UW-Madison Oral History Project
Oral History #644 – Denice Denton

Narrator: Coleman, Joyce
Interviewer: Denice Denton
Date: 2003
Location: Madison, Wisconsin

Subject: Origin of Denton's interest in engineering, her education at MIT, her appointment and experience as a UW-Madison faculty member, and as dean of the College of Engineering at the University of Washington.

Transcriptionist: Brad Kerr (8/19/09)
Auditor: Eve Fine (9/11/09)

00.00.00
Start of Tape 1 (November 20, 2003)

JC: [Words unclear] to Denice Denton. She was a professor at University of Wisconsin from 1987 to 1996 in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, and she is now dean at the College of Engineering at the University of Washington. And today's date is November 20, 2003. Perhaps you could start by telling me a little bit about your childhood and early years of schooling.

DD: Sure. I was born in Texas, and grew up in Houston, went to public schools there from Kindergarten through high school. And I was really interested in math and science as a kid, primarily in high school. My mother was a math teacher. So, I had a built-in role model with respect to mathematics. And I had a fairly clear picture in my mind at the time, that I wanted to go to college. And I think I'm the first person in my family who ever went off to a four-year school. I had—um—my uncle had gotten an engineering degree after going to a community college, and my mom picked up a bachelor's and eventually a master's in kind of bits and pieces of evening education and that kinda thing, but nobody had ever just kinda gone off to school freshman year to a four-year university.

JC: Oh okay. So, were you interested in engineering when you were in high school?

DD: Yeah, I was. I was in something called JETS, the Junior Engineering Technological Society, and we would go to these science contests. I remember there was one at Texas A&M and I was in the math club and I took a program, a summer program, at Rice University in the summer between my junior and senior year in high school. And that was a program where we lived in the dorms at Rice and spent about a month there and met a lot of engineering faculty and grad students and did projects and that kind of turned me on to the engineering.

JC: Okay. So, how did you get to MIT then?

DD: Well I had, you know, done some homework about where I wanted to go to college. Our high school had a college night, and I went around to the different booths for all the different campuses and I had read a lot that indicated that Boston was a really great college town. And I wanted to move far away from home and be independent. And so, I really wanted to go to Boston. As I did more research, MIT looked like a great choice since I wanted to go into engineering.

JC: Okay, and how were you able to finance your education?

DD: Well, it was a combination of financial aid, support from my mom, and I worked while I was there. I got a scholarship after I got there, so it was kind of a mixed package.

JC: Okay. And what led you to choose electrical engineering as your major?

DD: I think a lot of it was that I had enjoyed the electrical engineering part of my Rice experience. And once I got to MIT, I started taking some EE classes fairly early on and enjoyed them. So, and I did some undergraduate research projects as a freshman that were very EE oriented. And so, it kinda sealed the deal.

JC: Were there very many female students in the EE?

DD: Not really. It was—I think at the time I was at MIT it was about, um, let's say, 16 percent women, something like that. And, there wouldn't be very many women in most of my classes in EE. I think women were more underrepresented in EE than in most other departments at MIT.

JC: Did that bother you at all at the time?

DD: Well, a little bit. I didn't really mind it that much. There were quite a few women in my dorm. I was in a coed dorm. So, you know, I had female peers. And my living situation, and it worked out okay.

JC: Okay. And how would you describe the atmosphere for women in science and engineering at MIT?

DD: Well, I'd say it was mixed. I mean, there were certainly supportive faculty who were helpful. There was one particular guy, Arthur Smith, who was the head of the graduate program in the EE, and he was extremely supportive. There were other faculty who were either neutral or slightly negative. So, I would say it was kind of a mixed bag. But there was some good. You know, there was a women's room at MIT, called the Cheney Room, that had a lock on it, and it was explicitly just for women to go and hang out. So, there were some things like that that provided some solace or (unintelligible) when it got too much to be in an all male environment.

00.04.54

JC: Were there very many female faculty members?

DD: Not really. I don't recall ever having a female faculty member there until I was a grad student.

JC: Really?

DD: And as a grad student—Well, I had, you know, I had a female faculty member in a couple of music classes, and I had one in a writing class. But in all of my technical and science oriented courses, there was never a single woman professor. I had a female TA once. Even all the TA's were guys.

JC: Is there anybody there that served as a role model for you?

DD: Yeah, well, Millie Dresselhaus, who is a physics and electrical engineering faculty member. She is a very famous person in her field, and was the first woman to head the American Physical Society. And she's in both national academies. And I think she's gotten the Congressional Medal of Science. So, I took a class from her in my first or second year as a grad student and I got involved with a number of things she was doing around women in science and engineering at MIT. She was running a committee on women, and she asked me to join it. And so, I got into some of those activities with her.

JC: Okay, but that was only as a graduate student.

DD: Yeah, and you know, I think as an undergrad I did a few things, but I got more into the whole thing as a grad student.

JC: Okay, well maybe I should ask you then why you decided to pursue graduate education at MIT.

DD: I had been in a co-op program. So, I worked for two summers and then for a six or eight month period out in the bay area in Silicon Valley, and I worked in integrated circuit design and manufacturing, and did my master's thesis on a memory design project I was doing at Fairchild. And I really enjoyed the work and the company, but I found that it wasn't sufficiently satisfying. That—that's not what I wanted to do forever. It was fun, but it was not complete. And, I had been a TA at MIT as a grad student a couple of times, and I'd always enjoyed teaching. I'd been a tutor when I was a kid. And so, I really wanted to do something where I could have both the teaching piece and the research piece. And, so I figured grad school was gonna be a good way to move in that direction.

JC: Okay, so, at this point, you were thinking of an academic career.

DD: Somewhat. Yeah, I wouldn't say I was a hundred percent decided on that, but I was leaning that way.

JC: Okay, okay. And are there any other experiences from your graduate program that stand out? You mentioned that you were getting more involved in activities for women in science.

DD: Yeah, well, I developed a course. At MIT they have January period called independent activities period, where there's no formal classes, and I developed a course for, targeted for women, on kind of "Introduction to Electronics." And they would learn how to solder, and they would build small circuits that might do simple calculations or make funny noises or something like that so that they would learn how to use equipment and become familiar with circuitry and fabrication of electronic systems so that they wouldn't be so intimidated. A lot—What I had seen was that a lot of the guys coming to MIT had had labs in their basement at home or something like that, but most of the women didn't have that experience. So, I had a sense that a lot of women weren't choosing to go into these fields because they were kind of intimidated by the hardware. And I wanted to give them some hands on opportunities. So, I taught that class two or three times.

