

## UCSD Gender Equity Task Force Report (March 2002)

Our Task Force was asked to study gender equity among UCSD ladder rank faculty (LRF), particularly with regard to salary compensation, recruitment, and retention. The Task Force examined data related to the makeup of our existing workforce, new appointments, national availability pools, faculty salary, start-up funding, space, committee service, department and program chair appointments, rate of advancement, promotions and above-scale actions, accelerations, and separations. The Academic Personnel Office (APO) staff provided most of the data we examined. In order to make the task manageable, we restricted our analysis only to data of the past four years. In our statistical analysis, we adopted a null hypothesis, that there is no gender bias, and looked for instances where the data lead to a rejection of that hypothesis. Our study included only LRF on the general campus, the School of Medicine (SOM) and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO).

In addition to examining a considerable amount of data, the committee broadened its inquiry by interviewing as many LRF women as possible to understand whether there are widely perceived forms of gender bias which may not be easily identified by an objective analysis of data. Findings based on the interviews are more subjective and we have decided to report only those concerns which seemed widespread and corroborated by several faculty. The interviews did suggest that the perceptions of gender bias vary by department, with some departments doing well and others less well in the treatment of women. We realize that even if a statistical analysis were not to show any bias on average, there could surely be individual cases of bias, affecting both men and women. Therefore a mechanism to address individual cases needs to be considered. Although we are aware that women are underrepresented on the faculty and there is a significant salary differential in some units, the committee finds that overall the campus as a whole is doing relatively well in addressing traditional gender inequities.

In the sections below, we first provide a summary of our principal findings and major recommendations. In the introduction section, we provide background to the issues and discuss the methodology and processes we used. In subsequent sections, we present and discuss the data relevant to our findings and the results of our interviews. In the appendices, we provide tables of detailed data and associated definitions which provide the foundation for our findings and recommendations.

### **I. Summary of Key Findings and Primary Recommendations**

- Women represent only 18% of the LRF and **the serious challenge facing most departments is to recruit and retain women faculty in proportion to the available pool**. In the sciences and engineering, in proportional terms more women faculty candidates are available than hired, even if the pool is narrowed to graduates from the top institutions or with postdoctoral experience.
- After accounting for discipline, years since the doctorate, and years of service at UCSD, we find that LRF women faculty are paid 5.6% less than men in the academic year base salary, normalized to nine months, and about 12.5% less than men in total 12 month compensation. Our findings do not, by themselves, necessarily imply discrimination. We were unable to measure productivity and

quality, and there may be sub-discipline effects. But our study does suggest where to look, and **we identify significantly large disparities in a few units which need to be examined in more detail on a case by case basis.**

- Women have been hired at a salary which, over the past 44 years, averages 7% less than men, after accounting for experience and discipline. **The reasons and implications need to be examined and understood.** More recently, however, starting salaries have become equalized and for the past four years we find no statistically significant gender effect.
- **The salary regression model used in this study should be applied on an annual rolling basis to identify possible inequities so that additional review and appropriate corrections can be made in a timely and pro-active manner.**
- The School of Medicine has a more complex compensation system than the general campus and SIO, especially with regard to the Y (negotiated) and Z (clinical) components. We found no gender inequity in the base salary (X,X',Y'), but a significant 49% gender disparity in Y+Z compensation beyond the base salary. **This disparity requires additional analysis.** We did not consider non-LRF in the SOM.
- On average across the campus, we find little or no gender bias in rate of advancement, promotion, Step VI, to above-scale, and accelerations, appointments as chairs to departments and programs, startup packages, space allocation, or Senate committee service. Women at the Associate Professor rank, however, serve disproportionately on Senate committees.
- Women represent a meaningfully higher percentage of separations (22%) than their current population (18%). **The reasons should be solicited by exit interviews and/or surveys to understand the cause and effect of this loss in more detail than we have been able to accomplish.**
- **Faculty should be informed annually of the average salary by rank in their department.**
- **A mechanism should be established to enable faculty to seek confidential consultation outside their department and division regarding their standing in the ranks and associated compensation.**
- **Procedures should be developed to permit all tenured faculty to be able to request a special review to determine whether they are correctly calibrated in rank and salary. This option should be available once every five years.**
- UC policies related to child bearing and parental leaves are not sufficiently flexible, friendly, or kind to women, and are poorly understood by faculty. **The SVCAA should consider improvements to childbearing and childcare, especially in the areas of leaves and modified duties, “stopping the clock”, and availability of childcare.**

## II. Introduction and Background

The UCSD Task Force on Gender Equity was charged in March 2001, by Senior Vice Chancellor Chandler to conduct a study of gender equity among ladder rank faculty. Such a task force had been recommended in a report to the Chancellor by the Committee on the Status of Women in 2000. Gender equity has been a concern on all UC campuses and, during the formation of the task force, the general issue received national attention in early 2001 when several top ranked universities acknowledged that barriers exist for female faculty in science and engineering. During this same period the California Legislature authorized an audit related to gender equity in hiring and compensation within the UC system. The task force was able to review the state audit report published in May 2001 as well as recent gender equity studies at UCSD, UCLA, and UCI. We also reviewed gender studies at UCSD done by Vice Chancellor Ticho in 1989, and by the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women, in 1990 and again in 1992. In addition many of our members were able to meet with Nancy Hopkins, Professor of Biology at MIT, who led an internal MIT study that documented gender bias against women in MIT's School of Science.

The task force has examined data up through 2000 because it represented the latest complete year of data available to us. In 1990 women represented 14.5% of the ladder rank faculty. Where do we currently stand? The table in appendix A1 shows the workforce profile for ladder rank faculty (LRF) at UCSD during the period 11/95 - 10/00. Women currently represent 18% of the LRF. The average across all UC campuses is near 24% and UCSD stands near the bottom. The table shows the distribution to be very dependent on discipline ranging from a high of 33% in the arts and humanities to a low of 7% in engineering. Such distributions are common and can explain some of UCSD's low ranking overall, since 63% of our LRF are in sciences, SOM, and engineering. The table in appendix A2 gives data on new appointments at UCSD during the four years prior to the 1996 State Proposition 209, and the four years after. Unlike most UC campuses, UCSD's hiring of women did not drop after 209 but the hiring level of women faculty has been the lowest in the UC system, near 25%. Appendix A2 reflects the commonly observed differences between disciplines. Women faculty are recruited at much higher percentages in the fields where availability pools are highest, that is, in fields other than science and engineering. In fact, most disturbing are our hiring trends in the physical sciences and engineering. The impact of these trends on the workforce is a net loss of women LRF in engineering and no change in the physical sciences even as the total headcounts in both disciplines have grown substantially (appendix A1). Appendix A3 provides similar data on appointments but provides detail by tenure level and covers two additional years. Such data may vary slightly because the year of appointment does not always coincide with the year of arrival to campus, and the data for 2001 were not complete. As we write this final report we have become aware that recruitment of women faculty jumped to 30% overall during the 2001 year, an encouraging indication of what may be possible. Appendix A3 also supports the state audit finding that women faculty are more likely to be recruited at the non-tenured level. For a variety of reasons, there are plans to increase junior level appointments to above 60% of all new hires, and thus one of the benefits may be an increase in appointments of women. We discuss the important issue of recruitment of women in relation to availability pools below.

The committee worked with the Academic Personnel Office (APO) and the Academic Senate (AS) to obtain data related to the recruitment, compensation and advancement, committee service, and retention of faculty. **Our operational hypothesis has been the null hypothesis,**

**that there is no gender inequity unless the data demonstrate otherwise.** While we feel we have examined the most important data related to faculty, we did have to compromise an intellectual appetite to always look further with the workload placed on the APO staff and our desire to bring this phase of the campus inquiry to a close. Overall we are pleased with the breadth and the depth of the data we obtained. In each section below we summarize the important findings, placing the actual data in the appendix for further scrutiny by the interested reader. In some cases we have had to limit the level of detail in order to respect an appropriate level of confidentiality.

Based on our review of the previous reports mentioned above and on discussions with Professor Hopkins and other colleagues, the committee also decided to broaden its inquiry beyond data collection and analysis, by interviewing as many women LRF faculty as possible. In the final section, we describe the interview process and summarize those findings which seem to represent widespread perceptions and concerns. While this has been a long task and has delayed the final report, we have found the interviews to be informative and a useful balance to the interpretation of objective data.

### **III. Data and Discussion**

#### **A. Availability and Recruitment**

UCSD's Office of Academic Affirmative Action (OAAA) collects data annually from the National Research Council and provides an analysis of the data relevant to each LRF search to the department and dean. The NRC data is coded for each discipline and sub-discipline, and the OAAA analysis links the specific search to the appropriate NRC coded availability data. Availability is calculated separately for tenured and tenure-track faculty. The most recent five years of PhD data are used to calculate availability for tenure track faculty and the next five years are used for tenured faculty. The committee was informed that OAAA meets with each search committee chair and/or department chair to review the data and procedures. A copy of all relevant materials is sent to committee members. We consider this to be an essential step in the search process, and feel it is important that information is given to all search committee members and not only the chair. OAAA also provides a listing of best practices as suggestions for search committees to consider. The SVCAA has asked each dean to review the applicant pool, before final candidates are brought to the campus for interviews, to ascertain if the applicant pool reasonably reflects the availability pool. If women applicants are not present in the pool at about the rate of their estimated availability in the field, then the deans and departments should review whether recruitment and outreach procedures were sufficiently broad, and if not, consider reopening the search with expanded inclusive recruitment efforts. While this new process is seen as a significant improvement, it is clear that there are gaps between availability, the applicant pool, and appointments.

Tables in appendices A4, A5, and A6 show data by discipline comparing availability, applicant pool, and appointments for six years. The data are not complete for biology, which was joined with the physical sciences until the 1999-00 recruitment period, so we combine comments on this particular data set. The data fluctuate significantly year-to-year, but examining the six-year averages it appears that the applicant pool has been unreasonably low in women candidates in engineering, physical sciences/biology, social sciences, and the arts and humanities. Appointments of women seem unreasonably low in engineering, the physical sciences/ biology, SOM, and SIO. It is interesting that while the applicant pools of potential women candidates

appear to have been below availability in the social sciences and the arts and humanities, the appointments of women in these disciplines appear to meet or exceed the availability. The general conclusion from this data is that the campus should be able to improve in the sciences and engineering.

Availability is not straightforward data to assess and many faculty feel that the quality of our recruitment is better reflected in a narrower data base than the NRC data provide, and also that the post-doctoral pool is a better measure of potential candidates in the sciences. Although we feel the OAAA should begin to collect and report such refined data, we were able to obtain a summary of related data which was presented by UCSC Chancellor Greenwood when she testified before the State Select Committee on Government Oversight. This data is given in Appendix A7. Her remarks deal with UC wide hiring averages, and she presents comparison data for the national pool, the UC PhD pool, a set of eight Comparison Institutions, and the post doctoral pool. In engineering there seems to be little variation between the pools. In the life sciences the post-doctoral pool is not substantially below the national pool, and availability is even higher in the Comparison 8 Institutions. While the UC availability reflects the national availability in the physical sciences, there is a dramatic decrease in candidates available from the Comparison 8 Institutions. We would recommend that an effort be made to provide post-doctoral data to the science departments and deans. However, we do not see a strong basis for discounting the NRC national data as reflecting the availability of women candidates.

The selection of faculty candidates from an applicant pool is done by a departmental search committee. It is difficult if not impossible to assess whether any gender bias occurs at this critical step. The data comparison between the applicant pool and the appointments would cause concern in the physical sciences, engineering and SOM, but there are too many factors to make any reasonable judgements, including the narrowing of candidates by specific research areas within disciplines. Regardless, there was a specific recommendation made by the State Audit report to avoid using all-male search committees, even to the extent of utilizing women faculty external to the department. We would agree that it is a reasonable goal for search committee membership to be as inclusive as possible, provided women faculty are available who have a reasonable match in expertise with the search area, and that such committee service does not place an undue burden on women faculty in departments where their numbers are small. In any case, the recruitment process and committee search files should be open to all faculty for comment and not limited to a particular search committee.

We have found that another issue with search committees is that they need to be better informed on what they can or can not do with regard to Proposition 209 and affirmative action. This should be discussed and clearly articulated by the OAAA when they meet with faculty committees.

It is not clear how the deans are held accountable for addressing issues related to diversity in the hiring of faculty. The new policy of reviewing the applicant pool certainly involves them more. They should be expected to provide leadership to the departments in implementing equal opportunity and best practices in recruiting, and in helping departments to maintain sensitivity to the importance of gender equity while attracting the best qualified and most inclusive faculty to the campus. **We suggest that an assessment of efforts made to ensure equal opportunity in recruitment, particularly as it involves gender, become a specific component of the annual review of each dean's performance.**

## B. Salary Compensation

An important measure of gender equity is salary compensation. In response to a proposal from the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women we attempt to answer the question, "Are women's salaries lower than men's salaries, all else constant?" We answer this question by adapting the earnings model similar to one used by other universities (e.g., Stanford, UCI, and UCLA). The model is a simplified version of a standard earnings model in labor economics [e.g., see Johnson, George. 1999. "Trends in Relative Earnings of Tenure Track Faculty: 1973 – 1995." Working paper, Department of Economics, University of Michigan; Pencavel, John. 1997. "Market Work and Wages of Women: 1975-94." Working paper, Department of Economics, Stanford University].

