Report on the Status of Women Faculty at Stanford University

April 27, 2000: Patricia P. Jones, Vice Provost for Faculty Development

Two years ago, in response to a request from the Faculty Women’s Caucus, the Senate passed a resolution asking the Provost to supplement the annual statistics of gains and losses with a report on the efforts that have been made to recruit and retain women faculty throughout the university. In the spirit of that resolution, this report on the status of women faculty at Stanford is divided into two parts. Part I addresses the following: the representation of women faculty in the various schools and professorial lines; the hiring of men and women tenure-line faculty at both the junior and senior levels; tenure rates for men and women across the University; and the representation of women in leadership roles and among holders of endowed professorships. Part II discusses efforts that are being made to recruit and retain women faculty, including efforts to identify and address issues of concern to women faculty.

Part I. Women in the Stanford Professoriate

Representation of Women

Table 1 summarizes data from the report on Professorial Gains and Losses for all schools and professorial lines. Over the ten-year period from 9/1/89 to 9/1/99, the number of women more than doubled, increasing by 168, with the proportion of women increasing from 11.7% to 19.8%. Over the five-year period since 9/1/94, the number of women has increased by 81, an increase of 33.5%. Between 9/1/98 and 9/1/99, 47 women were added to the faculty, increasing the proportion of faculty who are women from 18.9% to 19.8%.

The data for the 5-year period broken down by schools are presented in the pictorial form in Figure 1.

This is an informative figure, in that it graphically reveals differences in the representation of women on the faculty, as well as absolute changes in the numbers of women and of total faculty (the numbers separated by slashes above each bar). Over the past five years, all schools and units in H&S and the Medical School showed an increase in the number and % of women, except the Law School (whose numbers reflect the departure of one woman; it is important to point out that the number of women among the Law School faculty had increased from 5 to 10 during the previous
five-year period, from 1989-94). The representation of women continues to be lowest in the sciences and engineering, except for the Medical School Basic Science departments (and the Department of Biological Sciences within H&S, currently with 28% women faculty), reflecting higher proportions of women in the life sciences at all stages of development than in the physical sciences and engineering.

Examination of the net changes in women and in total faculty over the last five years makes an interesting point. In all schools (except Law) the net increase in the number of women is a larger proportion of the net increase in total faculty than is the overall % of women. For example, in H&S Social Sciences, the net increase in total faculty was only one, but the number of women grew from 32 to 37. Of course these net changes represent the sum of all hires and departures in all lines, so they are difficult to interpret. But they do reflect the fact that the proportions of faculty who are women are increasing in all segments of the University.

A similar analysis of changes in the tenured faculty over the last 5 years is presented in Figure 2.

For the University overall, including all professorial lines, women currently constitute 15.5% of the tenured faculty. While there is considerable spread in the representation of tenured women faculty among the schools, in all cases there were significant net increases in the numbers of tenured women faculty relative to the net increase in total faculty. For example, in both the Graduate School of Business and the H&S Social Sciences, there was a net reduction in the number of tenured faculty, but there was a net increase in numbers of tenured women faculty (3 and 5, respectively). It is also worth noting that in the Clinical Departments at the Medical School, the net increase in the number of tenured faculty was 12, and the net increase in the number of tenured women faculty was 10. This largely reflects the success of their own assistant professors in earning tenure. The significant relative net increases in numbers of women compared to numbers of men among the tenured faculty is due in part to the high representation of men among those electing to retire during this period. Thus while the overall representation of women among the tenured faculty is still lower than we would like in parts of the University, the turnover of our faculty, albeit slow, is contributing to increases in both the number and proportion of women.

Gains, Losses, and New Appointments

The basis for changes over the past year in the representation of women faculty in each professorial line across the University is indicated in Table 3. All four groups showed increases in the representation of women, though small. Under the tenured faculty, the data show that more than 90% of the departures were men, and about 3/4 of them were due to retirement. Of the new appointments, women made up at least 30% of the new faculty except in the tenured faculty group, where women constituted 5/27 of new hires.
More information on new faculty hires, for each school over the past 5 years, is shown in Tables 4 and 5, for junior untenured faculty and senior tenured faculty, respectively. As the numbers for each unit each year are very small, the totals in the right-hand column are most significant. Over the 5 years, Education and the Medical School Basic Science Departments each did well in recruiting women, at 60% and 55%, respectively, of the assistant professors hired. This past year 41% of H&S junior recruits were women; the Philosophy Department under the leadership of Debra Satz hired three women assistant professors. The schools less successful in recruiting junior women are apparent from the table. Overall women comprised 28% of the tenure track/untenured recruits, not surprisingly about the same as the overall percentage of women among our junior faculty. Table 5 shows comparable data for new tenured faculty appointments. Over the 5-year period 22% of these senior hires have been women, a significant increase over the current representation of women among tenured faculty, 15.5%.