JC: Okay. Had you had any background in hardware before you came to MIT?

DD: No.

JC: Okay. And were you similarly intimidated?

DD: Um-hm. Yeah, it was a little bit of a barrier to get over.

JC: Mmm. Okay. Now, can you talk a bit about your job search once you finished your PhD?

DD: Well, so, I went into—went on to the job market. I interviewed at seven schools, and I needed to go to a university that had a clean room, meaning a laboratory where integrated circuits are fabricated because that's multimillion dollar facility, and you can't just build one as a junior faculty member. So, I went around to these different seven schools, and I think at every one of these schools I was going to be the first or only woman in their EE Department at that time. That was 1986. And so, there were a lot of gender issues, and I think I was asked illegal questions at all of the interviews.

JC: What types of illegal questions?

DD: Things like—I mean the main thing that would come up a lot would be, "Are you married? Do you have kids?" That kinda thing.

00.09:56

JC: Why do you think they asked you that?

DD: Well, I think a lot of them—like there was one guy at the University of Minnesota who said, it was a much older guy, and he said, "Well, are you married?" And I didn't answer because I knew that was an illegal question. And instead of moving on, he said, "Well, I mean, do you have a boyfriend?" And I said, "Well, why is that relevant to this? Is that relevant to this position?" And he said, "Well, you know, if you have a boyfriend, then we're gonna have to find him a job." And, you know, he was concerned about partner hire issues. (JC: Oh, okay.) And it's very unlikely that he would have asked a man—(JC: Yes, yes). So, it was those kinds of things, and I remember at the University of Minnesota, the department chair was saying that they had apparently recently gotten through or gone through a huge lawsuit about sex discrimination on salary. And the department chair asked me something like, "What would you be doing something like that," "Would you be one of those people?" Or—I don't remember, it was kind of weird. But there was a lot of discomfort and just awkwardness, since these people weren't used to interviewing women or working with women peers. It was very, very awkward at a lot of the interviews.

JC: Do you think there were some jobs you weren't offered because of your gender?

DD: I think I got offers from almost all of these places. I think that—I think it took a lot of savvy to kind of navigate through what was going on and be a little bit forgiving about the fact that these people were probably trying to do their best, but really just didn't know how to handle the situation. And I think that there are probably women who would have gone through that process and somewhere along the way kind of blown up at them, because they were doing some pretty stupid things. But I think I did end up getting interviews, I mean offers, from just about all the places that I talked to.

JC: Okay, so they might have had concerns, but in the end they were able to realize that you were a qualified candidate.

DD: Yeah, I remember at the University of Minnesota, at the end of the day, after I'd been through the whole interview, a day and a half, and I'd given my talk, the department chair said, "Well, we're really interested in you, and people are very impressed," and he said, "but they

really have one major concern." And I said, "Well, what's that?" And he said, "Well, they're just wondering what you would be able to teach," which was kind of an idiotic thing to say, you know (laughs), because why wouldn't I be able to teach what any guy who was interviewing.

JC: Interesting.

DD: They didn't feel like I'd be able to teach EE for some reason. So, I kind of listed some of the things that I would want to teach, and then I interviewed at Berkeley, and I had a similar experience there, where one of the—there was a very famous guy, and I was in a little one-on-one with him. And at one point he said, "Well, I just don't understand what you'd be able to teach." And, having been through this before, I was ready this time and I said, "Well, I think pretty much anything in your catalog" (both laugh). So, you kinda had to deal with these things. They were just not prepared to interview a woman colleague. One of the other things that happened at Berkeley was they were having a party. And usually you take somebody to dinner, you know, the candidate. And they said, "Well, we're having this department party, so instead of taking you to dinner, we're going to take you to this party." I said, "Okay, fine." So, we go over to this guy's house, and it was a very senior faculty member at Berkeley in the EE Department. And all—He was very hierarchical, so he hadn't invited any assistant professors. So, there were no young people there. And none of these guys wanted to talk to me. So, I just kind of sat there all evening (laughs), by myself, wishing I was somewhere else.

JC: Sounds awkward. Well, what were your initial impressions of UW?

DD: I had a good interview there. It was—I think it was in March, I think it was extremely cold, like zero or something (laughs).

JC: And you still came.

DD: I wasn't used to that. And I had actually had surgery. In early '86 I had thyroid cancer. And—now, let me see what the timing was here. Yeah, then I was doing—I had the surgery in early '86, and it was a horrible major surgery, like seven hour surgery under general anesthetic. And so, I think that Madison interview was one of the first interviews I did after my surgery and I was really very tired. You know, it takes a long time to recover from something like that. And I also, because of the surgery, was very sensitive to cold because I didn't have my thyroid anymore. And it was pretty challenging to deal with that physical environment, given my health. But it worked out. It was kind of on the edge. But the people were nice; I had good experiences. I remember feeling good about the talk that I gave. The staff—there were no women in the department in terms of faculty, but women showed up, like women staff and maybe some women who taught general engineering stuff, you know, technical writing. And so, that made me feel good that women had actually come out to find their way there because in a lot of the places I interviewed, it was just men at the talks.

00.15.28

JC: So, what then made you decide to come to UW?

DD: Well, I was down to UW and Berkeley were my choices that I was really looking at, and I liked UW because I liked the people. I liked the area. I had never lived in the Midwest. I'd

spent a lot of time in California, grew up in Texas, had been a long time on the east coast. And I liked the idea of moving in a new place. The lab seemed really nice, and I think that one of the things that kinda decided it for me was of seven schools, Berkeley was the only one that hadn't come out with an offer yet. They still were kinda messing around. They'd call me up and ask, "can we have your transcripts from college?" And so, I talked to my advisor about it, and we decided, well, it was just kinda weird, nobody else has done that. And so, I sent him off my graduate transcripts, and then nothing happened. I didn't hear anything. And I was down to waiting for Berkeley, and Madison was the other choice. So, Berkeley people called again, and the guy said, "Well, we're still trying to decide. Could you send us your undergrad transcript?"(JC: laughs) And at that point, I just thought, "This is ridiculous" (both laugh). And so, I said to the guy, "You know what? I'm going to Madison. I've made a decision." So, the Berkeley people being such jerks kind of bumped me into Madison. So, we weren't going to play that game anymore.

JC: Yeah.

DD: I didn't need the guy coming back and wanting my Head Start program report from when I could recognize my primary colors.