We began with the **null hypothesis, that women's salaries are not significantly different from men's, if all variables other than gender are held constant**. While we are able to complete such a regression model on several important variables that are known in these other models to affect salary, it was impossible to measure all of the variables known in the literature to affect earnings. The most important excluded variable would be one related to productivity and quality, which is at the heart of the academic review process and our ad hoc committee deliberations. Principally, our key independent variables used to estimate earnings are experience, both since the Ph.D. and at UCSD (measured in years to present). We also know that market forces vary by discipline and thus so should salary. Economists and engineers, for example, are known to make more than historians, and we account for these differences in our estimation of earnings. We could find no objective measure of productivity or quality that could be collected in a similar manner for faculty members across the varied departments on our campus, although discipline-specific measures can perhaps be formulated. The inclusion of productivity or quality measures in further refinements of the model should be contemplated. Our basic salary model is as follows:

$$\text{Log}(\text{Wages}_{jt}) = \sum_i C_i(\text{Discipline}_{jt}^i) + B_1(\text{PY}_{jt}) + B_2(\text{PY}_{jt})^2 + D_1(\text{UCY}_{jt}) + D_2(\text{UCY}_{jt})^2 + E(\text{Gender}_j) + F_t(\text{Year}_t) + e_{jt}$$

where:  $\text{Wages}_{jt}$  are the earnings of senate member  $j$  in year  $t$ , measured either as the member's nine-month salary (or the equivalent) or the member's total 12 month compensation.  $\text{Discipline}_{jt}^i$  is a set (vector) of  $i$  dummy variables identifying each senate member  $j$ 's discipline in year  $t$ . In this way, we "control for" or take account of the average wage gap among all units such as engineering, social sciences, SOM, SIO, etc. In several cases we were guided by previous results as well as our own to add variables for specific departments, such as economics, or groups of departments. Combining departments where it seemed likely that market conditions would be similar across departments was useful when the number of women faculty in any one department was too small to provide any power to our test of the null hypothesis.  $\text{PY}_{jt}$  is, for each senate member  $j$  in year  $t$ , the number of years of experience since earning a Ph.D.  $\text{UCY}_{jt}$  is similarly the number of years at UCSD for each person  $j$  in year  $t$ .  $\text{Gender}_j$  is, of course, the key variable for our tests, and is a dummy variable which is equal to one if person  $j$  is a female and zero otherwise. The rejection of the null hypothesis is based on the magnitude and statistical significance of the gender variable (i.e., regression coefficient  $E$ ). A standard statistical t-test is used to obtain the confidence interval for this coefficient. We only rejected the null hypothesis when the coefficient was significant at or above the 95% confidence level.  $\text{Year}_t$  is an included dummy variable for three of the four years in our study, which accounts for the average increase in salaries across individuals (i.e. COLAs) in year  $t$ .

Lastly,  $e_{jt}$  is a random error term whose average is zero and whose variance defines the standard error used to compute the confidence interval.<sup>1</sup>

We estimated the model above for all ladder rank faculty (LRF) at UCSD. Appendix A8 provides additional detail about the database. We also estimated the model for certain subsets of the faculty (by division, department, school, etc.) The total number of ladder rank faculty included in this study was 876, 154 women and 722 men. In order to cover a reasonable cycle of merit reviews and advancements, the model included up to four years for each faculty member (1997 to 2000). The average was 3.7 years since many faculty were not at UCSD for the full four years. The total number of observations input to the regression model was 3595.

Our results are divided into two major components, regressions on LRFs nine month academic salary, or base salary, or its equivalent, and their total twelve month salary, including additional compensation such as contract and grant summer salary, and stipends. For the SOM the base salary included X, X', and Y', and the additional compensation included Y and Z. Appendix A9 provides a detailed example of the regression output, while the tables in Appendix A10 provide the summary for selected cases for the important gender coefficient.

Appendix A9 is an example of the type of output the committee received for each regression. This data summarizes the campus-wide, base salary analysis and shows that there is a residual negative gender coefficient  $E = -0.0573$ , with a standard error of .0144 and gives the 95% confidence interval to be from  $-0.029$  to  $-0.0856$ . **This allows us to reject the null hypothesis, that the gender effect is zero, with more than 99.9% confidence.** Accounting for the log wage factor<sup>2</sup>, this coefficient means that **women faculty are paid 5.6 % less**, on average, than are men with equivalent experience and in similar disciplines. The other coefficients indicate relative (not absolute) salary factors related to each of the other regression variables. For example, we found that the most consistent factor explaining base salary is the variable PY, years since Ph.D. As expected, we also found that faculty in economics, engineering, and IRPS have base salaries higher on average than do faculty in the comparison group for this particular regression, and that faculty in the arts and humanities, social sciences, medicine, and biology have salaries that are lower, on average, than in the comparison group. For this particular regression, the comparison was the Division of Physical Sciences but the choice is arbitrary and has no consequence for the important gender coefficient.

We also estimated the regression selecting only on faculty in each campus division, for each department, and for clusters of departments. The results are summarized in Table A of Appendix A10 and show that for most divisions and departments on campus we are unable to reject the null hypothesis that the gender coefficient is zero. Some units give a negative gender coefficient but the result is not statistically significant. **The exceptions were<sup>2</sup> : the Division of Biology (-12% salary differential), the Division of Arts and Humanities**

---

<sup>1</sup> Errors produced by the model will be both random (variance from the mean) and will vary systematically from person to person (as in a fixed effects model). We used an estimation technique, known as a random effects model, to account for both types of error (Greene, William H. 1997. Econometric Analysis, 3d ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall. See Chapter 14). This also accounts for the fact that each LRF member was observed multiple times in the data set so that our observations were not all independent of one another.

<sup>2</sup> Because the dependent variable in the regression is the natural log of wages, the percentage wage gap can be calculated from the gender coefficient E as  $100\% \times (e^E - 1)$ .

**(-5.9% differential), the Department of Physics (-16% differential), and the Department of Bioengineering in the School of Engineering (-31% differential). A regression combining the faculty within the history, music, and literature departments also yields a significant gender coefficient (with a - 7.3% differential on average).** If these units are removed from the overall regression the gender factor for all remaining units on campus falls to -4.4% (and is still significant at the 98.6% level of confidence). While the result for all of the major divisions are summarized in Appendix 10, we only include those general campus departments which yielded a statistically significant negative gender coefficient. Of course, as in any modeling, our results are specific to the model we employed. Different models may produce different results.

**Our findings do not, by themselves, necessarily imply discrimination.** We were unable to measure productivity and quality, and there may be sub-discipline effects. But, our study does suggest where to look. We are able to find individuals, departments, and divisions that differ from the “norm.” **To understand if there are acceptable reasons for the salary inequity we found would require a case by case review of the academic files in these units, particularly for those faculty identified with salary below the norm calculated using the regression model. The committee recommends this course of action to the SVCAA.**

We also obtained data for total annual twelve-month compensation for all faculty. The model was applied in a similar fashion with total compensation as the dependent variable. The summary of the results is given in Table B of Appendix A10. The campus wide result is that **women faculty receive a total compensation which is, on average, 12.6 % less than men** (significant at the 99.9% confidence level). We found again that for certain departments and divisions we could reject the null hypothesis that the gender effect is zero: **Biology (-23%), Arts and Humanities (-14.6%), and the School of Medicine (-19.6%),** while for most departments and divisions we could not reject the null hypothesis.

Total annual compensation is the sum of base salary plus any additional compensation a faculty member receives. Our findings just discussed led us to examine additional compensation further, to see where significant disparities might arise. Because additional compensation is made up of several sources, many of which depend on faculty initiated external funding, the committee looked at the sources of funding by gender. Our study separated the general campus and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO) from the School of Medicine (SOM) because of the unique salary sources available in the SOM, embodied in the Y (negotiated) and Z (clinical) salary components.

Appendix A11 shows the data related to additional compensation for the general campus and SIO. Table 2 shows that on average 70% of male faculty receive additional compensation and 58% of women faculty, with the major differences originating in biology and the social sciences. Table 3 shows that women received 62% of their funding from federal sources while men received 57% from federal sources. In both biology and the social sciences the major funding source is federal grants. Table 4 shows the actual salary dollars, showing that women faculty obtain less on average. Although we did not pursue further analysis, the committee felt this is likely due to the rank distribution of the faculty, since additional compensation is tied to base salary.

In analyzing additional compensation (salary beyond the base salary, in the form of supplements, summer pay, etc.) we found that we could not reject the null hypothesis that men



and women were treated equally in both federally-sourced and other additional sources of compensation for the general campus and SIO. However, **in the SOM we did find that we could reject the null hypothesis and that women receive 49% less, on average, than men do in the sum of additional compensation (Y + Z).** Interestingly, when analyzing the Y and Z salary components separately for SOM we could not reject the null hypothesis, indicating that men and women were treated equally for each component. This suggests that there is some additive effect with the sources of additional compensation in SOM that is correlated with gender. The most obvious might be that men are much more likely to receive both Y and Z compensation while women are likely to receive only one or the other. In any event, **a finding of this magnitude suggests that a detailed study of additional compensation at SOM is warranted.** Because of the substantial number of non-LRF in the SOM, we again wish to note that they are not included in this analysis.

**One advantage of the methodology just described is that it can be iterated each year.** Each year we can identify those faculty who fall within a band some distance below the prediction line (e.g., we could pick those individuals who fall within the bottom 20%, relative to the regression line). With these individuals identified, the SVCAA could ask the department chairs and divisional deans to either ask for salary adjustments for those faculty in the lowest 20% or to explain why these salary differences exist. This does not imply that every such individual needs to be evaluated every year. This process could, in a few short years, correct any salary inequities that may exist between men and women at UCSD and would keep any such salary inequities from arising in the future. **We recommend that the SVCAA consider a mechanism to provide such an annual evaluation process.** Further, as we learn better techniques for refining the academic wage model the methods used can be adjusted and the process continued. In particular, we recommend that work be continued with the goal of incorporating a measure of productivity and quality by discipline into the regression model.

### C. **Starting Salary and Rate of Advancement**

The analysis of current salary data reflects where women faculty currently stand with respect to men. In addition to identifying the units mentioned above which require further scrutiny, we looked at campus-wide data related to starting base salaries and rate of advancement in an attempt to determine major factors which might contribute to gender disparity.

We analyzed **starting base salaries** using the above regression model for two cohorts. We first examined the deflated and adjusted starting salaries for all LRF since 1956, and second for LRF faculty hired more recently during the past four years of this study, 1997 - 2000. This regression used starting salary data for all LRF without all of the exclusions indicated in Appendix A8. A summary of the regression results is given in Table C of Appendix A10. **Considering LRF hired between 1956 and 2000, we found a significant campus-wide average gender effect in the base starting salary<sup>2</sup> of - 7%. However, campus-wide average starting salaries have become equalized and we cannot reject the null hypothesis for faculty hired during the past four years of this study.** Including LRF hired between 1956 and 2000, we are able to reject the null hypothesis independently for only two units. **The Division of Arts and Humanities has hired women faculty at an average starting salary 6.8% less than men, and the group of departments history, music and literature has hired women faculty at a salary 8.6% less than men.**

In part this gender effect may have been due to lower salaries of women before they come to UCSD, or it could be due to sub-disciplines. As reported in the section above, the current overall disparity for all LRF at UCSD is less (-5.6 %) suggesting that women faculty do improve their relative standing as they move through the ranks at UCSD. Indeed, re-running the base salary regression above, but interacting years of experience with gender, we found that the coefficient for gender interacted with years at UCSD is positive and significant, **meaning that the longer women faculty are at UCSD the smaller is the deficit in their salary relative to men.** Nevertheless, **equity in the starting base salary is a serious issue which should be examined more closely.**

Our database also permitted us to examine the rate of advancement through the normal merit steps within each rank. On average, we found no statistically significant gender effect. We further examined the rate of advancement at promotion, Step VI, accelerations and above-scale actions. To do this, we examined summaries of actual personnel action data on a campus-wide basis. There can be effects of gender bias at departmental levels not revealed by the average data presented, but we were not able to delve into such individual cases. The results for three years are shown in Appendix A12 for tenure reviews, promotion to full professor, advancement to Step VI and to above-scale, and other actions, which include accelerations. Except for tenure decisions, women faculty are being advanced at a slightly better rate than men. Women are advanced to tenure at a slightly lower rate than men (86% to 90%). **Overall this data suggests little or no gender inequity in rate of advancement.**

We also inquired about the influence of major awards on subsequent personal actions, particularly on accelerations and above-scale. Unfortunately it is difficult to establish what is or isn't a major award or recognition, especially in the non-sciences, so the data are most pertinent to the sciences. The results are given in Appendix A13. Although the database is small, these **limited data suggest that women and men are treated equitably in recognition of major awards.**

#### **D. Start-up Packages and Space**

Careers can be enhanced by start-up packages and space, especially in the sciences and engineering. The assessment of such benefits is not straightforward because of the differences in recruitment rank, research areas, and the variety of ways in which resources can be directed to a particular faculty member. In Appendix A14 we present average start-up data over a three-year period organized by division and gender, with and without the impact of laboratory renovations. The numbers are small for some divisions and the committee was able to satisfy itself that in those cases where a significant disparity appeared it was explained by the sub-discipline, typically laboratory or non-laboratory based research; for example mathematics versus physics. **On the whole we did not identify any gender inequity in start-up packages.**

Appendix A15 provides some laboratory space allocation data for the physical and biological sciences. The only apparent disparity in physics was accounted for by the research area; the particular woman faculty member was a theoretician. **We did not identify any gender inequity in space allocations.**

#### E. Committee Service

There are contradicting aspects of committee service on the campus. Service can be viewed as a measure of stature and influence, as part of the overall academic performance in merit reviews, or as an assignment of a task which detracts from research efforts. Gender balance on committees, especially recruitment search committees, is seen as an important gender equity issue, but at the same time some view it as a serious demand on women faculty's time. We were able to collect data for Senate committee service over a three-year period. The data are given in Tables a-e of Appendix A16. There are substantial yearly variations and we comment only on the overall three year totals. The data include: (a) the total Senate membership, which shows that women represent 17.3% of the membership during this period; (b) the invitations to serve, showing that women associate professors are asked a disproportionately higher number of times to serve (35.7%); (c) data for accepted invitations, which appear to parallel the invitation data; (d) the percentage rate of acceptance over three years showing that women and men accepted at nearly the same rate; and (e) a breakdown by Senate Council committees (more influential positions) and non- Senate Council committees, which shows that over the three-year period women are asked preferentially to serve on the Senate Council committees, and again the demand is most disproportionate for women associate professors.

