

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: 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. 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. PY_{jt} is, for each senate member j in year t , the number of years of experience since earning a Ph.D. UCY_{jt} is similarly the number of years at UCSD for each person j in year t . 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. 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.¹

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 factor², 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 were² : the Division of Biology (-12% salary differential), the Division of Arts and Humanities**

¹ 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.

² 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 salary² 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)³, 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.**

³ 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