JC: Yes, yes, I'm sure it's highly relevant.

DD: Yeah, I didn't want to wait that long.

JC: Okay. Well, maybe we can move to your career then at the University of Wisconsin.

DD: Mm-hm.

JC: Now just like before, when you arrived at UW, can you talk a little bit about what women were in the College of Engineering?

DD: Yeah, when I got there, I want to say there were something like 180 to 200 professors. There was one other woman in the college. That was in ME, Mechanical Engineering. And I went and sought her out and she was pretty despondent and had not had a positive experience. And we tried to get together occasionally, but I think about six months after I got there, she left. She went to become a faculty member at UT-Austin in Mechanical Engineering. She's still there. She's having a very good career. And from what I gathered, she had been treated pretty badly in ME at Madison. And, when she left, I was the only woman at that point, and it was pretty, you know, again awkward, just like the interview situation. These were a bunch of men who weren't used to working with women as colleagues, had no clue how to behave, were kind of asocial anyway, so (laughs) it was a stretch.

JC: Do you know anything about women who were in engineering before you arrived?

DD: I don't. I know there was one woman in EE prior to my arrival, at least one that I know about. I don't recall her name. But she came and left before I got there, I think prior to the tenure decision, but I'm really not sure. And I have no clue if there were women in other departments before I came. I kinda doubt it. But—

JC: Well, do you have any idea if at that point the college was making an effort to increase the number of women on its staff?

DD: Well, it didn't seem to me like there was any real concerted effort in place. I didn't get the sense that that was a priority of the dean at the time. If they were making an effort, they weren't doing very well, (both laugh) because they had 180 people and one woman.

JC: Yes, I guess so. Can you talk about your early years in the department and college and just how you found the climate towards the women in the college?

DD: Well, I think in the department there were a few people that I immediately connected with, younger people. There was one guy in particular that was a buddy, and we'd go to dinner with his wife and this and that. And, he was a good colleague. A lot of the older people, I'd say anybody over 45 or so, they were, a lot of them, unsure kinda how to interact with me. I remember, like the first or second day I was there, I was at the mailboxes getting my mail and one of the senior people came up, probably in his sixties, I don't know. And I introduced myself and put my hand out to shake his hand, and he wouldn't even shake my hand. And he kind of looked at me, looked up and down, and walked away (laughs).

JC: Really?

DD: And I thought, "Well, gee, that's weird," and he walked over to his mailbox, and I looked at it, and I said, "Oh, okay"—I didn't know who he was—and it was like third box over, fourth down or whatever. And I went and read the name off the box, to kinda see who it was. But, that was an extreme case, but I think it was representative of the fact that most of them just didn't have a clue about how to interact with me. So, a lot of it was me trying to decide how aggressive I was going to be about trying to build some relationships with these people because it was going to be tough.

JC: Yeah, you talked about cases of rudeness. Were there people who tried really hard to be nice, but somehow, I don't know, weren't—

DD: Well, I mean, there was some of that. I remember somewhere along the way fairly early on there was this really senior guy and he was trying to be nice, and trying to make an effort, and he asked if I would want to join his bowling league.(JC: laughs). And I was hesitating, and he said, "You know, we don't have any women. We'd really like to have a woman on the bowling league." And I was thinking to myself, "I'm already integrating Engineering. I don't think I'm going to go integrate your bowling league (both laugh)." But, it was trying to be nice. But, no way would I want to do that. But, there were a few things like that, yeah.

JC: Yeah, yeah. Okay. Did you find the climate considerably different than it was at MIT?

DD: Yeah. I mean, it wasn't as high pressure. It wasn't as intense. People didn't work all hours. You know, nobody is going to be in the office on Christmas day at Madison, at least not when I was there. And at MIT you just had—people were much more fanatical about their work. So, in that sense, I think the Madison people had a healthier outlook on work life balance. It's not that they were lazy or anything. They just were more reasonable about sharing time between work and family. You know, I think the big piece in this, that I haven't mentioned, is that one of

the key people who was involved in recruiting me was Henry Guckel, who ran the clean room. I talked before about how I had to have a clean room. And he was the key faculty member in the department, as far as I could tell, who was kind of advocating for me and wanting to hire me. And so, the first couple of years, there were—well, the first year—there were no other professors in that area that he was in, of microelectronics – and at least not in the integrated circuit area. And so, I was kinda the first one at that time, the only other one at that time, who was explicitly gonna be working with him in the clean room. And what started to become clear fairly early on, was that his idea of how this was all gonna to work was real different from mine and that he apparently wanted or was hoping to have like a super postdoc or a grad student type relationship with me, where what I was looking to be was an independent faculty member. And I think in some ways he thought that by hiring a woman, it would be easier for him to kinda manage that relationship and control my professional behavior. So, that relationship began to get strained pretty early on. And it was a major issue almost from the beginning. I got a teaching award somewhere around the first or second semester that I was there. It was a thing that was run by the students, and they did their own voting and so on. And I remember he was quite jealous about the fact that I had won this thing, just having arrived. And so, there was a professional jealousy issue there. And there was an issue of control, and it was a pretty complicated situation.

JC: What ended up happening?

DD: Well, ultimately, after I don't know exactly how long, but let's say a year to year and a half, maybe two, I walked into the parking lot outside our building and I saw this truck, "Bill's Key Shop." It was a vender from the city. And I walked upstairs to where the lab is, and there was a guy in coveralls changing the locks to the clean room. And I said to him, "What's going on?" And he said, "Well, I'm changing the locks." And I was very aware of the need to document. I'd already kinda started writing everything down and throwing things into a shoebox. And I said, "Well, who asked you to do that?" And he said, "Oh, well, Professor Guckel." And so it turned out that Henry had changed the locks so that me and my students wouldn't be able to get into the clean room. Then this whole episode ensued that was very complex and it involved people around the whole campus. So, that was quite the scene.

00:25:06

JC: In the end, you got back into the clean room?

DD: Yes.

JC: Now, what mechanisms—what did you do to try to resolve the situation?