#### F. Department Chairs and Program Directors

Another measure of the stature of and respect for women faculty is appointment as chairs and directors of important departments and programs. Appendix A17 provides an overview of data for the current year relevant to this issue. The two tables show data by gender, campus area, and by rank. The comparison is made to the percentage of women at the tenured levels, data given in the second table. **Overall women faculty hold these positions at a rate (20%) which is significantly greater than their percentage of the tenured faculty (16%).** We find this result to be encouraging.

#### G. Separations

Appendix A18 provides data on faculty who separated during a five-year period, by discipline and gender. While the numbers are small and fluctuate, we feel the total campus numbers are worrisome. **Women are separating at a significantly higher rate (22%) than their current population (18%).** This situation seriously erodes our ability to improve the ratio of women faculty and the reasons should be investigated. Although we felt that it would be useful to survey women faculty who have left UCSD, we did not find the time to do so. **We recommend that the SVCAA establish a process to conduct appropriate exit survey and/or exit interviews of women faculty to assess their views of the campus environment related to gender issues.**

#### IV. Interviews With Women Faculty

Data analysis may not identify gender bias which could occur in individual or small group circumstances, nor does it deal at all with the campus climate towards women faculty which may be favorable or unfavorable. We therefore decided to broaden our inquiry beyond the data collection and analysis presented, to include a more subjective inquiry based on interviews with women faculty. The results of this effort are summarized below.

After considerable discussion the committee agreed that each ladder rank woman faculty member would receive a written confidential invitation to be interviewed by women faculty serving on the committee; we did not include women hired after June 2001 nor women on leave. Once the faculty member agreed to be interviewed, the contact was handled personally one-on-one between the individual faculty and the committee interviewer. The process was handled with confidentiality by the committee chairs so that the names of the faculty member and the interviewer were not shared with any other faculty or with any other committee member. Committee reports remained anonymous and only the general comments were summarized for further discussion and appraisal by the whole committee. Each interviewer agreed to work from a fixed set of interview questions, shown in Appendix A19.

This interview phase was a long one and required significant commitment by the women committee members. It was not possible to complete all of the potential interviews and we did bring it to a close in early fall in order to proceed with this report. Approximately 75% of the women faculty were interviewed which provides a good sample of how women faculty perceive the gender issues on the campus. While the input is subjective, the responses identified issues which the campus needs to address further and also helped the committee to place the data analysis in a better perspective. Just as with the data, issues and perceptions varied by individual environment and rank. We only summarize those issues which seemed to have the broadest base of consensus. We acknowledge that many of the issues could just as well arise in interviews with men faculty.

Even though there is widespread concern about the low percentage of women faculty at UCSD, a majority of women faculty feel positively about the campus environment and feel that gender per se did not play a significant role in salary equity. Senior faculty who have been at UCSD for some time feel that there has been steady improvement on the campus over the years. However, **at the department level, with variations by discipline, there were serious individual concerns about equity in accelerations and off-scale awards, and departmental stature and service, not overt discrimination but subtly unequal treatment.** Women are generally felt to be less likely to be aggressive about seeking consideration for accelerations and off-scale salaries, and relief from teaching or committee service.

Faculty are generally not aware what the average salaries are in their departments or disciplines and this leads to an aura of secrecy and perhaps to an unnecessary feeling that they may be underpaid or not appreciated. Salaries are in fact public information. **We recommend that all faculty be informed annually about the average salaries, by rank, in their departments.** We note that a similar recommendation was also made in the recent State audit report.

The **lack of information about policy and process was especially evident**, simply knowing what is possible and how to achieve it. While the SVCAA does hold meetings with new faculty to review the merit and promotion system **we would recommend that a publication or handbook be developed to describe the variety of personnel actions and the process by which they are achieved.** For those individual women faculty who felt they had not been dealt with fairly there was some despair about being trapped by a seemingly oppressive department leadership, and further that going to a dean might only aggravate the situation. This issue was sufficiently prevalent that **we recommend that the SVCAA consider establishing a mechanism to enable faculty to seek confidential consultation outside their department regarding their standing in the ranks and associated compensation.** This might involve an

ombudsperson from the faculty ranks who coordinates other senior faculty willing to act as consultants.

A particular concern was raised in some areas about the lack of **access by women faculty to applications and files of all potential candidates for faculty positions**. Evidently applications may be screened out by a departmental search committee without an opportunity for all faculty to see the applications and provide input. **Department chairs should be asked to consider the impact of such procedures on efforts to include more women candidates in the hiring process.**

**Issues related to childbearing and childcare were brought up in nearly all interviews.** The impact of childbearing on the careers of women faculty is significant, not only for existing young faculty but for potential faculty in the pipeline. There is clearly a need for better communication to the faculty, men and women, regarding policy and procedures related to childbearing and parental leaves, and active service/modified duties (AS/MD)<sup>3</sup>, stopping the tenure clock, and associated accommodations at the department, campus, and UC-wide levels. It took the committee several iterations with APO before we could understand the options and policies. In general, current policies are not sufficiently flexible, friendly nor kind to women. In nearly every case the onus is placed on the woman faculty to ask for, and not automatically be offered, a special consideration easily and erroneously perceived to be associated with a weakness with regard to scholarly abilities and productivity.

Appendix A20 shows the numbers of women and men who have taken leaves related to child bearing over the past five years, and the average number of days involved. The numbers are unexpectedly small and it is clear that the benefits of AS/MD and parental leaves are useful to both men and women faculty. We were surprised to learn that the AS/MD actually treats men better than women because when women take childbearing leave it reduces the leave period available for AS/MD, while men may receive the full AS/MD benefit. We understand that UCOP is already considering changing the policy but it is indicative of the low status child bearing issues have had within the university.

It is unfortunate that childbearing decisions arise at the same time as young women approach the promotion barrier to tenure. Many women faculty felt that **clock-stopping is not a viable option** and that the stigma associated with requesting it may have a negative influence on their careers. **The clock-stopping process should be made automatic**, leaving it to the woman faculty to decline it.

Current paid childbearing leave is for only six weeks and not easily coordinated with the timing of academic quarters. We are told that if a woman asks she is normally granted an extension. The policy should be altered to automatically include this flexibility and all women informed that it is an option available to them. **Serious consideration should be given to extending the amount of paid childbearing leave to one quarter, and especially to making the coordination of childbearing leave and AS/MD more flexible.**

---

<sup>3</sup> Childbearing leave may be available up to four months, at least 6 weeks is paid leave. AS/MD is not a leave of absence but a modification of normal duties with pay, granted to faculty who have primary care responsibility before and up to 12 months following birth or adoption of a child under age five. Modified duties are negotiated with the department chair. The Divisional/School Dean may approve up to one quarter of AS/MD for each birth or adoption. Parental leave is up to one year without salary granted for the purpose of care for a child, spouse or domestic partner.

While there are guidelines to what constitutes modified duties within departments they are subject to interpretation by the department chair and it is not clear that they are implemented uniformly. Again, this practice places an onus on the woman faculty member to substantiate the need and negotiate.

We further heard that childcare is considered inadequate for faculty, especially the care of infants. There is a lack of information about the policies and availability of childcare, and the current web site is not suitable. While we were not able to examine the situation in detail, it is clearly of concern because it impacts the quality of life and productivity of our faculty.

Although recommending new policies is outside the scope of our charge, **we recommend that the SVCAA review campus policies in order to improve childbearing and childcare accommodations for women faculty.** If the campus wishes to make a difference in attracting women faculty then this is one area where significant change could help the image projected to women scholars at other institutions and especially to young scholars in graduate school. Modest expenditure at the margin could have a very large impact on the careers of outstanding women faculty.

Although the interviews brought many additional questions and suggestions to the table, we will only briefly mention a few more. An effort should be made to coordinate women faculty and facilitate the campus community environment through such things as mentoring, social events, and retreats. There are some good models for mentoring on the campus and these should be shared and supported. We had many inquires about spousal hiring, the process involved, and how equitable it is for male and female applicants. Other suggestions to improve recruitment of women, some of which have been previously noted, included more women on search committees and appointment as chairs of search committees, more junior level recruitments, increased attention to soliciting recommendations of women candidates from national colleagues, and focusing campus growth and subsequent recruitment in areas of interest to women scholars.

As we have noted above **the SOM is a special case** for several of the issues we have tried to address, such as the Y and Z compensation packages. Undoubtedly there is a need to establish a special task force to examine gender equity in the SOM, taking into account their broader population and in more detail than we have accomplished. The numbers of non-ladder rank clinical and adjunct women faculty are greater in the SOM than on the General Campus, and they carry a great deal of responsibility. There is some sense from interviews that our average data may be misleading about the situation women face in the SOM because it only samples a small fraction of women faculty – the actual SOM disparities may be even more serious than those we have been able to identify. We acknowledge this caveat and trust that the SOM will be examined further by another committee.

## **V. Task Force Members**

The present committee could continue to examine gender data and more details of the associated issues indefinitely. However, we feel that we have achieved a sufficient level of understanding, and our recommendations are important enough, that our report is timely, if not overdue. Hopefully you and the faculty will find the report interesting, beneficial, and provocative.

### **Submitted By**

Richard Attiyeh, Vice Chancellor for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies

Kim Barrett, Professor, Medicine

Julian Betts, Professor, Economics

Jennefer Collins, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs (Consultant)

Frances Hellman, Professor, Physics

Katja Lindenberg, Professor, Chemistry & Biochemistry (Co-Chair)

Carol MacLeod, Professor, Medicine

Mat McCubbins, Professor, Political Science

David Miller, Associate Vice Chancellor (Co-Chair)

Naomi Oreskes, Associate Professor, History

Jann Pasler, Professor, Music

Geert Schmid-Schoenbein, Professor, Bioengineering

Lisa Tauxe, Professor, Scripps Institution of Oceanography

Deborah Wingard, Professor, Family/Preventive Medicine

## List of Appendices

- A1 Workforce: Gender Distribution of Ladder Rank Faculty by Campus Division 11/1/1995 through 10/31/2000
- A2 Ladder Rank Faculty Gender Distributions of New Appointments for the Period Prior to 1996 (1992-1995) and After 1996 (1996-1999) by Campus Division
- A3 Campus Ladder Rank Faculty Appointments by Rank and Gender for the Period 7/1/1995 through 6/30/2001
- A4 Availability: Ladder Rank Faculty by Campus Division as of 11/1/1998
- A5 Applicant Pools: Ladder Rank Faculty by Campus Division 11/1/1995 through 10/31/2000
- A6 Appointments: Ladder Rank Faculty by Campus Division 11/1/1995 through 10/31/2000
- A7 UC-Wide Hiring and Availability Data from Chancellor M. Greenwood's Testimony to State Select Committee on Government Oversight January 31, 2001
- A8 Salary Regression Source Data
- A9 Regression on Base Salary (9-month or equivalent)
- A10 Table A: Gender Coefficient Summary of Base Salary Regression Results  
Table B: Gender Coefficient Summary of Total Annual Compensation Regression Results  
Table C: Gender Coefficient Summary of Starting Salary Regression Results
- A11 Sources of Additional Compensation by Division and Gender for General Campus and SIO, 1997-1998, 1998-1999, 1999-2000  
Table 1: Total Number of Ladder Rank Faculty  
Table 2: Number and Percent of Total Faculty Who Received Additional Compensation by Gender and Overall  
Table 3: Percent of Additional Compensation Dollars by Source and Gender  
Table 4: Average Dollars per Faculty Who Received Additional Compensation by Division, Gender, and Source
- A12 Ladder Rank Academic Review Files Advancement Outcomes for Files Effective 7/1/1997, 7/1/1998, 7/1/1999
- A13 Influence of Major, Prestigious Awards on Faculty Total Wage
- A14 General Campus Average Start-up Summary for Appointments Effective 7/1/1997 through 6/30/2001
- A15 Divisions of Biology and Physical Sciences Space Allocation (average square feet) by Gender and Rank
- A16.a Senate Committee Service Data: Total Senate Membership
- A16.b Senate Committee Service Data: Invitations to Serve
- A16.c Senate Committee Service Data: Accepted Invitations
- A16.d Senate Committee Service Data: Rate of Acceptance
- A16.e Senate Committee Service Data: Invitations by Committee Type
- A17 2001-2002 Department Chairs and Program and Project Directors by Gender and SubCampus
- A18 Separations: Ladder Rank Faculty by Campus Division 11/1/1995 through 10/31/2000
- A19 Interview Questions
- A20 Childbearing and Parental Leaves and Active Service/Modified Duties (AS/MD) Ladder Rank Faculty Academic Years 1996-1997 through 2000-2001



Appendix A1

UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA  
SAN DIEGO

WORKFORCE: GENDER DISTRIBUTION OF  
LADDER-RANK FACULTY \*  
BY CAMPUS DIVISION  
11/1/95 - 10/31/00

ENGINEERING

YEAR (10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1995	100	88	88.0%	12	12.0%
1996	105	95	90.5%	10	9.5%
1997	111	101	91.0%	10	9.0%
1998	118	108	91.5%	10	8.5%
1999	129	119	92.2%	10	7.8%
2000	135	125	92.6%	10	7.4%
NET DIFFERENCE	35	37	105.7%	-2	-5.7%

