (2009). Equity and leadership: Research-based strategies for school leaders. *School Leadership and Management,* 29(5): 463–476.

Rosser, S. V., and Chameau, J. L. (2006). Institutionalization, sustainability, and repeatability of ADVANCE for institutional transformation. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 31(3): 335–344.

Santamaría, L. J. (2014). Critical change for the greater good: Multicultural perceptions in educational leadership toward social justice and equity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(3): 347–391.

Schuster, J. H., and Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers*. JHU Press.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. Doubleday/Currency.

Shakeshaft, C., Brown, G., Irby, B. J., Grogan, M., and Ballenger, J. (2007). Increasing gender equity in educational leadership. In *Handbook for Achieving Gender Equity through Education*, S. S. Klein, ed., 103–129. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Shields, C. M. (2010). Transformative leadership: Working for equity in diverse contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(4): 558–589.

Shurchkov, O. (2020). Is COVID-19 turning back the clock on gender equality in academia? *Medium*. https://medium.com/@olga.shurchkov/is-covid-19-turning-back-the-clock-on-gender-equality-in-academia-70c00d6b8ba1.

Shurchkov (2020). "Gender Differences in Output Quality and Quantity under Competition and Time Constraints: Evidence from a Pilot Study." FEEM Working Paper No. 95.2009. https://ssrn.com/abstract=1515794 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1515794.

Slaughter, S., and Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State, and Higher Education*. JHU Press.

Small, E. E., and Rentsch, J. R. (2010). Shared leadership in teams: A matter of distribution. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 9(4): 203–211. https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000017.

Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed Leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sprague, J., and Massoni, K. (2005). Student evaluations and gendered expectations: What we can't count can hurt us. *Sex Roles*, 53(11): 779–793.

Staniscuaski, F., Reichert, F., Werneck, F. P., de Oliveira, L., Mello-Carpes, P. B., Soletti, R. C., Almeida, C. I., Zandona, E., Ricachenevsky, F. K., Neumann, A., Schwartz, I. V. D., Tamajusuku, A. S. K., Seixas, A., and Kmetzsch, L. (2020). Impact of COVID-19 on Academic Mothers. *Science*, 368(6492): 1–724. doi: 10.1126/science.abc2740.

Stillman, J. (2009). Taking Back the Standards: Equity-Minded Teachers' Responses to Accountability-Related Instructional Constraints. *The New Educator*, 5(2): 135–160.

Sullivan O. (2019). Gender inequality in work-family balance. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 3: 201–203.

Taylor, A. (2020). Beyond the neoliberal university. *Boston Review* (August 4). http://bostonreview.net/class-inequality/todd-wolfson-astra-taylor-beyond-neoliberal-university.

Theoharis, G. (2010). Disrupting injustice: Principals narrate the strategies they use to improve their schools and advance social justice. *Teachers College Record*, 112(1): 331–373.

Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(2): 221–258.

UCLA (2020). "Open Letter to Chancellor on Research Productivity and Childcare." https://csw.ucla.edu/2020/07/06/open-letter-on-research-productivity-and-childcare/.

Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., and McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(4): 298–318.

Viglione, G. (2020). Are women publishing less during the pandemic? Here's what the data say. *Nature*, 581: 365–366. https://media.nature.com/original/magazine-assets/d41586-020-01294-9/d41586-020-01294-9.pdf.

Vincent-Lamarre, P., Sugimoto, C. R., and Larivière, V. (2020a). "The Decline of Women's Research Production during the Coronavirus Pandemic." *Nature Index*. https://www.natureindex.com/news-blog/decline-women-scientist-research-publishing-production-coronavirus-pandemic.

Wenniger, M. D., and Conroy, M. H. (2002). *Gender Equity or Bust!: On the Road to Campus Leadership with Women in Higher Education*. John Wiley & Sons.

Wheatley, M. J. (1999). *Leadership and the New Science: Discovering Order in a Chaotic World* (2nd ed.). Berrett-Koehler Press.

Wolverton, M., and Gonzales, M. J. (2000). "Career Paths of Academic Deans." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 2000, New Orleans, LA.

Wolfinger, N. H., Mason, M. A., and Goulden, M. (2008). Problems in the pipeline: Gender, marriage, and fertility in the ivory tower. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(4): 388–405.

Zumeta, W. (2010). The great recession: Implications for higher education. *The NEA 2010 Almanac of Higher Education*, 29–42. http://beta.nsea-nv.org/assets/img/PubAlmanac/Zumeta_2010.pdf.