DD: Well, initially I—initially I talked, and I don't remember exactly what order all this happened in, but fairly early on I spoke to one of my friends on the faculty, who was another young woman from Texas, who was in the law school. We'd never known each other before Madison, but her specialty was in race and gender discrimination law. And I told her what had happened. And she said, "Well, you know, Denice, he can't do that." And I said, "Well, Vicki, he did do that (laughs), so what's the next step?" So, she pulled together a number of senior women from the law school, I think one of whom had been on the Wisconsin State Supreme Court, another of whom had argued the Johnson Controls case at that the real Supreme Court,

U.S. Supreme Court, and I brought along a colleague, Cora Marrett, who at the time was in our Sociology Department and went on to run one of the directorates at NSF later. And we all met at Vicki's house. It was a blizzard. I remember we had to push the one lady's car up the driveway through snow and all this. And we all sat down and had a takeout dinner of Chinese, and I told them what was going on. And they kind of walked me through what I needed to do. And what we decided to do was, I had gotten recently an annual review, where the department chair sends you a letter saying, "Gee, this is how you did this year, blah, blah, blah. Your teaching's fine, but you need to get more papers out," or whatever. So, they encouraged me to use that as an opportunity to write a letter in response in which I would lay out the full scenario of what had been happening to me, and how I had been denied access to the clean room, and then ultimately literally locked out. So—

JC: Now, the chair of your department at this time, did he know anything about this?

DD: Did he know I was doing the meetings and stuff?

JC: Well no, was he aware of the situation between you and Guckel?

DD: Was who aware?

JC: The chair of your department.

DD: Mm. Maybe I had alluded a few things. I don't know. But what I did was—so that was like on a Friday night, and they said, "Okay," and I told them I had this shoebox of stuff I had been writing down. And they said, "Well, bring your shoebox tomorrow, we'll all have breakfast at my house," one of them said, "and we'll go through the shoebox and tell you what to do, which things matter, which things don't." So, we went and had breakfast at one of their homes, and their husband cooked pancakes for us. (JC: laughs.) And they went through all the things in the box and they put them kind of in three piles: 'this doesn't matter at all,' 'this matters a lot,' and 'maybe this one's important, maybe not'. And they said, "Okay, go out now and write the letter based on what we've told you is important." And so, I write like a six or eight page doubled spaced letter that day—to my chair, went back by the same lady's house where we'd had the pancakes. She read it over, gave me some feedback. I took it on a disc to my younger friend, Vicki, and she read it over, made a few changes, and she said, "Look, Denice, the one thing you don't have in here is the issue of sex discrimination." And I said, "Oh, Vicki, I don't know if it's really sex discrimination, blah, blah, blah." She said, "Look, it goes in now! Because (laughs) if we ever end up in court, you can't, in the middle of the road, change your story." So, she counseled me that that really needed to be in there, and I said, "Okay," and so she wrote that paragraph. And that letter then went on to the department chair, I took it to him. And he read it. And he said, "Well, gee,"—you know, he wasn't surprised. And he said, "Well, you know, Denice,"—this guy happened to be Jewish—and he said, "and I think he's anti-Semitic too." I said, "Look, Leon, you're really on your own for that one." I mean, this is about me (both laugh), right? And this was a pattern now that began to emerge. These guys had all been so terrorized by this guy, but they'd never had the guts to stand up to him or fight him, and so, as we went through this thing, people would kinda come out of the woodwork: "Oh, well he's mean to me, too," or "he's always been mean to me, too." You know, like that. It was kind of interesting.

JC: They all wanted to join in.

DD: They'd all been so timid, and I was in essence the first one that had had the guts to fight back. So, that was interesting.

00:29:42

JC: So, what happened after you handed your chair this letter?

DD: Well, I think what I did—I think the chair didn't really know what to do. He was scared of the guy. And I went along and saw the associate dean for research and talked to him about it, and, he had done research with Guckel and was kind of a colleague, and didn't want to really rock the boat too much and said, "Well, we could get you your own clean room. We'll get you one of those little clean rooms that you build and put it out in the parking lot or whatever." And (laughs) I was like, "I don't want a case kit clean room. I want to be in the real "big temple" clean room." So, he was trying to find some compromise that wouldn't directly confront Guckel. Well, I wasn't happy with that, and so then I went on up to the dean, and the dean basically spent half an hour, which was how long our meeting was, telling me about the new mast he'd gotten for his yacht and how long it was (JC: laughs), this really kind of phallic conversation (both laugh). And when he did get around to the issue, he kind of said, "Well, look Denice, you've got great things going on, and you need to build your program. And Henry's got great things going on, he needs to build his program, and you shouldn't get in his way, and he shouldn't get"—he was telling me, "Back off." He wasn't going to do anything about it. So, at that point I was really discouraged because I had run the chain of command as far as I knew it as an assistant professor. You don't know about provosts and presidents and stuff or who they are. And so, I went and saw this woman. The only other senior woman in the college was a professional staff woman who ran the career services for the students, the placement office. She's still there.

JC: And what's her name?

DD: And I went and saw her, and just kinda said, "Oh, I don't know what to do. I'm kind of at the end of my rope, and I've talked to all these people. And obviously nothing is going to happen." And she went to church with a guy who was at the time like the acting vice chancellor, and she said, "Well, you need to go see this guy." And I said, "Oh, well, why would I want to do that?" "Oh, well, I know he's going to be supportive, and he'll help you figure out what to do." (JC: And who was the acting—) So , I gave this guy a call, and this was before Shalala arrived. So, it was kind of between—acting president type situation.

JC: Would this have been Crawford Young?

DD: No, this was Phil Certain. And so I called him. It was like a Friday afternoon, late, and he said, "Oh, yes, well would you like to come right over?" And I said, "Well, it's not that important" (laughs). And I think she had prepped him, I think she had said to him, "You know this is going on," and they had maybe colluded to have me call. And I said, "No, I can come on Monday." And once I went over there, then the ball started rolling, and he gave me a lot of good advice about what to do. And he recommended that I send a letter to both the associate dean and the dean, or maybe it was taking that same other letter that I had written and sending it on to the associate dean and the dean with a memo on top of it saying, "Look, I'm blind copying you on

this letter that's gone to the department, but I need to get some support here with what's going on, and I'm also sending it over to—it was Certain and Bernie something, was the acting chancellor.

JC: Oh, Bernie Cohen?

DD: Bernie Cohen, maybe. I said in the letter in the memo, "I'm sending it over to them at their request as well." Then the ball started rolling, and then it became big power politics. And the big guys got involved in kinda beating up on my dean, and so on.

JC: Okay, now at this point are you still locked out of the lab?

DD: Yeah.

JC: Really? So, you had several weeks in which you just couldn't do any research?

DD: Quite a while, yeah.

JC: Okay, and how was it finally resolved?