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

YEAR (10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1995	115	102	88.7%	13	11.3%
1996	123	109	88.6%	14	11.4%
1997	127	114	89.8%	13	10.2%
1998	130	116	89.2%	14	10.8%
1999	125	112	89.6%	13	10.4%
2000	127	114	89.8%	13	10.2%
NET DIFFERENCE	12	12	100.0%	0	0.0%

BIOLOGY

YEAR (10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1995	52	46	88.5%	6	11.5%
1996	53	46	86.8%	7	13.2%
1997	56	48	85.7%	8	14.3%
1998	57	48	84.2%	9	15.8%
1999	59	49	83.1%	10	16.9%
2000	62	51	82.3%	11	17.7%
NET DIFFERENCE	10	5	50.0%	5	50.0%

SOCIAL SCIENCES

YEAR (10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1995	161	123	76.4%	38	23.6%
1996	164	120	73.2%	44	26.8%
1997	169	123	72.8%	46	27.2%
1998	167	122	73.1%	45	26.9%
1999	172	122	70.9%	50	29.1%
2000	169	121	71.6%	48	28.4%
NET DIFFERENCE	8	-2	-25.0%	10	125.0%

IR/PS

YEAR (10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1995	18	16	88.9%	2	11.1%
1996	22	19	86.4%	3	13.6%
1997	22	19	86.4%	3	13.6%
1998	24	21	87.5%	3	12.5%
1999	23	20	87.0%	3	13.0%
2000	22	19	86.4%	3	13.6%
NET DIFFERENCE	4	3	75.0%	1	25.0%

ARTS & HUMANITIES

YEAR (10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1995	149	106	71.1%	43	28.9%
1996	152	108	71.1%	44	28.9%
1997	160	112	70.0%	48	30.0%
1998	158	107	67.7%	51	32.3%
1999	154	105	68.2%	49	31.8%
2000	158	106	67.1%	52	32.9%
NET DIFFERENCE	9	0	0.0%	9	100.0%

SCH. OF MEDICINE

YEAR (10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1995	180	160	88.9%	20	11.1%
1996	188	165	87.8%	23	12.2%
1997	189	166	87.8%	23	12.2%
1998	191	168	88.0%	23	12.0%
1999	198	175	88.4%	23	11.6%
2000	197	173	87.8%	24	12.2%
NET DIFFERENCE	17	13	76.5%	4	23.5%

SCRIPPS INST. OF OCEANOGRAPHY TOTAL CAMPUS

YEAR (10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1995	76	69	90.8%	7	9.2%
1996	77	70	90.9%	7	9.1%
1997	78	70	89.7%	8	10.3%
1998	79	71	89.9%	8	10.1%
1999	81	73	90.1%	8	9.9%
2000	81	72	88.9%	9	11.1%
NET DIFFERENCE	5	3	60.0%	2	40.0%

YEAR (10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1995	851	710	83.4%	141	16.6%
1996	884	732	82.8%	152	17.2%
1997	912	753	82.6%	159	17.4%
1998	924	761	82.4%	163	17.6%
1999	941	775	82.4%	166	17.6%
2000	951	781	82.1%	170	17.9%
NET DIFFERENCE	100	71	71.0%	29	29.0%

\* Note: Workforce does NOT include VERIP/RTAD personnel.

**LADDER RANK FACULTY GENDER DISTRIBUTIONS OF NEW APPOINTMENTS FOR THE PERIOD  
PRIOR TO 1996 (1992-1995) AND AFTER 1996 (1996-1999) BY CAMPUS DIVISION**

<b>NON-TENURE</b>		<b>Arts &amp; Humanities</b>	<b>Social Sciences*</b>	<b>Biology</b>	<b>Physical Sciences**</b>	<b>Engineering Computer Sci</b>	<b>Health Sciences</b>
Prior	<b>Total</b>	13	27	5	23	9	8
	<b>Women</b>	6	11	1	5	3	1
	<b>% Women</b>	46.2%	40.7%	20.0%	21.7%	33.3%	12.5%
After	<b>Total</b>	14	31	10	8	14	17
	<b>Women</b>	10	13	5	0	0	3
	<b>% Women</b>	71.4%	41.9%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.6%

<b>TENURE</b>		<b>Arts &amp; Humanities</b>	<b>Social Sciences*</b>	<b>Biology</b>	<b>Physical Sciences**</b>	<b>Engineering Computer Sci</b>	<b>Health Sciences</b>
Prior	<b>Total</b>	10	11	2	14	10	32
	<b>Women</b>	1	4	0	0	1	3
	<b>% Women</b>	10.0%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	9.4%
After	<b>Total</b>	10	12	4	15	19	22
	<b>Women</b>	4	4	1	2	0	5
	<b>% Women</b>	40.0%	33.3%	25.0%	13.3%	0.0%	22.7%

<b>OVERALL</b>		<b>Arts &amp; Humanities</b>	<b>Social Sciences*</b>	<b>Biology</b>	<b>Physical Sciences**</b>	<b>Engineering Computer Sci</b>	<b>Health Sciences</b>
Prior	<b>Total</b>	23	38	7	37	19	40
	<b>Women</b>	7	15	1	5	4	4
	<b>% Women</b>	30.4%	39.5%	14.3%	13.5%	21.1%	10.0%
After	<b>Total</b>	24	43	14	23	33	39
	<b>Women</b>	14	17	6	2	0	8
	<b>% Women</b>	58.3%	39.5%	42.9%	8.7%	0.0%	20.5%

\* includes IR/PS

\*\* includes SIO

**CAMPUS LADDER RANK FACULTY APPOINTMENTS BY RANK AND GENDER**  
 (including General Campus, School of Medicine, and Scripps Institution of Oceanography)  
 For the period 7/1/1995 through 6/30/2001\*

APPT YR	TENURE	MEN		WOMEN		Total N	% BY RANK
		N	%	N	%		
1995/96	TENURE	22	91.7%	2	8.3%	24	60.0%
	NON-TENURE	10	62.5%	6	37.5%	16	40.0%
<b>1995/96 Total</b>		<b>32</b>	<b>80.0%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>40</b>	
1996/97	TENURE	18	81.8%	4	18.2%	22	40.7%
	NON-TENURE	22	68.8%	10	31.3%	32	59.3%
<b>1996/97 Total</b>		<b>40</b>	<b>74.1%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>25.9%</b>	<b>54</b>	
1997/98	TENURE	16	88.9%	2	11.1%	18	42.9%
	NON-TENURE	13	54.2%	11	45.8%	24	57.1%
<b>1997/98 Total</b>		<b>29</b>	<b>69.0%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>31.0%</b>	<b>42</b>	
1998/99	TENURE	15	68.2%	7	31.8%	22	57.9%
	NON-TENURE	11	68.8%	5	31.3%	16	42.1%
<b>1998/99 Total</b>		<b>26</b>	<b>68.4%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>31.6%</b>	<b>38</b>	
1999/00	TENURE	17	85.0%	3	15.0%	20	47.6%
	NON-TENURE	17	77.3%	5	22.7%	22	52.4%
<b>1999/00 Total</b>		<b>34</b>	<b>81.0%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>19.0%</b>	<b>42</b>	
2000/01	TENURE	18	78.3%	5	21.7%	23	53.5%
	NON-TENURE	15	78.9%	5	21.1%	20	46.5%
<b>2000/01 Total</b>		<b>33</b>	<b>76.7%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>23.3%</b>	<b>43</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	TENURE	106	82.2%	23	17.8%	129	49.8%
	NON-TENURE	88	67.7%	42	32.3%	130	50.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>194</b>	<b>74.9%</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>25.1%</b>	<b>259</b>	

\* The target population for this report was all ladder-rank hires whose appointments were effective between July 1, 1995 and June 30, 2001. However, it is unlikely that all faculty hires effective during 2000-01 are reflected in the data as a number of recruitments are still in process.

AVAILABILITY: LADDER-RANK FACULTY BY CAMPUS DIVISION AS OF 11/1/98	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO
---	--

ENGINEERING		PHYSICAL SCI		BIOLOGY		SOCIAL SCIENCES IR/PS		ARTS and HUMANITIES		SCHOOL OF MEDICINE		SCRIPPS INST.	
MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
87.1%	12.9%	80.7%	19.3%	62.1%	37.9%	55.6%	44.4%	71.2%	28.8%	53.7%	46.3%	78.6%	21.4%

Notes:

Availability is based on PhDs granted in the United States; source = National Opinion Research Center.

A sliding 10-year period is used as a parameter (most recent 5 years for tenure-track faculty, the next 5 years for tenured).

Only PhD data that are relevant to UCSD faculty are used.

Availability data are used:

1. To establish a benchmark to evaluate the diversity of applicant pools.
2. To compare with campus workforce data to identify any areas of underutilization within the workforce.
3. To establish placement goals when underutilization is identified.

The exact number of people (by sex/ethnicity) with PhDs who have actually pursued careers in academic research institutions is unknown.

1998 WORKFORCE DATA FROM APPENDIX A1 FOR COMPARISON

ENGINEERING		PHYSICAL SCI		BIOLOGY		SOCIAL SCIENCES IR/PS		ARTS and HUMANITIES		SCHOOL OF MEDICINE		SCRIPPS INST.	
MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
91.5%	8.5%	89.2%	10.8%	84.2%	15.8%	73.1%	26.9%	87.5%	12.5%	67.7%	32.3%	88.0%	12.0%

UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA  
SAN DIEGO

APPLICANT POOLS: LADDER-RANK FACULTY  
BY CAMPUS DIVISION  
11/1/95 - 10/31/00

ENGINEERING

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	962	853	88.7%	109	11.3%
1995-96	808	742	91.8%	66	8.2%
1996-97	539	510	94.6%	29	5.4%
1997-98	255	240	94.1%	15	5.9%
1998-99	790	724	91.6%	66	8.4%
1999-00	404	363	89.9%	41	10.1%
TOTAL	3758	3432	91.3%	326	8.7%

PHYSICAL SCIENCES  
(NATURAL SCIENCES 95-99)

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	3113	2681	86.1%	432	13.9%
1995-96	2453	2018	82.3%	435	17.7%
1996-97	1597	1352	84.7%	245	15.3%
1997-98	1653	1366	82.6%	287	17.4%
1998-99	1035	836	80.8%	199	19.2%
1999-00	1103	982	89.0%	121	11.0%
TOTAL	10954	9235	84.3%	1719	15.7%

BIOLOGY  
(Part of Natural Sciences 95-99)

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1995-96	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1996-97	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1997-98	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1998-99	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1999-00	488	393	80.5%	95	19.5%
TOTAL	488	393	80.5%	95	19.5%

SOCIAL SCIENCES  
(Includes IR/PS 95-99)

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	1298	938	72.3%	360	27.7%
1995-96	1606	1149	71.5%	457	28.5%
1996-97	1018	702	69.0%	316	31.0%
1997-98	2470	1545	62.6%	925	37.4%
1998-99	1106	805	72.8%	301	27.2%
1999-00	767	536	69.9%	231	30.1%
TOTAL	8265	5675	68.7%	2590	31.3%

IR/PS

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1995-96	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1996-97	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1997-98	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1998-99	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1999-00	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

ARTS & HUMANITIES

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	1152	799	69.4%	353	30.6%
1995-96	1102	722	65.5%	380	34.5%
1996-97	518	288	55.6%	230	44.4%
1997-98	208	117	56.3%	91	43.8%
1998-99	379	268	70.7%	111	29.3%
1999-00	1034	737	71.3%	297	28.7%
TOTAL	4393	2931	66.7%	1462	33.3%

SCH. OF MEDICINE

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	500	390	78.0%	110	22.0%
1995-96	584	471	80.7%	113	19.3%
1996-97	478	392	82.0%	86	18.0%
1997-98	210	152	72.4%	58	27.6%
1998-99	702	532	75.8%	170	24.2%
1999-00	355	272	76.6%	83	23.4%
TOTAL	2829	2209	78.1%	620	21.9%

SCRIPPS INST. OF OCEANOGRAPHY

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	116	98	84.5%	18	15.5%
1995-96	73	57	78.1%	16	21.9%
1996-97	95	83	87.4%	12	12.6%
1997-98	122	107	87.7%	15	12.3%
1998-99	122	107	87.7%	15	12.3%
1999-00	484	386	79.8%	98	20.2%
TOTAL	1012	838	82.8%	174	17.2%

TOTAL CAMPUS

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	7141	5759	80.6%	1382	19.4%
1995-96	6626	5159	77.9%	1467	22.1%
1996-97	4245	3327	78.4%	918	21.6%
1997-98	4918	3527	71.7%	1391	28.3%
1998-99	4134	3272	79.1%	862	20.9%
1999-00	4635	3669	79.2%	966	20.8%
TOTAL	31699	24713	78.0%	6986	22.0%

UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA  
SAN DIEGO

APPOINTMENTS: LADDER-RANK FACULTY  
BY CAMPUS DIVISION  
11/1/95 - 10/31/00

ENGINEERING

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	10	9	90.0%	1	10.0%
1995-96	10	10	100.0%	0	0.0%
1996-97	4	4	100.0%	0	0.0%
1997-98	7	7	100.0%	0	0.0%
1998-99	13	13	100.0%	0	0.0%
1999-00	7	7	100.0%	0	0.0%
TOTAL	51	50	98.0%	1	2.0%

PHYSICAL SCIENCES  
(NATURAL SCIENCES 95-99)

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	15	14	93.3%	1	6.7%
1995-96	9	7	77.8%	2	22.2%
1996-97	8	7	87.5%	1	12.5%
1997-98	8	5	62.5%	3	37.5%
1998-99	5	4	80.0%	1	20.0%
1999-00	11	11	100.0%	0	0.0%
TOTAL	56	48	85.7%	8	14.3%

BIOLOGY  
(Part of Natural Sciences 95-99)

