

Date: December 3, 2009

**Executive Summary:
Report of the Gender Equity Committee (GEC) on the 2007 Dataset**

Members of the GEC: Professors Marisa Carrasco, Ernest Davis, Jo Dixon, Raquel Fernandez, Carol Shoshkes Reiss (chair) and Gabrielle Starr

FAS Institutional Research (IR): Rachel Krug, David Vintinner, and Joe Juliano

History: This is the third in a series of reports evaluating aspects of gender equity for FAS faculty members by committees appointed by the FAS Dean, comprised of three members of P&P and three members of the FAS Women's Faculty Caucus (WFC). The GEC is grateful to the IR team for their hard work and willingness to re-analyze and to re-present data.

The report, entitled "Arts and Science Faculty Equity Study, 2007" and GEC full analysis entitled "Report of the Gender Equity Committee to Former FAS Dean Richard Foley, Acting FAS Dean Jess Benhabib, and the FAS Dean's Advisory Committee on Policy and Planning on the 2007 Dataset" can be found at the URL: <http://as.nyu.edu/object/faculty.equity> This material was presented to the FAS Dean's Advisory Committee on Policy and Planning in October, 2009.

Summary & Recommendations:

1. Characteristics of Tenure Track (TT) and Tenured faculty

a) **Women constitute ~28% of the TT faculty in 2007 (N=621), rising from ~24% of 513 total in 2000.** More women TT faculty were recruited in the Humanities rising from ~33% in 2000 to ~40% in 2007; in the Social Sciences the percent women TT faculty rose from 24% to ~28%; there was little change in the Sciences, an increase of only ~1% from 14% to 15%.

In this review, for the first time, data were presented for "Under-represented minorities" (URM; self-declared Black or Hispanic which includes African, Latin Americans, and Iberian-born faculty in addition to the US-defined American Black, American Hispanic but probably not US Indigenous people aka "American Indians"). **The frequency of URM in the TT FAS faculty have remained stable at ~8%.**

We applaud the successful recruitment and retention of more women faculty with the expansion of the FAS faculty. The sciences are especially deficient in women faculty compared to the Humanities and the Social Sciences and the Sciences should be targeted for recruitment of women TT faculty in the coming years. While the FAS faculty has expanded, this indicates increased recruitment and retention of URM, but we encourage more Diversity in the hiring of URM to the TT faculty.

b) **Gender and rank** are associated for TT faculty. Females are under-represented in the Professor rank and at the Assistant Professor (aP) rank, but somewhat over-represented at the Associate Professor (AP). URM are also over-represented at the AP rank (~14%) and under-represented at the aP rank (~4%). Data have been blinded by department and division identity.

These data indicate that female faculty are in the pipeline, mid-rank, and thus will be candidates for promotion to full professor in the future, however, to maintain women in the pipeline, recruitment of female faculty needs to be targeted for entry level aP.

c) **Salary analysis:** Overall, at every rank, male faculty earn significantly more than female faculty (2007 0.013 units less log salary). But, **when controlled by rank, department, and year of hire, the difference is no longer significantly different.** This does not mean that every individual is "average", but rather that the population of TT faculty at each rank shows

equity in average salary.

URM: Because of their small numbers among their peers (52/621 and 32 departmental units in the dataset), the analysis of URM is limited. The differences in mean salary of URM and the balance of the TT faculty population are not significant. URM faculty TT faculty members are compensated equitably, although the pool is too small to enable detailed analysis.

While overall, the average female and male salaries are similar by rank, in some departments, there are departures. Although women have made progress in being hired and promoted in FAS, the distribution is not uniform. We recommend that the Divisional Deans be vigilant in assuring that individual departments recruit, promote, and retain women (and URM) faculty. The male TT faculty-dominated departments (for example Economics and Physics) have a higher salary than departments where more of the faculty members are women (generally Humanities departments). This is finding unchanged since we started this analysis in 2000, however, it does not appear (from the blinding of information available to us) that there is inequity in the salaries of women and men in those departments.

d) Administrative responsibilities (Provost, Dean, Chair, DUGS and DGS) are not biased by either sex of faculty member. It should be noted that the fraction of women faculty in administrative responsibilities has dropped from 31% in 2000 to 22% in 2007. URM are not over-represented in administrative appointments.

e) Research support: Female (75%) and URM (79% of pooled both male and female URM) faculty are more likely to receive Internal (NYU) research support than male colleagues (53%), and to receive larger grants.