Obviously many factors affect our ability to recruit women faculty, as well as members of minority groups. Not the least of these is the representation -- or lack thereof -- of women and minorities in availability pools, especially in many of the science and engineering disciplines. Because of additional factors such as the subdisciplinary requirements of searches, academic qualifications, and the preference of some to pursue non-academic careers, the numbers of PhD women in the availability pools for assistant professor positions at Stanford are even lower. Competition for the relatively small numbers of highly qualified applicants with our sister institutions is intense. Needless to say, that is even more true for the availability pools for senior faculty hires, comprised of senior faculty at other institutions. So recruiting outstanding women and minority faculty presents challenges that we must strive to overcome. These issues will be discussed further in Part II.

**Tenure Rates**

A summary of tenure awards for men and women is presented in Table 6, and graphically in Figure 3.

As has been done in previous years, all tenure-line assistant professors hired in a specified period of time, here 1975-1992, have been divided into three chronological cohorts: those hired between 1975-80, 1981-86, and 1987-92 - those hired in 1992 being the last cohort largely to have gone through the tenure evaluation process. Grouping the yearly cohorts gives higher numbers of individuals for the comparisons, though in some schools the numbers are still small. These cohort groups include all tenure-track assistant professors hired in that period, whether or not they were brought forward for a tenure decision, including those who resigned for various reasons prior to the tenure evaluation. The "other" category represents transfers to other faculty lines, and in the most recent cohort, 1992, individuals whose tenure decisions
are still pending (and hence will show up in the other categories in the future, potentially increasing the tenure rates).

For these 18 cohort years, the data show no consistent difference in tenure rates for men and women. During this period the University's overall tenure rate is about 40%, with the tenure rate for women being higher than that for men, 45.7% compared to 38.3%. For the most recent cohort, the small numbers of individuals makes the difference in rates (43.9% for men vs. 40.3% for women) not significant — changing the outcomes in just two cases for each equalizes the tenure rates.

The data for the individual schools over this period, shown in Table 7, are similar, with the tenure rates for women being higher than for men in all schools and department clusters except Law and Education. It should be pointed out again that in these two schools, as well as in some other schools, the numbers of individuals are small so the differences are not significant. The general conclusion that should be drawn from this analysis is that there is no significant difference in the tenure rate for men and women at Stanford.

**Leadership**

The representation of women in positions of leadership and as holders of endowed chairs is summarized in Table 8. There has been steady growth in the numbers of women in these positions since the early 90's. This year we lost a woman provost but gained a woman dean, Kathleen Sullivan in Law; as you know, during the next academic year we will be adding a second, Deborah Stipek, the dean-designate of the School of Education. Our cadre of associate deans has shown significant growth in the representation of women, now 27%. There have been steady increases in the numbers of women department chairs, now 21%, higher than the overall representation of women among the tenured faculty, 15.5%. 35% of directors of interdepartmental degree programs are women. The Academic Senate currently has its highest ever number of women, 15, which represents 27%. Finally, the numbers of women holders of endowed professorships has shown steady growth since the early 90's, with this past year showing the biggest absolute and % increases. Just about 1/3 of the net increase in endowed professorships this past year is in women chair holders. Thus there have been steady increases in the presence of women in positions of leadership and prestige at this University. In 8 of the 11 leadership categories, the % of women is higher -- and in many cases substantially so -- than the % of tenured women faculty. These data indicate that there is no glass ceiling at Stanford.
Part II. Efforts to Recruit and Retain Women Faculty

Recruitment

While the data presented in this report indicate that the numbers and proportions of women are increasing in all segments of the professoriate, progress is still slower than we would like. This results from a number of factors, including: the historical demographics of our faculty, no or slow growth in the most parts of the professoriate, the slow rate of turnover of our faculty (affected in part by the end of mandatory retirement), the low representation of women in relevant availability pools in some disciplines, and intense competition for qualified applicants. Given this reality, it is even more important for us to be pro-active in seeking to increase the diversity of our faculty, to which this University is committed.

Clearly, the major responsibility for hiring decisions lies with the departments and schools; the administration does not make hiring decisions. We are thus critically dependent on the departmental faculty and their search committees for surfacing applicant pools as diverse as possible and for making sure that qualified women and minority candidates are given serious consideration for the final short lists. The same is true for identifying appropriate senior candidates for target of opportunity hires. The University has strict guidelines requiring that searches make serious attempts to identify qualified women and minority candidates. These efforts must be documented in the long forms, one way by which the University maintains vigilance over the efforts at department and school levels to diversify the faculty. The importance of diversifying the faculty and the implementation of our affirmative action policies are also stressed at the Chairs Workshops, quarterly meetings of chairs and deans hosted by the Provost. These issues will again be on the agenda at the spring quarter Chairs Workshop.

In addition, when an outstanding women or minority candidate is identified through a search but does not happen to meet the particulars of that search (perhaps because of the subfield), the school can apply to the Provost for funding from the Faculty Incentive Fund to help support an additional faculty position. The FIF makes it possible to broaden faculty recruitment beyond narrowly—defined research and teaching needs, allowing us to take advantage of opportunities to add to the diversity of our faculty with highly qualified scholars. In the past year alone about $660,000 have been allocated from FIF to various schools in support of such appointments. Since 1994 the University's investment in FIF has been over $8.3 million; these funds have helped us recruit 53 new faculty.