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1995-96	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1996-97	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1997-98	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1998-99	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1999-00	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
TOTAL	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%

SOCIAL SCIENCES  
(Includes IR/PS 94-95)

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	8	3	37.5%	5	62.5%
1995-96	13	7	53.8%	6	46.2%
1996-97	8	5	62.5%	3	37.5%
1997-98	6	3	50.0%	3	50.0%
1998-99	9	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
1999-00	9	5	55.6%	4	44.4%
TOTAL	53	29	54.7%	24	45.3%

IR/PS

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1995-96	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
1996-97	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1997-98	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
1998-99	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1999-00	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TOTAL	5	5	100.0%	0	0.0%

ARTS & HUMANITIES

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	7	4	57.1%	3	42.9%
1995-96	9	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
1996-97	8	2	25.0%	6	75.0%
1997-98	4	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
1998-99	5	3	60.0%	2	40.0%
1999-00	9	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
TOTAL	42	21	50.0%	21	50.0%

SCH. OF MEDICINE

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	9	8	88.9%	1	11.1%
1995-96	9	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
1996-97	8	8	100.0%	0	0.0%
1997-98	13	10	76.9%	3	23.1%
1998-99	10	9	90.0%	1	10.0%
1999-00	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
TOTAL	51	43	84.3%	8	15.7%

SCRIPPS INST. OF OCEANOGRAPHY

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
1995-96	3	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
1996-97	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
1997-98	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1998-99	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
1999-00	6	5	83.3%	1	16.7%
TOTAL	14	12	85.7%	2	14.3%

TOTAL CAMPUS

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	50	39	78.0%	11	22.0%
1995-96	55	40	72.7%	15	27.3%
1996-97	38	28	73.7%	10	26.3%
1997-98	41	28	68.3%	13	31.7%
1998-99	44	37	84.1%	7	15.9%
1999-00	46	37	80.4%	9	19.6%
TOTAL	274	209	76.3%	65	23.7%

## Appendix A7

### UC-WIDE HIRING & AVAILABILITY DATA FROM CHANCELLOR M. GREENWOOD'S TESTIMONY TO STATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT JANUARY 31, 2001

---

#### Engineering & Computer Sciences

13.5%	UC Hired
12.7%	National PhD Pool
12.9%	UC PhD Pool
na	Comparison 8 Institutions (number not stated in testimony)
12.0%	Post Doc Pool

#### Life Sciences

29.0%	UC Hired
39.3%	National PhD Pool
42.7%	UC PhD Pool
42.7%	Comparison 8 Institutions
36.0%	Post Doc Pool

#### Physical Sciences

13.2%	UC Hired
22.5%	National PhD Pool
22.6%	UC PhD Pool
10.2%	Comparison 8 Institutions
(1)	Post Doc Pool

(1) No numerical figure given in testimony but Greenwood stated, "...the percent of women in the postdoctoral pool was less than in the Ph.D. only pool but still substantially higher than UC's hiring rate."

#### Mathematics

5.4%	UC Hired
22.1%	National PhD Pool
18.4%	UC PhD Pool
19.6%	Comparison 8 Institutions
13.2%	Post Doc Pool

Regarding the Postdoctoral Pool, Greenwood stated, "There are however some data on the 1997 postdoctoral appointee pool. This pool is comprised of officially appointed fellows (e.g., NSF, NIH, NASA, etc.), thus it does not include all possible postdoctoral appointments. Be that as it may, it is still illustrative."

## Salary Regression Source Data

Wage data were compiled for General Campus, Scripps Institution of Oceanography and School of Medicine ladder rank faculty from the Distribution of Payroll Expenditure module of the campus payroll and personnel system for the period of July 1, 1997 through June 30, 2000.

These data were grouped into the following components to facilitate analysis.

	General Campus and SIO	School of Medicine
Base salary	Regular pay received for the professorial appointment and sabbatical pay, if any	X (base salary scale) X' (retirement factor of 1.30 of X) Y' (additional covered compensation)
Additional compensation	Summer salary (ninths), fellowships, Summer Session teaching, University Extension teaching	Y (negotiated) Z (clinical)

To ensure that data for all segments of the study group were comparable, some faculty appointments were excluded as shown below.

	General Campus	Scripps Institution of Oceanography	GC and SIO Total	School of Medicine	Total
Ladder rank faculty (May 2001 salary data)	686	81	767	204	971
<b>Exclusions</b>					
Ladder rank faculty with shared FTE in School of Medicine and General Campus departments	0	0	0	10	10
Individuals on leave without pay during entire 3 year period	3	0	3	2	5
Individuals whose appointments began 3/1/2000 or later	35	5	40	1	41
Senior Management Group (e.g., deans, provosts, etc.)	14	1	15	3	18
Lecturers with Security of Employment	13	0	13	0	13
HHMI or Ludwig investigators	2	0	2	6	8
<b>Study Group Ladder Rank Faculty</b>	619	75	694	182	876



## Regression on Base Salary (9-month or equivalent)

```

Random-effects GLS regression                Number of obs   =   3595
Group variable (i) : ismnum                 Number of groups =   965

R-sq:  within = 0.8312                      Obs per group:  min =    1
        between = 0.6794                      avg =           3.7
        overall = 0.6804                      max =           4

Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian               Wald chi2(16)   = 14937.63
corr(u_i, X) = 0 (assumed)                  Prob > chi2     =  0.0000

```

```

-----+-----
Wages   |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|    [95% Conf. Interval]
-----+-----
Gender  |  -.0573127   .0144444    -3.968  0.000    -.0856224   -.0290031
PY      |   .0344406   .0015804    21.793  0.000     .0313431   .0375381
(PY)2   |  -.0002425   .0000327    -7.416  0.000    -.0003066   -.0001784
UCY     |  -.0014699   .0013789    -1.066  0.286    -.0041725   .0012326
(UCY)2 |  -.0000668   .0000374    -1.788  0.074    -.00014     6.43e-06
Economics|  .2581498   .0361578     7.140  0.000     .1872817   .3290178
Engineer|  .1262739   .0205964     6.131  0.000     .0859058   .1666421
Social Sc| -.0532572   .0200567    -2.655  0.008    -.0925676   -.0139468
Arts & Hu| -.1308861   .0196622    -6.657  0.000    -.1694233   -.0923488
SIO     |  -.0354453   .0234071    -1.514  0.130    -.0813223   .0104316
SOM     |  -.0574315   .0188938    -3.040  0.002    -.0944628   -.0204003
Biology |  -.0581585   .0261041    -2.228  0.026    -.1093215   -.0069955
IRPS    |  .1383355   .0381492     3.626  0.000     .0635645   .2131065
Year98 |  .056897    .0020404    27.885  0.000     .0528978   .0608962
Year99 |  .1075745   .0022729    47.328  0.000     .1031196   .1120294
Year00 |  .1463442   .0026212    55.832  0.000     .1412068   .1514816
Constant|  10.72481    .02054     522.142  0.000     10.68455   10.76507
-----+-----
sigma_u |  .16315738
sigma_e |  .04021205
rho     |  .94273509   (fraction of variance due to u_i)
-----+-----

```

**Table A**  
**Gender Coefficient Summary of Base Salary Regression Results**

Campus Unit	Gender Coefficient	Standard Error (n)	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Entire campus	-.057 *	.014 (3595)	-.086	-.029
General Campus and Scripps Institution of Oceanography (excludes School of Medicine)	-.057 *	.016 (2825)	-.091	-.028
Division of Arts and Humanities	-.057 *	.028 (612)	-.112	-.001
Division of Biology	-.132 *	.052 (213)	-.234	-.030
Jacobs School of Engineering	-.075	.045 (469)	-.164	.014
Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies	-.083	.091 (85)	-.261	.094
Division of Physical Sciences	.003	.053 (487)	-.102	.107
Scripps Institution of Oceanography	-.005	.045 (302)	-.094	.083
School of Medicine	-.051	.033 (770)	-.116	.014
Division of Social Sciences (excludes Economics)	-.043	.032 (568)	-.106	.019
Department of Economics	-.168	.103 (89)	-.369	.033
<u>Individual departments with significant gender coefficients</u>				
Department of Bioengineering	-.372 *	.032 (26)	-.434	-.309
Department of Physics	-.178 *	.081 (167)	-.337	-.019
Departments of History, Literature and Music	-.076 *	.037 (403)	-.149	-.004

\* Significant at the 95% or greater confidence level.

**Table B**  
**Gender Coefficient Summary of Total Annual Compensation Regression Results**

Campus Unit	Gender Coefficient	Standard Error (n)	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Entire campus	-.134 *	.027 (2520)	-.186	-.083
General Campus and Scripps Institution of Oceanography (excludes School of Medicine)	-.117 *	.027 (1976)	-.169	-.065
Division of Arts and Humanities	-.157 *	.048 (416)	-.252	-.062
Division of Biology	-.265 *	.091 (152)	-.444	-.087
Jacobs School of Engineering	-.065	.074 (339)	-.209	.080
Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies	.057	.224 (56)	-.382	.497
Division of Physical Sciences	-.068	.079 (339)	-.223	.088
Scripps Institution of Oceanography	-.031	.097 (221)	-.221	.159
School of Medicine	-.217 *	.077 (544)	-.368	-.067
Division of Social Sciences (excludes Economics)	-.086	.054 (393)	-.193	.020
Department of Economics	-.151	.168 (60)	-.480	.178
<u>Individual departments with significant gender coefficients</u>				
Department of Bioengineering	-.341 *	.073 (19)	-.484	-.199
Department of Physics	-.396 *	.129 (123)	-.648	-.143
Departments of History, Literature and Music	-.131 *	.059 (283)	-.246	-.064

\* Significant at the 95% or greater confidence level.

**Table C**  
**Gender Coefficient Summary of Starting Salary Regression Results**

Campus Unit	Gender Coefficient	Standard Error (n)	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
<u>Entire campus faculty appointed in years</u>				
1956-2000	-.073 *	.021 (968)	-.115	-.031
1956-1996	-.084 *	.025 (805)	-.133	-.034
1997-2000	-.020	.029 (163)	-.077	.038
<u>Faculty appointed in years 1956-2000</u>				
Division of Arts and Humanities	-.071 *	.027 (165)	-.124	-.017
Departments of History, Literature and Music	-.090 *	.040 (107)	-.169	-.010
Division of Biology	-.041	.066 (60)	-.174	.091
Jacobs School of Engineering	-.047	.031 (131)	-.109	.015
Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies	-.105	.108 (22)	-.334	.125
Division of Physical Sciences	-.056	.048 (130)	-.150	.038
Scripps Institution of Oceanography	-.025	.039 (81)	-.102	.052
School of Medicine	-.177	.100 (204)	-.373	.020
Division of Social Sciences (excludes Economics)	-.031	.025 (150)	-.081	.019
Department of Economics	-.107	.076 (25)	-.265	.051

\* Significant at the 95% or greater confidence level.

## Appendix A11

### Sources of Additional Compensation by Division and Gender General Campus and SIO 1997-1998, 1998-1999, 1999-2000

**TABLE 1. Total number of ladder-rank faculty**

Division	Women	Men	Total
A&H	48	98	146
BIO	9	45	54
ENG	9	116	125
IR/PS	3	17	20
PHY SCI	11	104	115
SIO	8	67	75
SOC SCI	44	115	159
<b>Total</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>694</b>

**TABLE 2. Number and percent of total faculty (in Table 1. above) who received additional compensation by gender and overall**

For example, of 132 women, 77 (58%) received additional compensation.

Division	Women		Men		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
A&H	20	42%	40	41%	60	41%
BIO	6	67%	41	91%	47	87%
ENG	9	100%	100	86%	109	87%
IR/PS	3	100%	16	94%	19	95%
PHY SCI	9	82%	87	84%	96	83%
SIO	3	38%	28	42%	31	41%
SOC SCI	27	61%	81	70%	108	68%
<b>Total</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>68%</b>

**TABLE 3. Percent of additional compensation dollars by source and gender**

Division	Women		Men		Total	
	Fed.	Other	Fed.	Other	Fed.	Other
A&H	0%	100%	6%	94%	4%	96%
BIO	65%	35%	78%	22%	77%	23%
ENG	65%	35%	54%	46%	54%	46%
IR/PS	62%	38%	7%	93%	15%	85%
PHY SCI	85%	15%	74%	26%	75%	25%
SIO	39%	61%	24%	76%	26%	74%
SOC SCI	68%	32%	53%	47%	55%	45%
<b>Total</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>42%</b>

**NOTE:**

Dollars are grouped into two categories based on source.