2. Non-TT Full Time Faculty (NTTFTF) characteristics:

a) The number of contract NTTFTF has increased from 46 in 2000 to 124 in 2005 and in 2007 stood at 199, a 433% increase. Most NTTFTF are members of Humanities departments. They have been divided into two groups for analysis: "Tenure Bound Faculty" (TBF; titles aP/Faculty Fellow and Courant Instructors) and NTTF (clinical faculty and Language Lecturers). **Overall in 2007, 52% are women, 9% URM.** In the 47 TBF, there are 25 males and 22 females; among 152 NTT, 70 males and 82 females. URM are also more likely to be found in NTT (N=13) than in TBF (N=5).

While in the TT faculty, ~27% are women, in the NTTFTF pool women represent more than half. The fraction of URM is the same in NTTFTF as in TT faculty. This is a heterogeneous population of contract faculty members, with different expectations and skill-sets, but it is a concern that women are so over-represented in the contract pool, and under-represented at the aP TT level.

b) Overall, male NTTFTF earn significantly more (0.10 units log salary) than females in both TBF and NTT, but URM earn more than male TBF but less than women NTT. However, when controlled for rank, department and year of hire, some of the differences are lost. Contract faculty earn significantly less than TT faculty. The disparity in male NTTFTF compensation noted in the 2005 report has largely, but not entirely resolved; this is especially evident in the NTT group, where the Mean for males is \$57,678 and their female counterparts just \$49,565. This may reflect more seniority, although we were unable to determine if that were the case.

Among contract faculty, men are better compensated than are female faculty and many departments are exclusively male in their NTTFTF members, despite the fact that most NTTFTF are female. This compensation disparity is a concern and we recommend the Divisional Deans scrutinize these data.

c) Administrative responsibilities: 12 (of 199; 7 are males) **NTTFTF have significant**

administrative jobs such as DUGs or another officer of the department. None of the URM NTTFTF hold administrative positions. It does not appear that there is gender inequity in administrative responsibilities among NTTFTF.

d) **Research Support:** Women (88%) and URM (89%) NTTFTF are more likely than their male (65%) colleagues to successfully receive internal research grants in 2005 and 2007; however there is no effect of sex or minority status on the size of the grants received.

3. *Hiring analysis TT faculty*

a) From 6/1/95 to 4/2/07, 396 TT faculty were **hired**. Of these, 129 (33%) are female and 36 (9%) are URM. URM hiring was greater in the 1996-2001 period (N=23, 13% hires) than in the 2002-2007 period (N=13, 9%). **Females and URM are disproportionately hired at the AP rank.** Starting salary in the period 1996-2007 remains a problem, since male faculty start at higher salaries, but rank and dept are the variables which contribute to this disparity. The relative surge in hiring female TT faculty has resulted in the increase noted above in female TT faculty, especially at the AP rank.

b) **Recruitment Short lists:** 73 (22%) of 330 short lists (1996-2007) analyzed had no women candidates for TT faculty positions; 30 (9%) did not have male candidates. 108 (33%) had $\geq 50\%$ women on the short lists; 222 (67%) had $\geq 50\%$ male candidates. 15 searches had no female applicants and 9 searches did not have male applicants. When women were on the short lists, they were successful, especially in 2002-2007.

4. *Promotion and Tenure decisions*

a) The 10-year dataset of the promotion of hired faculty from 1996-2007 was divided into two 5 year cohorts because of the length of the tenure process. Overall, of 220 faculty members, 103 were tenured, 15 were denied tenure, 29 resigned, and 73 were eligible (pending). Of the earlier cohort, promotion of 1 woman was pending in 2007 and the remaining 72 eligible are from the more recent cohort of hires. **There was no gender- or URM-bias in the granting of tenure.** 70% of men and 68% of women were tenured from the early group. The success rate of minorities was not presented in an accessible form. The progress through the promotion and tenure process appears equitable.

b) **Men were more likely to have resigned before tenure consideration** (15 vs 5), but women were likely to resign later (1.2 years difference). Overall 9 female and 22 male faculty received early tenure decisions in the 10 year period. In the 2002-2007 pool of 115 TT faculty, 30 have received tenure, half with early consideration. Survival analysis indicates there is no difference in women or URM in survival until tenure in the 1996-2007 study.

There was no evidence of bias in the promotion and tenure process for TT faculty.

In **conclusion**, although there are still some areas in need to remediation, the FAS faculty is remarkably equitable in almost every metric used to evaluate it. The chair and deans are to be congratulated on their successes in these matters. Continued efforts are needed to maintain this momentum and to recruit and promote women and URM , especially in some departments where they are less well represented.