DD: Well, what finally happened was that my department chair set up a committee, the standard kind of academic remedy when you don't have the guts to really do anything yet. And the committee was members of my department, and they investigated the whole situation. They wrote up a big report. They interviewed a zillion people, including Guckel and myself and our students and so on, and they came up with a report that basically said he shouldn't run the lab. And so, the associate dean for research in the college kinda took that on, and they did take him out of running the lab. And then I got a key.

JC: Does that mean that you were then in charge of the—

DD: So, it worked out. It took some time. It took a cast of thousands.

JC: Does that mean that you were then in charge of the lab or was it (unintelligible)?

DD: No, no, no. For a while they made the associate dean the director of the lab, and they identified some money to go out and hire a staff person who would be the staff manager of the lab, and that guy is still there. So, there were a lot of changes.

00:35:10

JC: Now, what did you learn from this whole battle?

DD: Well, I learned a lot about academic institutions and how they work, where the points of leverage are, how the politics work, and how one might effectively manage in an academic setting. And so, I think it gave me a huge jump start towards moving into leadership roles in universities because if you're in a situation like that and you're at the very bottom of the org. chart and have no leverage, yet you have to kinda try to figure out how to make things happen. It made it a lot easier as I began to get leadership roles. Now, as a dean, it's just so easy to do

things, compared to what that was (laughs). So, it was like a baptism by fire in academic leadership.

JC: Well, it's five after the hour. My next question is about tenure. Do you think you have enough time to discuss tenure?

DD: I've got another eight minutes or so. So, we can do a few more things.

JC: Okay, sure. Do you want to just comment on your experience with tenure?

DD: Yeah, so, on my tenure process, when the whole key situation got resolved, somewhere along the way I was counseled to request a tenure clock extension because of all of the time that I had lost with these battles. And I believe that I received a two-year tenure clock extension. And then we got a new department chair, and somewhere in my fourth or fifth year—I think it would have been a little bit early—I pushed that chair to put me up for tenure. And he really didn't want to, but I was pressing it. And one of the things that I was concerned about was that I felt like this group of people needed to vote no, the first time. And I really didn't think that they were going to vote yes no matter how strong my case was in round one. And I just wanted to get on through that and let them get it out of their systems, vote no, and then let's come back and get the yes vote. (JC: Why were you so sure—) And that's pretty much how it played out. They went through the process, they got outside letters, they did the whole drill. I think those outside letters were really, really strong from what I could ascertain, but they voted no. And it was not catastrophic because I had plenty of time with the tenure clock extension. And then when the next year rolled around and they put me up again, I got a positive vote and everything was hunky dory. (JC: Well, why were you so sure—) The process itself, I would say, worked out okay. I was disappointed that they couldn't wrap their brains around a supportive vote the first time around. One of the things I heard from one of my informants, who is a senior colleague—he said that, "Oh, Denice, your letters are really good. You know, you've got one letter from this woman Millie Dresselhaus," who I mentioned to you earlier, and he said, "But that letter's not going to count cause it's from a woman. So, it won't matter." And (laughs) that was a ridiculous thing to say for a lot of reasons, but one reason is that that one woman, just all by herself, had more honors and prestige and credentials and awards than the whole EE Department rolled up in a ball at Madison. But her letter wasn't going to matter because she was a woman.

JC: If you could explain, why were you so sure that you would be denied the first time?

DD: Oh, I just—you know, this was just a group of people who wasn't ready to vote yes on a woman, to accept a woman into their midst. I think they just felt the need to kinda beat me down a little bit with that.

JC: To make you jump through a few extra hoops?

DD: Yep. Yep. Yeah.

JC: So, do you think you were held to a higher standard than other candidates?

DD: Oh, probably. Probably, yes.

00:39:10

JC: Now, I'm not sure. Amy Wendt and Vicki Bier mentioned that you had been involved in work when somebody's unjustly denied tenure, and you were involved in changing the rules about what then happens. Did this relate to your own tenure experience?

DD: Okay, well there was this case with Ceil Pillsbury. Hang on a sec. There was a woman at UW-Milwaukee, and I think she was in the business school there. And she'd been denied tenure, and by all appearances, she was better than three or four men in the same department who'd gotten tenure recently. And what we discovered was that the laws or whatever in the state of Washington, or sorry Wisconsin, were set up in such a way that a department could vote no on a case—no, you know, deny tenure. And then in this—there was a case at UW-Stout or someplace—I think it was Eau Claire actually—where a Black guy had been denied tenure by his department, but the regents and/or the chancellor had granted him tenure. And then the department members had sued or grieved through some process, and they won. And the judge in court said, "Look, given the laws in the state of Wisconsin, I have to find for the members of this department, but fundamentally, I have to tell you that I think these rules are out of sync with Title IX, or whatever, or equitable practices." Because the bottom line was that the department could have basically said, "We're voting against this guy cause he's Black," and the way the rules or the laws in Wisconsin are written, that couldn't be overturned. And so, when a similar thing happened to Ceil Pillsbury, we mobilized around her case, a number of women in the state, and we got an elected official—and I don't remember who it was—to push to get that law changed. And they called it the Pillsbury Law or something. And it actually got changed so that there could be some oversight in tenure denials in a way that made sense, and we all ended up going to the signing. The governor, Tommy Thompson at the time, came over to one of the—you know, that UW administration building on campus there for the whole system—

JC: Oh, Van Hise, yes.

DD: So, anyway, it was up on the top floor of that tall building, and he had a big signing ceremony, and we were all there. And then we walked out, and we were waiting around in the elevator area to go downstairs. And he walked by. And it was all the women who'd kinda been involved in this campaign. And he looked at us as he walked by and said, "Oh, Well, if I knew all these beautiful women would be here, I'd have signed this law earlier" (both laugh). A real pig type person. So, that was an interesting little thing.

JC: Now that meant that when a woman was denied —a person was denied—tenure and it could be proved that it was unjust, what then happened?

DD: You could now reverse it. Whereas before, apparently, it wasn't able to be reversed by the people up on high. So, I don't know, you could find—I'm sure that's in the records, that law change.

JC: Okay. Well, perhaps we should—actually, I'm going to just turn the tape recorder off.

00:42:44

End of Tape 1 (November 20, 2003)

00.00.00
Start of Tape 2 (November 25, 2003)

JC: I'm here once again interviewing Denice Denton, who is dean of the College of Engineering at the University of Washington, and the date today is November 25, 2003. I was wondering if today you could talk a bit about women in engineering, the changes you saw for women in engineering after you arrived at UW. And I noticed that you said last time that there was initially one other woman, and soon you were the only one. But then within a few years a few more started to arrive. And I was wondering if you could talk about why you think more women started to become members of the faculty.