Federal: U.S GOVERNMENT

Other: DESIGNATED (self-supporting programs, contract and grant administration, opportunity funds, fee funds)

ENDOWMENT INCOME

GENERAL (19900 funds)

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

OUTSIDE AGENCY (private agencies or companies who wish to use campus financial services may deposit money in university accounts which is then available for disbursement)

PRIVATE GIFTS, GRANTS & CONTRACTS

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**Sources of Additional Compensation by Division and Gender**  
**General Campus and SIO**  
**1997-1998, 1998-1999, 1999-2000**

**TABLE 4. Average dollars per faculty who received additional compensation by division, gender, and source**

Division	Women						Men						Total					
	N	Federal	N	Other	N	All sources	N	Federal	N	Other	N	All sources	N	Federal	N	Other	N	All sources
A&H			20	\$6,574	20	\$6,574	4	\$5,118	39	\$5,523	43	\$5,499	4	\$5,118	59	\$5,832	63	\$5,801
BIO	5	\$17,752	5	\$12,079	10	\$15,270	37	\$21,110	25	\$12,711	62	\$18,395	42	\$20,805	30	\$12,623	72	\$18,059
ENG	8	\$15,551	7	\$7,334	15	\$11,156	76	\$18,635	82	\$12,496	158	\$15,179	84	\$18,343	89	\$12,055	173	\$14,819
IR/PS	2	\$16,474	1	\$7,506	3	\$11,349	3	\$10,677	15	\$9,524	18	\$9,598	5	\$13,576	16	\$9,356	21	\$9,825
PHY SCI	9	\$14,468	4	\$7,939	13	\$12,885	76	\$17,891	47	\$10,470	123	\$15,070	85	\$17,501	51	\$10,311	136	\$14,862
SIO	3	\$12,740	3	\$11,564	6	\$11,992	16	\$13,709	23	\$17,995	39	\$16,714	19	\$13,565	26	\$17,257	45	\$16,124
SOC SCI	8	\$20,629	24	\$4,675	32	\$9,821	39	\$19,317	62	\$10,985	101	\$14,216	47	\$19,545	86	\$9,605	133	\$13,328
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>\$16,611</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>\$6,784</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>\$10,686</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>\$18,533</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>\$11,365</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>\$14,594</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>\$18,304</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>\$10,707</b>	<b>643</b>	<b>\$14,076</b>

## NOTES:

- Individuals may be counted more than once. Those who received additional compensation from both Federal and Other sources will be counted in both categories.
- Dollars are grouped into two categories based on source.
  - Federal: U.S. GOVERNMENT
  - Other: DESIGNATED (self-supporting programs, contract and grant administration, opportunity funds, fee funds)
    - ENDOWMENT INCOME
    - GENERAL (19900 funds)
    - LOCAL GOVERNMENTS
    - OUTSIDE AGENCY (private agencies or companies who wish to use campus financial services may deposit money in university accounts which is then available for disbursement)
    - PRIVATE GIFTS, GRANTS & CONTRACTS
    - STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**LADDER RANK ACADEMIC REVIEW FILES  
ADVANCEMENT OUTCOMES**  
for files effective 7/1/97, 7/1/98, and 7/1/99

**TENURE REVIEWS**

BEGIN	GENDER	ADVANCED		NOT ADVANCED		TOTAL
		N	%	N	%	
07/01/97	Women	8	89%	1	11%	9
	Men	19	95%	1	5%	20
<b>07/01/97 Total</b>		<b>27</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>29</b>
07/01/98	Women	3	60%	2	40%	5
	Men	18	90%	2	10%	20
<b>07/01/98 Total</b>		<b>21</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>25</b>
07/01/99	Women	7	100%	0	0%	7
	Men	8	80%	2	20%	10
<b>07/01/99 Total</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Women	18	86%	3	14%	21
	Men	45	90%	5	10%	50
	<b>Total</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>71</b>

**PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**

BEGIN	GENDER	ADVANCED		NOT ADVANCED		TOTAL
		N	%	N	%	
07/01/97	Women	3	100%	0	0%	3
	Men	13	81%	3	19%	16
<b>07/01/97 Total</b>		<b>16</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>19</b>
07/01/98	Women	5	100%	0	0%	5
	Men	32	100%	0	0%	32
<b>07/01/98 Total</b>		<b>37</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>37</b>
07/01/99	Women	7	100%	0	0%	7
	Men	22	88%	3	12%	25
<b>07/01/99 Total</b>		<b>29</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Women	15	100%	0	0%	15
	Men	67	92%	6	8%	73
	<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>88</b>

**ADVANCEMENT TO STEP 6**

BEGIN	GENDER	ADVANCED		NOT ADVANCED		TOTAL
		N	%	N	%	
07/01/97	Women	2	100%	0	0%	2
	Men	23	79%	6	21%	29
<b>07/01/97 Total</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>31</b>
07/01/98	Women	3	100%	0	0%	3
	Men	23	96%	1	4%	24
<b>07/01/98 Total</b>		<b>26</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>27</b>
07/01/99	Women	4	100%	0	0%	4
	Men	23	100%	0	0%	23
<b>07/01/99 Total</b>		<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Women	9	100%	0	0%	9
	Men	69	91%	7	9%	76
	<b>Total</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>85</b>

**ADVANCEMENT TO ABOVE SCALE**

BEGIN	GENDER	ADVANCED		NOT ADVANCED		TOTAL
		N	%	N	%	
07/01/97	Women	0	0%	0	0%	0
	Men	10	91%	1	9%	11
<b>07/01/97 Total</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>11</b>
07/01/98	Women	0	0%	0	0%	0
	Men	13	93%	1	7%	14
<b>07/01/98 Total</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>14</b>
07/01/99	Women	2	100%	0	0%	2
	Men	12	92%	1	8%	13
<b>07/01/99 Total</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Women	2	100%	0	0%	2
	Men	35	92%	3	8%	38
	<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>40</b>

**OTHER ACTIONS**

BEGIN	GENDER	ADVANCED		NOT ADVANCED		TOTAL
		N	%	N	%	
07/01/97	Women	41	91%	4	9%	45
	Men	152	85%	27	15%	179
<b>07/01/97 Total</b>		<b>193</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>224</b>
07/01/98	Women	46	92%	4	8%	50
	Men	179	87%	27	13%	206
<b>07/01/98 Total</b>		<b>225</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>256</b>
07/01/99	Women	40	85%	7	15%	47
	Men	157	84%	29	16%	186
<b>07/01/99 Total</b>		<b>197</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>233</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Women	127	89%	15	11%	142
	Men	488	85%	83	15%	571
	<b>Total</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>713</b>

**ALL ACTIONS**

GENDER	ADVANCED		NOT ADVANCED		TOTAL
	N	%	N	%	
Women	171	90%	18	10%	189
Men	704	87%	104	13%	808
<b>Total</b>	<b>875</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>997</b>

## Influence of Major, Prestigious Awards on Faculty Total Wage

### Data sources

This analysis is based on information maintained in the Academic Personnel Office and the Office of the Senior Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs. Specifically, these sources are:

1. Academic Personnel data files showing the review and advancement of each faculty member.
2. The OSVCAA list of campus faculty who have been awarded prestigious awards, honors, and memberships includes:

American Academy of Arts and Sciences  
Guggenheim Fellowships  
National Academy of Sciences  
National Medal of Science  
Nobel Prize

### Methodology

In the OSVCAA list, there are a total 265 honorees of which 20 are women and 245 are men. For the purposes of this analysis, the study was limited to faculty who received awards during the years of 1990 through 2000. In this subset, there are 64 individuals (7 women and 57 men). Of these 64, 20 (2 women, 18 men) were not ladder rank faculty, were retired or assumed emeritus status following receipt of the award, are up for review July 1, 2001, or left UCSD prior to review. These were excluded from further

For each of the remaining 44 faculty members, review actions were categorized into two groups:

1. Normal merit and promotion
2. Exceptional merit and promotion (e.g., accelerations, merits and promotions to off-scale and above-scale)

### Results

Review action	Women		Men		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Normal merit and promotion	1	20%	7	18%	8	18%
Exceptional merit and promotion	4	80%	32	82%	36	82%
<i>Total</i>	5	100%	39	100%	44	100%

**GENERAL CAMPUS AVERAGE START-UP SUMMARY**  
*for appointments effective 7/1/1997 through 6/30/2001*

**Summary Data - Four Years Overall**

**Including Renovation**

<b>Division</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Average Start-Up</b>
<b>A&amp;H</b>	Men	11	\$ 32,729
	Women	16	\$ 36,305
<b>A&amp;H Overall</b>		<b>27</b>	<b>\$ 34,848</b>

<b>BIO</b>	Men	7	\$ 487,000
	Women	6	\$ 462,750
<b>BIO Overall</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>\$ 475,808</b>

<b>ENG</b>	Men	31	\$ 374,231
<b>ENG Overall</b>		<b>31</b>	<b>\$ 374,231</b>

<b>IRPS</b>	Men	2	\$ 37,167
<b>IRPS Overall</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>\$ 37,167</b>

<b>PHY SCI</b>	Men	19	\$ 529,509
	Women	1	\$ 148,000
<b>PHY SCI Overall</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>\$ 510,433</b>

<b>SOC SCI</b>	Men	14	\$ 121,046
	Women	12	\$ 83,331
<b>SOC SCI Overall</b>		<b>26</b>	<b>\$ 103,639</b>

<b>Total</b>		<b>119</b>	<b>\$ 266,430</b>
--------------	--	------------	-------------------

**Excluding Renovation**

<b>Division</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Average Start-Up</b>
<b>A&amp;H</b>	Men	11	\$ 32,729
	Women	16	\$ 36,305
<b>A&amp;H Overall</b>		<b>27</b>	<b>\$ 34,848</b>

<b>BIO</b>	Men	7	\$ 420,571
	Women	6	\$ 366,800
<b>BIO Overall</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>\$ 395,754</b>

<b>ENG</b>	Men	31	\$ 374,231
<b>ENG Overall</b>		<b>31</b>	<b>\$ 374,231</b>

<b>IRPS</b>	Men	2	\$ 37,167
<b>IRPS Overall</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>\$ 37,167</b>

<b>PHY SCI</b>	Men	19	\$ 444,009
	Women	1	\$ 148,000
<b>PHY SCI Overall</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>\$ 429,208</b>

<b>SOC SCI</b>	Men	14	\$ 101,332
	Women	12	\$ 66,248
<b>SOC SCI Overall</b>		<b>26</b>	<b>\$ 85,139</b>

<b>Total</b>		<b>119</b>	<b>\$ 239,991</b>
--------------	--	------------	-------------------



**Divisions of Biology and Physical Sciences  
Space Allocation (average square feet)  
by Gender and Rank**

		<b>Biology</b>		<b>Division of Physical Sciences</b>							
		Average space allocation		<b>Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</b>		<b>Mathematics</b>		<b>Physics</b>			
		N	allocation	Average space allocation		Average space allocation		Average space allocation			
		N	allocation	N	allocation	N	allocation	N	allocation		
<b>Asst. Professor</b>	Women	6	1,939	0		0		0			
	Men	11	1,917	7	1,827	1	133	0			
	<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1,923</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1,837</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>0</b>			
<b>Assoc. Professor</b>	Women	1	1,970	1	2,121	1	144	1	146		
	Men	2	1,893	4	2,067	6	138	3	670		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1,918</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2,078</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>539</b>		
<b>Professor</b>	Women	3	2,316	2	2,086	4	162	3	1,063		
	Men	34	2,182	23	2,651	37	152	37	1,163		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>2,193</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>2,606</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>1,156</b>		
<b>All Ranks</b>	Women	10	2,055	3	2,098	5	158	4	834		
	Men	47	2,107	34	2,413	44	150	40	1,126		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>2,098</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>2,387</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>1,100</b>		

Source: Divisions of Biology and Physical Sciences, July 2001.

NOTE:

1. Faculty who are assigned space in the School of Medicine have been excluded.
2. Average space calculations for the Department of Physics includes space allocated to both theoreticians and experimentalists.