Recruitment and retention efforts require tremendous investments of resources, both financial and personal (in terms of time and effort). Again, the departments and schools have the greatest responsibility for the personal efforts required for recruiting and retaining our top faculty. The schools — and the Provost for the non-formula schools — contribute financial resources for recruitment and retention packages. I am
pleased to announce that the University has recently received a substantial anonymous gift of endowment that will provide additional discretionary funds to the Provost for use in recruitment and retention of faculty, with a preference for women faculty. These funds complement others available to the Provost that can be used to enable us to hire and retain the most outstanding scholars and teachers, including women.

As was apparent from the data presented earlier concerning recruitment of women faculty at both the junior and senior levels, some of our departments and schools have clearly been more successful in their endeavors than others. We in the Provost's Office will be providing particular encouragement to, and vigilance over, departments and schools that have not been so successful.

**Retention and Climate**

When we consider what is required to retain our prized faculty, we must include more than what it takes to counter attractive recruitment packages from other institutions. Other key factors affecting whether faculty want to stay are related to their academic environment: whether it is intellectually stimulating and allows them to do their best teaching and research, whether it is collegial and supportive, and whether it appropriately recognizes their contributions and accomplishments. We are committed to the principle that all faculty, including women faculty, should have this kind of academic environment at Stanford. While women in some parts of the University have enjoyed such a stimulating, collegial atmosphere, we recognize that this may not be true in every department in every school. The remainder of this report will consider what we are doing about these issues, which affect the experiences of our women faculty and potentially their retention.

The first issue is faculty salary equity. Following up on last year's recommendations of the Provost's Salary Equity Committee, the Provost's Office has been working with the deans to examine faculty salaries. Data have been assembled comparing faculty members' salaries to the salaries that would be predicted by various objective factors, i.e., rank at the time of hire, current rank, years at Stanford, years since highest degree, years in rank, discipline, etc. The difference between the actual and the predicted salary, called the "residual", reflects other, more subjective factors, including the faculty members' research and teaching performance. A negative residual means that the actual salary is lower than the salary predicted by the objective criteria. Bob Weisberg, Special Assistant to the Provost for Faculty Affairs, and Provost's Office staff have been reviewing with the deans the salaries of faculty whose residuals are in the lowest quintile - specifically, asking whether the negative residuals are appropriate. This novel method of analysis has revealed a small number of faculty, both men and women, whose salaries warrant adjustments; these adjustments will be reflected in their 2000-01 salaries. In the future we plan to provide similar information for all quintiles of salary residuals to deans and department chairs as an extra tool to assist them in setting appropriate salaries for all faculty.
The second set of issues is related to the climate for women faculty. First, it is appropriate to repeat a statement that John Hennessy made during his public comments following his selection as President-designate. We have zero tolerance for discrimination, and zero tolerance for retaliation. This is a clear and strong statement, pertaining to the entire Stanford community, and it requires no further comment.

We have recently followed up on the sexual harassment training program, to make sure that all recently-hired faculty have attended these sessions. At our winter quarter Chairs Workshop, Laraine Zappert, Director of the Sexual Harassment Policy Office, gave an update on the program, and the department chairs were asked to help make sure that all of their new faculty will attend a training session.

In addition, we all need to be conscious of, and strive to eliminate, more subtle behaviors that may selectively disadvantage women or members of other groups. To open a dialogue with women faculty across the University, and to help us identify and address issues that may be of concern to them, this spring Provost Hennessy and I invited all women faculty to lunch at the Faculty Club. By May 9 we will have had eleven lunches with a total of 147 women, a remarkable 45% of the women from all schools and professorial lines. One of the lunches was a productive meeting with senior members of the Faculty Women's Caucus. I think that John will agree that overall it has been a very positive experience - in the first place, just meeting so many women from across the University and learning about their scholarship and their contributions to the University. Many of the issues they have raised are issues common to faculty of both genders, including housing, mentoring of junior faculty, and the Medical Center Line. Other issues are more specifically related to women, such as concerns about childcare (the burden for which is particularly felt by women), the climate for women in their departments, whether search committees are as effective as they could be in identifying women candidates, whether women have more advising and mentoring responsibilities than their male colleagues, and the desire for leadership training for women. We will look for appropriate ways to consider and address these issues, both within the administration and in our discussions with deans and department chairs.

Some issues of concern to young women faculty are common to all junior faculty. The programs of the Stanford Faculty Resource Network, initiated by my predecessor, Anne Fernald, are targeted at providing information and resources to junior faculty to help them navigate their early years at Stanford. During May we will be holding a panel discussion on "Strategies for Managing Academic Careers and Family", as well as a series of lunch discussions on tenure and promotion in different parts of the University, to be hosted by current and former members of the Advisory Board and school appointments and promotions committees.

At our Women Faculty Lunches, the Provost and I invited the faculty to contact us individually with any concerns or suggestions, and we extend that invitation to the faculty as a whole.
In closing, I would like to reiterate that while progress is being made in increasing the representation of women in the Stanford professoriate and in fostering an appropriate academic environment for them -- and for all faculty -- much still needs to be done. These issues warrant continuing attention and vigilance -- from all of us.
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