DD: Well, I think that it was at a period when more women were getting PhDs in engineering, and it took a while for the impact of Title IX to really hit. And so, I think the late eighties is when we began to see women really picking up PhDs and having the quality and having the numbers to be able to compete in a research university search. And it was about the time that that started happening, I think, in campuses around the country. One of the things that I did as soon as there were a few of us, was I started reserving a room in the student union, actually whatever the one's called, the south campus.

JC: Oh yeah, Union South.

DD: It wasn't the main union, but we reserved a room every month, I think, for the women in Engineering and Computer Science to get together and have lunch so that we can kind of network and just share strategies about how to get through being in a male dominated environment, and also, I started an evening thing of junior women faculty from engineering and science and related areas. And we'd get together at somebody's house once a month for wine and cheese, and we'd once in a while have a speaker but usually just keep it informal. So, that networking, I think, helped a lot of people to kinda get through the day and deal with some of their problems.

JC: Okay. What sort of problems would people discuss?

DD: Oh, just things that were going on in the department. Issues around promotion and tenure, or their merit review, or maybe some personal thing that had come up. I don't remember real specific things, but usually it was work related stuff, maybe dealing with students.

JC: So, just a way to get advice from a friendly audience.

DD: Yeah, yeah. Mm-hm.

JC: And what difference do you think this made to the women who participated in this?

DD: Well, I think it made a difference. I got an award recently at Madison for mentoring. And they cited those activities as some of the reasons for giving me the award.

JC: Okay. And I have also noted that you were the faculty advisor for the student chapter of the Society of Women Engineers.

DD: Right.

JC: And what did you do as faculty advisor?

DD: Well, I would meet with the leadership of SWE, and we'd talk about the plans for the year. And I would go with them on some of their events. Occasionally, we'd do what we called "blitz trips" over spring break, and we'd drive around to like Green Bay or Eau Claire and go to high schools and talk to the students in the high schools about coming to engineering and try to target in particular the women students. So, we had a variety of things. We hosted "Spring Weekend" on campus for women who had been admitted to the College of Engineering -- who had been admitted as freshman to the university and were interested in Engineering. They could come and spend the weekend and take some classes and live in the dorms. Those were the kinds of events that SWE would do, and I was just involved in an advisory role to help them think through some of those issues.

JC: Okay, now was the college meanwhile making steps to also try to recruit more women?

DD: I think so. I don't know how high a priority it was. I don't recall there being very much effort at the higher levels. I don't recall there being a program in the dean's office or anything like that. Toward the end of my time there, the dean did hire a director of diversity. And I don't remember that guy's name. But he began to put some of that kind of thing together, but I think it was pretty much the mid-nineties at that point when he hired that person.

JC: Okay. Now, do you think that Donna Shalala had any impact on how many women the college was trying to hire?

DD: Oh, probably not. I think that she was pretty far removed from that. And I don't recall her making diversity a high priority, other than at the student level she had the Madison plan, and that was, as far as I could tell, very focused around, minority students and faculty. My sense is that she didn't really have a—I don't think women in science and engineering was on her radar screen very much. I could be wrong, but that's how it appeared.

00:05:09

JC: Do you know of any other campus administrators who started to take an interest in this? I know at one point there was a position—well, I think it's now called Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Climate—and I don't know in the early nineties if that existed yet.

DD: Yeah, they had—there was a woman called Janet Hyde that they put in place as somebody to work on campus wide issues for women, and I think Betsy Draine might have held that position for a while. So, there were some campus level activities. And I think it might have been Janet. I can't remember. One of them started a campus wide mentoring program for women. It would match women faculty: a junior one and a senior one. So, that was a good program.

JC: Do you know if women from Engineering got involved with that?

DD: I got involved with it. I can't remember. I'm assuming there were a few others from

Engineering who got involved with it.

JC: Okay. Well, I was wondering if you could talk about some of your service activities relating to women in science and engineering. Now, one of them, you coordinated the women's programs in the College of Engineering from 1988 onwards. What was that role?

DD: Well, I think that was what I told you about before, just setting up those networking opportunities and making sure—

JC: Okay, I didn't realize that was an official position.

DD: Yeah, it was probably not official; that was unofficial.

JC: Okay. You also served—you chaired the Women in Science and Engineering Strategic Planning Committee in 1994 and 1995. Can you talk a little about that?

DD: Yeah, I think that was just an effort to try to bring together from across those two disciplines to talk about some campus wide issues, and I believe we probably put some recommendations forward to the Provost. But it's been a long time, and I don't really recall specifically what that was. I think one of the things that I did do that's not on your list here, at one point the university did a gender equity pay study, and I think Janet Hyde ran that. And they found that there was some inequity, and each college put together what they called a GEPC, Gender Equity Pay Committee. And I was on the GEPC for the College of Engineering, and I would say that was probably in the early nineties.

JC: Okay, and what did your committee find?

DD: Well, I think the way it worked was that, I can't remember if we were supposed to go through all of the women in the college or if there were targeted women on a list that we were provided with, but we basically looked at individual women and comparables--comparable males—to try and understand whether these women were paid at the right level. And in some cases, we found there were women who definitely looked like they deserved an increase. And I don't know if the campus set aside a pot of money or if each dean had to do that, but there was some money to go back and allocate additional dollars to some of these women scholars. So, that was effective, I thought.

JC: Are there any other of the items on these lists that you think are particularly important? I couldn't tell which ones were the most important ones.

DD: Yeah, I think you kind of hit the highlights here. I think that the networking lunches and the evening wine and cheese gigs were probably the highest impact because I know a number of women had told me they might have left Madison had it not been for those opportunities to connect with other women because many of us were so isolated at that time.

JC: Yeah, both Vicki Bier and Amy Wendt also said that they felt that that was a very important contribution you had made to the college.

DD: And then I did a lot of stuff on engineering education. I don't know if you've got that on

your list.

JC: Yes, that was the next topic.

DD: I think really trying to raise the level of education so that it didn't seem like the poor cousin to research and getting it more integrated into the department and college priorities. I worked with the dean on some issues of creating new introductory engineering classes. I got a grant from DARPA—and I guess it was called ARPA at the time—but there was something called the Peace Dividend when the Berlin wall came down and the feds put out a chunk of money to help convert people who had been in the defense industry over into commercial, and we got a grant to develop some manufacturing oriented work curriculum in the college. And one of the things we did was to create an introductory engineering program. And I worked with about six or eight faculty, most of whom were from Mechanical Engineering, but they were from different departments. And they became the team that took the lead on developing these courses through the grant that I had brought in.