SENATE COMMITTEE SERVICE DATA

TOTAL SENATE MEMBERSHIP

1998-1999					1999-2000					2000-2001					THREE YEAR TOTAL				
	RANK	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL			
<b>ARTS</b>	FULL	9 22.0%	32 78.0%	41	9 22.0%	32 78.0%	41	10 23.3%	33 76.7%	43	28 22.4%	97 77.6%	125						
	ASSOC	2 16.7%	10 83.3%	12	3 27.3%	8 72.7%	11	3 23.1%	10 76.9%	13	8 22.2%	28 77.8%	36						
	ASST	4 0.0%	2 0.0%	6	4 0.0%	2 0.0%	6	4 0.0%	1 0.0%	5	12 0.0%	5 0.0%	17						
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>15 25.4%</b>	<b>44 74.6%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>16 27.6%</b>	<b>42 72.4%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>17 27.9%</b>	<b>44 72.1%</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>48 27.0%</b>	<b>130 73.0%</b>	<b>178</b>						
<b>HUMAN</b>	FULL	12 24.0%	38 76.0%	50	12 23.5%	39 76.5%	51	13 26.5%	36 73.5%	49	37 24.7%	113 75.3%	150						
	ASSOC	16 44.4%	20 55.6%	36	16 35.6%	29 64.4%	45	14 32.6%	29 67.4%	43	46 37.1%	78 62.9%	124						
	ASST	6 0.0%	6 0.0%	12	5 0.0%	4 0.0%	9	8 0.0%	4 0.0%	12	19 0.0%	14 0.0%	33						
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>34 34.7%</b>	<b>64 65.3%</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>33 31.4%</b>	<b>72 68.6%</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>35 33.7%</b>	<b>69 66.3%</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>102 33.2%</b>	<b>205 66.8%</b>	<b>307</b>						
<b>SOC SCI</b>	FULL	19 17.4%	90 82.6%	109	22 20.2%	87 79.8%	109	21 17.9%	96 82.1%	117	62 18.5%	273 81.5%	335						
	ASSOC	9 12.0%	66 88.0%	75	11 23.4%	36 76.6%	47	11 24.4%	34 75.6%	45	31 18.6%	136 81.4%	167						
	ASST	18 0.0%	24 0.0%	42	13 0.0%	17 0.0%	30	14 0.0%	17 0.0%	31	45 0.0%	58 0.0%	103						
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>46 20.4%</b>	<b>180 79.6%</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>46 24.7%</b>	<b>140 75.3%</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>46 23.8%</b>	<b>147 76.2%</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>138 22.8%</b>	<b>467 77.2%</b>	<b>605</b>						
<b>NAT SCI</b>	FULL	11 8.5%	118 91.5%	129	10 7.8%	119 92.2%	129	13 9.8%	119 90.2%	132	34 8.7%	356 91.3%	390						
	ASSOC	6 16.2%	31 83.8%	37	6 30.0%	14 70.0%	20	5 22.7%	17 77.3%	22	17 21.5%	62 78.5%	79						
	ASST	3 0.0%	18 0.0%	21	18 0.0%	29 0.0%	47	6 0.0%	20 0.0%	26	27 0.0%	67 0.0%	94						
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>20 10.7%</b>	<b>167 89.3%</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>34 17.3%</b>	<b>162 82.7%</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>24 13.3%</b>	<b>156 86.7%</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>78 13.9%</b>	<b>485 86.1%</b>	<b>563</b>						
<b>ENG</b>	FULL	5 7.6%	61 92.4%	66	5 6.4%	73 93.6%	78	6 5.9%	95 94.1%	101	16 6.5%	229 93.5%	245						
	ASSOC	2 7.7%	24 92.3%	26	2 9.5%	19 90.5%	21	4 22.2%	14 77.8%	18	8 12.3%	57 87.7%	65						
	ASST	3 0.0%	6 0.0%	9	2 0.0%	13 0.0%	15	0 0.0%	14 0.0%	14	5 0.0%	33 0.0%	38						
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>10 9.9%</b>	<b>91 90.1%</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>9 7.9%</b>	<b>105 92.1%</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>10 7.5%</b>	<b>123 92.5%</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>29 8.3%</b>	<b>319 91.7%</b>	<b>348</b>						
<b>SIO</b>	FULL	5 8.3%	55 91.7%	60	6 9.4%	58 90.6%	64	6 9.8%	55 90.2%	61	17 9.2%	168 90.8%	185						
	ASSOC	3 23.1%	10 76.9%	13	4 16.0%	21 84.0%	25	2 8.3%	22 91.7%	24	9 14.5%	53 85.5%	62						
	ASST	0 0.0%	3 0.0%	3	0 0.0%	3 0.0%	3	0 0.0%	3 0.0%	3	0 0.0%	9 0.0%	9						
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>8 10.5%</b>	<b>68 89.5%</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>10 10.9%</b>	<b>82 89.1%</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>8 9.1%</b>	<b>80 90.9%</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>26 10.2%</b>	<b>230 89.8%</b>	<b>256</b>						
<b>SOM</b>	FULL	17 11.8%	127 88.2%	144	17 10.4%	146 89.6%	163	19 11.9%	141 88.1%	160	53 11.3%	414 88.7%	467						
	ASSOC	5 20.8%	19 79.2%	24	3 10.3%	26 89.7%	29	2 8.7%	21 91.3%	23	10 13.2%	66 86.8%	76						
	ASST	2 0.0%	11 0.0%	13	3 0.0%	13 0.0%	16	2 0.0%	13 0.0%	15	7 0.0%	37 0.0%	44						
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>24 13.3%</b>	<b>157 86.7%</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>23 11.1%</b>	<b>185 88.9%</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>23 11.6%</b>	<b>175 88.4%</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>70 11.9%</b>	<b>517 88.1%</b>	<b>587</b>						
<b>OVERALL</b>	FEMALE	78 13.0%	521 87.0%	599	81 12.8%	554 87.2%	635	88 13.3%	575 86.7%	663	247 13.0%	1650 87.0%	1897						
	ASSOC	43 19.3%	180 80.7%	223	45 22.7%	153 77.3%	198	41 21.8%	147 78.2%	188	129 21.2%	480 78.8%	609						
	ASST	36 34.0%	70 66.0%	106	45 35.7%	81 64.3%	126	34 0.0%	72 0.0%	106	115 34.0%	223 66.0%	338						
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>157 16.9%</b>	<b>771 83.1%</b>	<b>928</b>	<b>171 17.8%</b>	<b>788 82.2%</b>	<b>959</b>	<b>163 17.0%</b>	<b>794 83.0%</b>	<b>957</b>	<b>491 17.3%</b>	<b>2353 82.7%</b>	<b>2844</b>						

## SENATE COMMITTEE SERVICE DATA

## INVITATIONS TO SERVE

1998-1999					1999-2000			2000-2001			THREE YEAR TOTAL		
	RANK	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL
ARTS	FULL	7 31.8%	15 68.2%	22	6 23.1%	20 76.9%	26	3 17.6%	14 82.4%	17	16 24.6%	49 75.4%	65
	ASSOC	4 23.5%	13 76.5%	17	4 25.0%	12 75.0%	16	1 16.7%	5 83.3%	6	9 23.1%	30 76.9%	39
	ASST	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	1 0.0%	0 0.0%	1	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	1 0.0%	0 0.0%	1
	TOTALS	11 28.2%	28 71.8%	39	11 25.6%	32 74.4%	43	4 17.4%	19 82.6%	23	26 24.8%	79 75.2%	105
HUMAN	FULL	4 10.5%	34 89.5%	38	7 19.4%	29 80.6%	36	8 30.8%	18 69.2%	26	19 19.0%	81 81.0%	100
	ASSOC	15 65.2%	8 34.8%	23	16 48.5%	17 51.5%	33	8 42.1%	11 57.9%	19	39 52.0%	36 48.0%	75
	ASST	0 0.0%	2 0.0%	2	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	2 0.0%	2
	TOTALS	19 30.2%	44 69.8%	63	23 33.3%	46 66.7%	69	16 35.6%	29 64.4%	45	58 32.8%	119 67.2%	177
SOC SCI	FULL	12 19.0%	51 81.0%	63	18 18.4%	80 81.6%	98	8 22.9%	27 77.1%	35	38 19.4%	158 80.6%	196
	ASSOC	4 33.3%	8 66.7%	12	2 22.2%	7 77.8%	9	2 18.2%	9 81.8%	11	8 25.0%	24 75.0%	32
	ASST	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0
	TOTALS	16 21.3%	59 78.7%	75	20 18.7%	87 81.3%	107	10 21.7%	36 78.3%	46	46 20.2%	182 79.8%	228
NAT SCI	FULL	1 2.2%	45 97.8%	46	3 3.9%	74 96.1%	77	7 13.5%	45 86.5%	52	11 6.3%	164 93.7%	175
	ASSOC	3 25.0%	9 75.0%	12	5 33.3%	10 66.7%	15	6 54.5%	5 45.5%	11	14 36.8%	24 63.2%	38
	ASST	0 0.0%	2 0.0%	2	0 0.0%	2 0.0%	2	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	4 0.0%	4
	TOTALS	4 6.7%	56 93.3%	60	8 8.5%	86 91.5%	94	13 20.6%	50 79.4%	63	25 11.5%	192 88.5%	217
ENG	FULL	3 13.6%	19 86.4%	22	4 11.8%	30 88.2%	34	4 12.1%	29 87.9%	33	11 12.4%	78 87.6%	89
	ASSOC	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	3	1 10.0%	9 90.0%	10	1 20.0%	4 80.0%	5	2 11.1%	16 88.9%	18
	ASST	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0
	TOTALS	3 12.0%	22 88.0%	25	5 11.4%	39 88.6%	44	5 13.2%	33 86.8%	38	13 12.1%	94 87.9%	107
SIO	FULL	14 25.0%	42 75.0%	56	14 22.6%	48 77.4%	62	14 27.5%	37 72.5%	51	42 24.9%	127 75.1%	169
	ASSOC	7 70.0%	3 30.0%	10	4 50.0%	4 50.0%	8	4 33.3%	8 66.7%	12	15 50.0%	15 50.0%	30
	ASST	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0
	TOTALS	21 31.8%	45 68.2%	66	18 25.7%	52 74.3%	70	18 28.6%	45 71.4%	63	57 28.6%	142 71.4%	199
SOM	FULL	12 38.7%	19 61.3%	31	14 36.8%	24 63.2%	38	6 27.3%	16 72.7%	22	32 35.2%	59 64.8%	91
	ASSOC	0 0.0%	5 100.0%	5	1 16.7%	5 83.3%	6	1 16.7%	5 83.3%	6	2 11.8%	15 88.2%	17
	ASST	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0
	TOTALS	12 33.3%	24 66.7%	36	15 34.1%	29 65.9%	44	7 25.0%	21 75.0%	28	34 31.5%	74 68.5%	108
OVERALL	FEMALE	53 19.1%	225 80.9%	278	66 17.8%	305 82.2%	371	50 21.2%	186 78.8%	236	169 19.1%	716 80.9%	885
	ASSOC	33 40.2%	49 59.8%	82	33 34.0%	64 66.0%	97	23 32.9%	47 67.1%	70	89 35.7%	160 64.3%	249
	ASST	0 0.0%	4 100.0%	4	1 33.3%	2 66.7%	3	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	1 14.3%	6 85.7%	7
	TOTALS	86 23.6%	278 76.4%	364	100 21.2%	371 78.8%	471	73 23.9%	233 76.1%	306	259 22.7%	882 77.3%	1141

## SENATE COMMITTEE SERVICE DATA

## ACCEPTED INVITATIONS

		1998-1999			1999-2000			2000-2001			THREE YEAR TOTAL		
	RANK	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL
ARTS	FULL	4 36.4%	7 63.6%	11	4 28.6%	10 71.4%	14	3 23.1%	10 76.9%	13	11 28.9%	27 71.1%	38
	ASSOC	3 25.0%	9 75.0%	12	2 18.2%	9 81.8%	11	1 16.7%	5 83.3%	6	6 20.7%	23 79.3%	29
	ASST	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0
	TOTALS	7 30.4%	16 69.6%	23	6 24.0%	19 76.0%	25	4 21.1%	15 78.9%	19	17 25.4%	50 74.6%	67
HUMAN	FULL	4 10.5%	34 89.5%	38	6 20.7%	23 79.3%	29	6 28.6%	15 71.4%	21	16 18.2%	72 81.8%	88
	ASSOC	9 52.9%	8 47.1%	17	12 52.2%	11 47.8%	23	6 37.5%	10 62.5%	16	27 48.2%	29 51.8%	56
	ASST	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0
	TOTALS	13 23.6%	42 76.4%	55	18 34.6%	34 65.4%	52	12 32.4%	25 67.6%	37	43 29.9%	101 70.1%	144
SOC SCI	FULL	9 17.0%	44 83.0%	53	8 14.0%	49 86.0%	57	5 15.6%	27 84.4%	32	22 15.5%	120 84.5%	142
	ASSOC	2 33.3%	4 66.7%	6	1 25.0%	3 75.0%	4	1 10.0%	9 90.0%	10	4 20.0%	16 80.0%	20
	ASST	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0
	TOTALS	11 18.6%	48 81.4%	59	9 14.8%	52 85.2%	61	6 14.3%	36 85.7%	42	26 16.0%	136 84.0%	162
NAT SCI	FULL	1 3.2%	30 96.8%	31	3 5.9%	48 94.1%	51	6 16.2%	31 83.8%	37	10 8.4%	109 91.6%	119
	ASSOC	1 11.1%	8 88.9%	9	3 33.3%	6 66.7%	9	2 33.3%	4 66.7%	6	6 25.0%	18 75.0%	24
	ASST	0 0.0%	2 0.0%	2	0 0.0%	1 0.0%	1	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	3 0.0%	3
	TOTALS	2 4.8%	40 95.2%	42	6 9.8%	55 90.2%	61	8 18.6%	35 81.4%	43	16 11.0%	130 89.0%	146
ENG	FULL	2 10.5%	17 89.5%	19	3 12.5%	21 87.5%	24	3 13.6%	19 86.4%	22	8 12.3%	57 87.7%	65
	ASSOC	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1	1 10.0%	9 90.0%	10	1 25.0%	3 75.0%	4	2 13.3%	13 86.7%	15
	ASST	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0
	TOTALS	2 10.0%	18 90.0%	20	4 11.8%	30 88.2%	34	4 15.4%	22 84.6%	26	10 12.5%	70 87.5%	80
SIO	FULL	14 29.2%	34 70.8%	48	14 29.2%	34 70.8%	48	9 23.7%	29 76.3%	38	37 27.6%	97 72.4%	134
	ASSOC	7 70.0%	3 30.0%	10	4 57.1%	3 42.9%	7	2 25.0%	6 75.0%	8	13 52.0%	12 48.0%	25
	ASST	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0
	TOTALS	21 36.2%	37 63.8%	58	18 32.7%	37 67.3%	55	11 23.9%	35 76.1%	46	50 31.4%	109 68.6%	159
SOM	FULL	8 32.0%	17 68.0%	25	5 19.2%	21 80.8%	26	6 30.0%	14 70.0%	20	19 26.8%	52 73.2%	71
	ASSOC	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1	1 50.0%	1 50.0%	2	1 50.0%	1 50.0%	2	2 40.0%	3 60.0%	5
	ASST	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0
	TOTALS	8 30.8%	18 69.2%	26	6 21.4%	22 78.6%	28	7 31.8%	15 68.2%	22	21 27.6%	55 72.4%	76
OVERALL	FEMALE	42 18.7%	183 81.3%	225	43 17.3%	206 82.7%	249	38 20.8%	145 79.2%	183	123 18.7%	534 81.3%	657
	ASSOC	22 39.3%	34 60.7%	56	24 36.4%	42 63.6%	66	14 26.9%	38 73.1%	52	60 34.5%	114 65.5%	174
	ASST	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	2	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	3
	TOTALS	64 22.6%	219 77.4%	283	67 21.2%	249 78.8%	316	52 22.1%	183 77.9%	235	183 21.9%	651 78.1%	834

SENATE COMMITTEE SERVICE DATA

RATE OF ACCEPTANCE (Accepted vs. Invitations as a %)