00:10:15

JC: Now what problems in education were you trying to address?

DD: Well, part of it was to try to get students to be—to develop their teaming skills, get em to work in teams, get em to understand issues of timelines and deliverables, and having a budget, and kind of working on real world projects, and building up their communication skills because they would have to write up what they were doing and give presentations about it. So, it was an opportunity to give engineering students more of a real world experience and earlier in their career so that they could make an informed decision about whether or not they would really want to major in engineering.

JC: Okay. You also mentioned the other day that you started, when you were at MIT, you initiated a program to teach technical skills to engineering students. Did you do anything similar?

DD: What's that?

JC: Did you do anything similar at Madison?

DD: No. And that thing at MIT was targeted to both undergrad and grad students who just wanted to get a hands-on experience. I mean, you could say that this freshman engineering thing had some of the same character because it provided students with an opportunity to get hands on experience in engineering and designing and building something. So, it had some of that flavor.

JC: Now, this program that you were discussing, is that separate from the term you served as the co-director of the NSF National Institute for Science Education?

DD: Yeah, that's separate.

JC: Okay.

DD: So, the National Institute for Science Education, there was a—NSF put out an RFP for this program I guess in probably the '93-'94 time frame. They wanted to fund one institute in the country to look at science education issues from kindergarten through grad school. And we put in a big proposal at Madison with me as the PI and a colleague in education as the co-PI, and we enlisted people from across the campus. And we got a lot of support from Terry Millar, who was the associate dean of the grad school. I think he might still be in that role. And he was a big advocate of getting this to work, and when the dust settled, there were three finalists that they wanted to consider. And one was a group at Harvard, and one was a Stanford-Berkeley consortium, and one was us. And so, it was pretty stiff competition. And NSF did site visits to all three locations. And after looking carefully at all the programs, they chose ours. So that was really good. It's good for Madison to beat out that kind of competition.

JC: Yes, yes. Do you have any idea why Madison was chosen?

DD: Well, I think we had done a much better job of building a team that was truly a team and not just a loose collection of individuals. I think part of it probably had to do with—and this is kind of stereotypical—but I think as a woman, my leadership style is more consensus oriented and open and transparent. And I got the sense that at the other places, which were led by guys, it was much more top down, and not so much focused on building a team, but just putting together an empire. So, I think that NSF sensed that and felt like they would get more what they were looking for with this approach that we were taking.

JC: Now, is this a permanent institute, or is it going to be still funded?

DD: I'm not sure if it still goes on. The initial funding was for five years, and I don't think they had the opportunity for renewal. And I don't know if they've chosen to try to keep funding it without the federal dollars or not.

JC: I have a sense that something like that still exists. I'm not sure if it's the exact same program or not. Now, do you think that changes in engineering education can help to diversify colleges of engineering?

DD: Yeah, I think they definitely can. I think if you go back in history, the first engineering degrees in the country were granted at West Point. Engineering comes out of a very military tradition: hierarchical, top down, white male oriented. And it was designed of, by, and for a—just a very homogenous group of people. So, there's a lot of things that need to be changed. It historically has had kind of a boot camp mentality, and "look to your left, look to your right, only one of you will be here at the end of this year" kind of an approach. And I think what we're doing is we're changing engineering education to be much more welcoming to students. We are providing a lot more infrastructure around advising, and tutoring, and study centers, and trying to make students feel like we want them to succeed, rather than the other way around. And also getting more women faculty and faculty of color so that the students have some role models and so that those people can begin implementing some change in the system because they'll think they're friendly. So, I think, yeah, it'll make a big difference. It just takes some time. And I think we're already seeing that. Our Electrical Engineering Department here in Washington is twenty percent female now, and that's, I think, way better than most of the competition around the country. And I think we're seeing a change, too, in the numbers of grad students. A lot more

women graduate students are applying. So, it has a direct effect.

00:15:51

JC: Okay. Well, the next thing I wanted to ask you about was your shift to the University of Washington. I wanted to ask why in 1996 you decided to accept the position as dean there.

DD: Well, I think it was the—I had been at Madison for nine years, and I felt like I was kind of getting to a plateau there in terms of I wasn't really being challenged. I was just doing the same old thing, and it was interesting, but it wasn't challenging and exciting. I had been to University of Washington before to visit for professional reasons and liked the people and liked what I had seen. I liked the campus in the area. And I had done a lot of work with Boeing, so I had been out to Seattle a lot and liked the area. So, I knew quite a bit about it. And it just looked like a great opportunity.

JC: Okay. And in what ways did you feel that your career here prepared you for accepting a position as dean—because I know it is very unusual to move from a faculty member to a dean position immediately?

DD: Well, I think that the whole National Institute for Science Ed experience was very valuable because I had pulled together a whole team of people from across the campus and had to go through a very complex process in designing and building that institute. I had been chair of the divisional committee for the physical sciences, which reviews all of the tenure cases that go through all the parts of the campus that involve the physical sciences. So, I think like seven hundred faculty come under that umbrella. So, I knew a lot about promotion and tenure processes and had a lot of background in that. I had run two of the five—or two of the, yeah, two of the four thrust areas, I guess—in the Engineering Research Center, which was an NSF funded center. And those are a big deal. You have to have a lot of managing skills and budget and people skills. So, all of those kind of leadership roles together with the things we've talked about, the leadership around the diversity issues, I think, prepared me for being the dean. And then also, all of the stuff around getting locked out of the lab taught me a lot about how universities work and where the pressure points are, and how do you make things happen, and where's the leverage, and how do you build alliances to get things to happen in an academic environment. So, that was very valuable. And while it was a very unpleasant experience at the time, and I certainly wouldn't recommend it as a training ground (laughs), it was a training ground. And I learned a lot from going through that.

JC: Did it also give you a sense of how you wanted things to be done differently?

DD: Oh, definitely, yes. You know, coming out of that, I definitely wanted to be in a position to ensure that that didn't happen to other people.

JC: Now, what efforts have you made to recruit and retain women and other underrepresented groups at the University of Washington?