1998-1999					1999-2000			2000-2001			THREE YEAR TOTAL		
	RANK	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL
<b>ARTS</b>	FULL	57.1%	46.7%	50.0%	66.7%	50.0%	53.8%	100.0%	71.4%	76.5%	68.8%	55.1%	58.5%
	ASSOC	75.0%	69.2%	70.6%	50.0%	75.0%	68.8%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	76.7%	74.4%
	ASST	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	TOTALS	63.6%	57.1%	59.0%	54.5%	59.4%	58.1%	100.0%	78.9%	82.6%	65.4%	63.3%	63.8%
<b>HUMANITIES</b>	FULL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	85.7%	79.3%	80.6%	75.0%	83.3%	80.8%	84.2%	88.9%	88.0%
	ASSOC	60.0%	100.0%	73.9%	75.0%	64.7%	69.7%	75.0%	90.9%	84.2%	69.2%	80.6%	74.7%
	ASST	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	TOTALS	68.4%	95.5%	87.3%	78.3%	73.9%	75.4%	75.0%	86.2%	82.2%	74.1%	84.9%	81.4%
<b>SOC SCI</b>	FULL	75.0%	86.3%	84.1%	44.4%	61.3%	58.2%	62.5%	100.0%	91.4%	57.9%	75.9%	72.4%
	ASSOC	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	42.9%	44.4%	50.0%	100.0%	90.9%	50.0%	66.7%	62.5%
	ASST	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	TOTALS	68.8%	81.4%	78.7%	45.0%	59.8%	57.0%	60.0%	100.0%	91.3%	56.5%	74.7%	71.1%
<b>NAT SCI</b>	FULL	100.0%	66.7%	67.4%	100.0%	64.9%	66.2%	85.7%	68.9%	71.2%	90.9%	66.5%	68.0%
	ASSOC	33.3%	88.9%	75.0%	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%	33.3%	80.0%	54.5%	42.9%	75.0%	63.2%
	ASST	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	TOTALS	50.0%	71.4%	70.0%	75.0%	64.0%	64.9%	61.5%	70.0%	68.3%	64.0%	67.7%	67.3%
<b>ENG</b>	FULL	66.7%	89.5%	86.4%	75.0%	70.0%	70.6%	75.0%	65.5%	66.7%	72.7%	73.1%	73.0%
	ASSOC	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	80.0%	100.0%	81.3%	83.3%
	ASST	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	TOTALS	66.7%	81.8%	80.0%	80.0%	76.9%	77.3%	80.0%	66.7%	68.4%	76.9%	74.5%	74.8%
<b>SIO</b>	FULL	100.0%	81.0%	85.7%	100.0%	70.8%	77.4%	64.3%	78.4%	74.5%	88.1%	76.4%	79.3%
	ASSOC	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	87.5%	50.0%	75.0%	66.7%	86.7%	80.0%	83.3%
	ASST	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	TOTALS	100.0%	82.2%	87.9%	100.0%	71.2%	78.6%	61.1%	77.8%	73.0%	87.7%	76.8%	79.9%
<b>SOM</b>	FULL	66.7%	89.5%	80.6%	35.7%	87.5%	68.4%	100.0%	87.5%	90.9%	59.4%	88.1%	78.0%
	ASSOC	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%	20.0%	33.3%	0.0%	20.0%	33.3%	0.0%	20.0%	29.4%
	ASST	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	TOTALS	66.7%	75.0%	72.2%	40.0%	75.9%	63.6%	100.0%	71.4%	78.6%	61.8%	74.3%	70.4%
<b>OVERALL</b>	FULL	79.2%	81.3%	80.9%	65.2%	67.5%	67.1%	76.0%	78.0%	77.5%	72.8%	74.6%	74.2%
	ASSOC	66.7%	69.4%	68.3%	72.7%	65.6%	68.0%	60.9%	80.9%	74.3%	67.4%	71.3%	69.9%
	ASST	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	TOTALS	74.4%	78.8%	77.7%	67.0%	67.1%	67.1%	71.2%	78.5%	76.8%	70.7%	73.8%	73.1%

## SENATE COMMITTEE SERVICE DATA

## INVITATIONS BY COMMITTEE TYPE

Senate Council					Non Senate Council					Senate Council and Non Senate Council					
1998-99	Female		Male		Total	Female		Male		Total	Female		Male		Total
FULL	22	25.6%	64	74.4%	86	28	14.8%	161	85.2%	189	50	18.2%	225	81.8%	275
ASSOC	2	14.3%	12	85.7%	14	26	45.6%	31	54.4%	57	33	40.2%	49	59.8%	82
ASST	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4	0	0.0%	4	0.0%	4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24.0%</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>76.0%</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>65.1%</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>78.4%</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>23.0%</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>77.0%</b>	<b>361</b>
<b>1999-00</b>															
FULL	22	23.2%	73	76.8%	95	44	15.9%	232	84.1%	276	66	17.8%	305	82.2%	371
ASSOC	14	45.2%	17	54.8%	31	19	28.8%	47	71.2%	66	33	34.0%	64	66.0%	97
ASST	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	3	1	0.0%	2	0.0%	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>28.6%</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>71.4%</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>18.6%</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>81.4%</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>21.2%</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>78.8%</b>	<b>471</b>
<b>2000-01</b>															
FULL	19	24.7%	58	75.3%	77	44	25.6%	128	74.4%	172	50	21.2%	186	78.8%	236
ASSOC	12	29.3%	29	70.7%	41	19	51.4%	18	48.6%	37	23	32.9%	47	67.1%	70
ASST	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>26.3%</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>73.7%</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>30.5%</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>69.5%</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>23.9%</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>76.1%</b>	<b>306</b>
<b>THREE-YEAR TOTAL</b>															
FULL	63	24.4%	195	75.6%	258	116	18.2%	521	81.8%	637	166	18.8%	716	81.2%	882
ASSOC	28	32.6%	58	67.4%	86	64	40.0%	96	60.0%	160	89	35.7%	160	64.3%	249
ASST	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2	25.0%	6	75.0%	8	1	0.0%	6	0.0%	7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>26.5%</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>73.5%</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>22.6%</b>	<b>623</b>	<b>77.4%</b>	<b>805</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>22.5%</b>	<b>882</b>	<b>77.5%</b>	<b>1138</b>

*Senate Council* = Committees which are represented on the Senate Council

*Non Senate Council* = Committees which are not represented on the Senate Council

Note: Breakdown by Committee type excludes 3 invitations to serve on an ad hoc committee.

**2001-2002 Department Chairs and Program and Project Directors  
by Gender and SubCampus**

NOTE: In some instances, there may be co-chairs or co-directors in one program or department, or two or more individuals may share the chair or director duties over the course of the year. A weight has been applied in these instances; see examples below.

		Women		Men		To Be Named		Overall	Overall
		Weight	Percent	Weight	Percent	Weight	Percent	Weight	Percent
<b>General Campus</b>	Departments	5.75	21%	21.25	79%	0	0%	27	100%
	MRUs	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
	ORUs	2.5	12%	18.5	88%	0	0%	21	100%
	Programs	12	27%	30	68%	2	5%	44	100%
	Projects	2	29%	5	71%	0	0%	7	100%
<b>General Campus Total</b>		<b>22.25</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>76.75</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>SIO</b>	Departments	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
	MRUs	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
	ORUs	1	9%	10	91%	0	0%	11	100%
	Programs	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2	100%
<b>SIO Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>SOM</b>	Departments	2	14%	12	86%	0	0%	14	100%
	ORUs	0.5	10%	4.5	90%	0	0%	5	100%
	Programs	2	33%	4	67%	0	0%	6	100%
<b>SOM Total</b>		<b>4.5</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall Total</b>	Departments	7.75	18%	34.25	82%	0	0%	42	100%
	MRUs	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	4	100%
	ORUs	4	11%	33	89%	0	0%	37	100%
	Programs	15	29%	35	67%	2	4%	52	100%
	Projects	2	29%	5	71%	0	0%	7	100%
<b>Overall Total</b>		<b>28.75</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>111.25</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>100%</b>

Weight example #1: If a program has two co-chairs for the entire year then each is weighted at .50.

Weight example #2: If one department has two chairs in the year then the person serving 7/1/01-9/30/01 is weighted as .25 and the second person serving 10/1/01-6/30/02 is weighted as .75.

The "Overall Weight" column is the sum of the weights and is also the count of the number of Departments, MRUs, ORUs, Programs and Projects at UCSD.

**2001-2002 Faculty by Gender, SubCampus and Rank**

		Women		Men		Total N	Total %
		N	%	N	%		
<b>General Campus</b>	Assoc.	38	28%	98	72%	136	100%
	Full	65	15%	381	85%	446	100%
	LSOE	7	64%	4	36%	11	100%
<b>General Campus Total</b>		<b>110</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>593</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>SIO</b>	Assoc.	2	14%	12	86%	14	100%
	Full	6	10%	55	90%	61	100%
<b>SIO Total</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>SOM</b>	Assoc.	1	5%	19	95%	20	100%
	Full	20	13%	139	87%	159	100%
<b>SOM Total</b>		<b>21</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>		Women		Men		Total N	Total %
		N	%	N	%		
	Assoc.	41	24%	129	76%	170	100%
	Full	91	14%	575	86%	666	100%
	LSOE	7	64%	4	36%	11	100%
<b>Total</b>		<b>139</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>708</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>847</b>	<b>100%</b>

UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA  
SAN DIEGO

SEPARATIONS:  
LADDER-RANK FACULTY  
BY CAMPUS DIVISION  
11/1/95 - 10/31/00

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	ENGINEERING				PHYSICAL SCIENCES				BIOLOGY						
	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN		TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN		TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1995-96	4	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
1996-97	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1997-98	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	3	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
1998-99	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	4	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	4	3	75.0%	1	25.0%
1999-00	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	6	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TOTAL	10	6	60.0%	4	40.0%	14	13	92.9%	1	7.1%	9	7	77.8%	2	22.2%

  

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	SOCIAL SCIENCES				IR/PS				ARTS & HUMANITIES						
	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN		TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN		TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	7	6	85.7%	1	14.3%	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
1995-96	7	6	85.7%	1	14.3%	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
1996-97	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	3	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
1997-98	8	5	62.5%	3	37.5%	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	5	100.0%	0	0.0%
1998-99	6	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	10	5	50.0%	5	50.0%
1999-00	10	6	60.0%	4	40.0%	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	4	3	75.0%	1	25.0%
TOTAL	39	29	74.4%	10	25.6%	5	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	27	17	63.0%	10	37.0%

  

YEAR (11/1-10/31)	SCH. OF MEDICINE				SCRIPPS INST. OF OCEANOGRAPHY				TOTAL CAMPUS						
	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN		TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN		TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
1994-95	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	12	92.3%	1	7.7%
1995-96	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	21	16	76.2%	5	23.8%
1996-97	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	12	10	83.3%	2	16.7%
1997-98	7	5	71.4%	2	28.6%	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	26	19	73.1%	7	26.9%
1998-99	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	30	22	73.3%	8	26.7%
1999-00	4	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	29	23	79.3%	6	20.7%
TOTAL	22	20	90.9%	2	9.1%	5	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	131	102	77.9%	29	22.1%

Note: RTAD/VERIP separations have been removed from above data.



## Interview Questions

Based on your own experience:

1. Do you feel your rank and salary are commensurate with your accomplishments at UCSD?
2. From your own experience, do you think there are inequities in your department with regard to rank and salary, respect, or any type of perks (related, for example, to accelerations, office space, teaching assignments, student support, etc.) which can be given to faculty?

If there are inequities, what do you think they are due to?

If there are inequities, are any related to gender?

3. We want to know how your department recognizes achievement.

Have you received any significant prize or award, or made some unusual professional accomplishment in research, teaching, and/or service?

When this happened, did your department and/or the university recognize the achievement appropriately?

4. Having children is an important consideration for faculty.

If you have made a decision whether to have children or not, were you influenced by any special circumstances or perceived challenges or consequences related to your academic career?

Are women faculty with children viewed differently by their colleagues or departments? Are there different expectations or perceptions that surround women with and without children?

Would you feel free to discuss reasonable but special considerations related to your family with your department chair?

Do you find current policies reasonable with regard to maternity leave, 'time out' from the review cycle, and child care?

Do you think things are different for women having children today than when you entered academia?

5. Are there gender issues related to faculty-graduate student interactions within your department, such as supervision, support, or thesis committee assignments?
6. UCSD wishes to hire and retain more women faculty. Are there one or two things that stand out in your mind we could do to be more effective?
7. Are there any additional issues related to gender equity you would like to bring to the committee's attention?
8. Is there a particular event or circumstance about which you would like to speak with someone else confidentially, and not part of this general interview process? [NOTE: To facilitate this should it be needed, we will provide a list of possible referrals.]

**Childbearing and Parental Leaves  
and Active Service/Modified Duties (AS/MD)  
Ladder Rank Faculty  
Academic Years 1996-1997 through 2000-2001**

		Women		Men		Total	
		N	Average Days/Leave	N	Average Days/Leave	N	Average Days/Leave
<b>AS/MD</b>	1996-1997	1	120	1	121	2	121
	1997-1998	1	122	3	122	4	122
	1998-1999	0	0	1	120	1	120
	1999-2000	3	122	1	122	4	122
	2000-2001	0	0	2	123	2	123
<b>AS/MD Total</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>122</b>

<b>CHILDBEARING</b>	1996-1997	3	51	0	0	3	51
	1999-2000	1	40	0	0	1	40
	2000-2001	2	82	0	0	2	82
<b>CHILDBEARING Total</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>60</b>

<b>PARENTAL</b>	1996-1997	4	106	1	14	5	87
	1997-1998	0	0	1	120	1	120
	1998-1999	1	123	2	181	3	162
	1999-2000	0	0	4	165	4	165
	2000-2001	0	0	3	162	3	162
<b>PARENTAL Total</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>137</b>

## NOTES:

1. N = count of leave or ASMD occurrences.
2. Parental leave may be granted to those caring for a child, spouse, or domestic partner of the academic appointee.
3. Average number of days reflects pay periods; 1 quarter equals 120 pay days.