DD: Well, we have a really outstanding constellation of diversity programs here in the College of Engineering. We have one that focuses on the disabled, one that focuses on women students, one on minorities. And then there's a K-12 outreach program called MESA, Math Engineering

Science Achievement, which has a statewide effort, not just a UW effort, but a statewide effort to bring underrepresented students into science and engineering. So, there's a really strong set of programs here. They were all here prior to my arrival. And what I've done is I've tried to get additional resources to those programs. I've tried to cohere them so that they work together better with each other, and I've tried to enhance their linkages to our academic departments to make sure that once we get these students in the door they have a successful experience and make it into one of the academic majors in engineering. So, we've done a lot of work around recruitment and retention of underrepresented students. And then at the faculty level, I've spent a lot of time personally working on recruitment of underrepresented faculty, women and faculty of color. We developed a faculty recruitment toolkit that's actually online and has a lot of diversity resources in it. And that's been made available campus wide, and also, I've been asked to come give talks around the country about that toolkit. So, I've been to Berkeley, and Texas A&M, and Rice, and the Midwest, Iowa, and Michigan to talk about that work.

00:20:30

JC: So, it sounds like Washington is a bit of a model in that area, then.

DD: Yeah, we've gotten a lot of good publicity, and we've had a lot of people using that—the folks from MIT who did that study on women faculty in the sciences, they moved on and did some work on women in engineering. And they've put out a campus wide toolkit, and they refer to our kit in theirs. And I've spoken to them about what we're doing here.

JC: Okay, now you said that when you arrived there were many programs already in place. Was that unusual for a college to already have set up programs, for example with the disabled? I don't think that maybe Madison has that.

DD: Well, I think we're ahead of the curve on the disabled, for sure. I think that a lot of programs around the company in the mid nineties, a lot of colleges of engineering had such programs. I mean, there's a lot of leaders like Georgia Tech and Berkeley. They've been doing this stuff a long time. So, I think Washington is in the leadership group with respect to having these programs, but we're by no means the only one who had programs like that in the mid nineties. There were quite a few, although there were still places that had very little.

JC: Okay. And it also sounds like one of the focuses is getting to people—getting to students—before they get to college.

DD: Well, yeah, definitely. There's a big K-12 outreach component.

JC: Okay. And that seems very important because people are going to form their impressions of what engineering is long before they get to school.

DD: Definitely. That's a big challenge.

JC: And to what extent have you met your goals to diversify the college?

DD: Well, I think we're doing really well with respect to faculty. I've cited some numbers. We also got an NSF ADVANCE award. It's a new program in NSF that focuses on advancing

women faculty in science, math, and engineering. So it's not K-12, it's not undergrad, it's not grad students. You know, it's really looking at systemic issues of institutional transformation to insure that women faculty can be successful. So, I would say that our numbers at the faculty level look really good with respect to women. They're very, very small with respect to people of color. So, we have a lot of work to do there. At the student level, our numbers are again quite good with respect to women. We're above the national average in the granting of Bachelor's, Master's, and PhD's to women. And we're significantly above the national average at the Master's and PhD level. So, I think we're doing really well there. So, I think we're making good forward progress, but you have to keep chipping away at it. It's a lifetime commitment.

JC: Are there some factors that you think are necessary to create an environment within engineering that is more welcoming to women and minorities? Are there things that you're still working on that you think need to be changed?

DD: Oh, yeah, definitely. I think that one of the most important things in this arena is leadership, and if you don't have people at the top who are pushing the diversity agenda in a meaningful way, I don't think you're going to make it. Grassroots alone is not enough. You've really got to have both people working at the grassroots and people working at the leadership level to pull it off. So, that's one structural thing. That's kind of depressing for people who are in an organization where their leaders are not onboard (laughs). But I think they can chip away a long time and get nowhere, frankly, because you can only go so far if the people at the top aren't onboard. Then I think it's a question of really looking at policies and making sure that your recruitment, your hiring, your promotion policies are all aligned with the basic principles of equity. A lot of our policies have some built in issues, like take tenure. If you have a rigid probationary period of five or six years for tenure, and that's exactly when women would want to be having children, then that policy is going to be antithetical to forward progress for women faculty. So, most universities have fairly flexible and liberal tenure clock extension policies that will allow people to not be stuck in that very teeny window, where they want to be having their families. So, that's one example of how you have to go and really look carefully at policies that have been in place a long time and see where they're not consistent with the goal of diversifying the faculty.

00:25:07

JC: Do you have any idea how long ago colleges and universities started becoming more flexible with regards to tenure rules?

DD: I would say that a lot of them were looking at that in the early eighties. I don't know—I'm sure every university is in a different place now, but there's quite a bit of movement in that arena.

JC: Okay, I was wondering. It seemed to me like it might be a very new idea.

DD: No, I don't think it's that new.

JC: Now, do you have any final comments you want to make about your career at UW-Madison or your career at the University of Washington?

DD: Well, I think—I think I hit UW-Madison at a time when certainly the College of Engineering wasn't quite ready to have a female colleague, and I think any place where you go where you're the very first one of a certain type, and you're surrounded by a lot of other people who are not like you, it's gonna be tough. And, I think that at Madison I kinda hit at a time when whatever woman came along it's going to be a real challenge. My understanding is one woman was in that EE Department before me and came and left. So, it was kind of chewing people up and spitting them out. And I think that for any institution that's being integrated, so to speak, the first people that come along to integrate it generally have to be pretty strong willed and have a stubborn streak and a capability to take on the kind of adversarial behavior that you might end up seeing. I think a lot of people leave who are underrepresented because it is just very, very difficult, and I think one of the reasons that I was able to be successful at Madison was that I am a strong willed, more stubborn kind of a person. And also because there were a lot of people at Madison who wanted to help me be successful. You really have to have a combination of those two things. I think no matter how stubborn you are, again, it comes back to leadership. No matter how stubborn you are, if nobody at the top's gonna get behind you, you can't win. And so, you have to give Madison credit for the fact that people came together around my cause, so to speak, and made it possible for me to be successful. So, I think that that's very positive. And I think with respect to the University of Washington, by the time I got out here, I think it was at a more enlightened level than Madison was when I got to Madison. So, there hasn't been nearly as much of the gender related stuff that I've had to deal with here. There's some, but its not nearly as much. And I think there's a really strong team of people out here who want to make really good progress on the diversity agenda. About half the deans are women. We have a lot of people, male and female, at the leadership levels, who are very concerned and very involved in enhancing the environment for diversity. So, I think it's a really good spot to be doing this kind of work.

JC: Well, then thank you very much for your time. I really appreciate this, and I think it's going to be a very excellent addition to our collection.

DD: Right, okay, well good luck with your program.

JC: Thank you.

DD: Bye.

JC: Bye.

00:28:28

End of Tape 2