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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report describes the efforts of the Perceptions Committee of the Faculty Senate-appointed Gender Equity Task Force (GETF) to assess perceptions of gender equity among full-time faculty at Saint Louis University. These data are based, in large part, on the responses to and comments on the GETF survey questions embedded within the broader Saint Louis University 2016 Faculty/Staff Feedback Survey, conducted by Willis Towers Watson in April 2016. In addition to a quantitative assessment of responses to survey questions, a qualitative analysis of the comments from survey respondents is reported here. The Perceptions Committee of the Gender Equity Task Force utilized the Feedback Survey in order to address the following question:

What are the perceptions of gender equity as it relates to power and influence, privilege, compensation, career development, and work/life integration among the full time faculty at Saint Louis University?

- Of the 1468 full-time faculty, 863 responded to the Feedback Survey, including 440 men and 423 women, a 58.8% response rate.
- Responses to the fourteen GETF specific survey questions indicate that perceptions of university climate for women faculty are less favorable than for men in all areas assessed except in University image.
- Analysis of qualitative data supported the quantitative findings and resulted in the identification of four themes, each with associated sub-themes: Gender inequity; lack of transparency; policies and practices that disadvantage junior faculty; and lack of racial equity.

Based on the findings of the Feedback Survey, the Perceptions Committee, along with the membership of the full Gender Equity Task Force, developed a list of actionable recommendations to be implemented on a university-wide basis.
FOREWORD

This report was produced by the Perceptions Committee of the Saint Louis University Gender Equity Task Force (SLU GETF). This task force was formed at the request of the SLU Faculty Senate in Spring 2015. As noted in the Quantitative Committee Report, the SLU GETF received the following charge from Dr. Fred Pestello, University President:

a. To examine data in multiple areas of university activity such as climate, recruitment, hiring and appointment of faculty, workload distribution, allocation of leadership responsibilities, compensation and promotion to assess whether faculty are treated equitably and are not disadvantaged because of their gender;
b. To determine if there are areas of perceived gender inequity among the faculty with an awareness that gender may intersect with other issues and identities; and
c. To prepare a report on the findings and conclusions of the task force that will include a plan, with recommendations, to address any inappropriate gender differences.

The SLU GETF is composed of full-time faculty members who represent each of the schools and colleges within the University. The work of the SLU GETF was conducted through two committees, the Quantitative Committee and the Perceptions Committee. The goals of the Quantitative Committee were to provide quantitative evaluation of gender equity indicators among full-time faculty at Saint Louis University. The goal of the Perceptions Committee was to explore perceived differences among full-time faculty experience based on gender. This report is one of several products of the SLU GETF, the others being the Quantitative Committee Faculty Demographics Report and the Mercer Phase 2 Salary Equity Report.

This report describes the results of data collection and analysis by the Perceptions Committee, using quantitative and qualitative measures of perceptions of gender equity as it relates to power and influence, privilege, compensation, career development and work/life integration. Based on these findings, the Perceptions Committee offers a series of recommendations to be implemented on a university-wide basis.

The Perceptions Committee expresses its gratitude to Provost Nancy Brickhouse, and to Human Resources professionals Patty Haberberger and Patrick Maloney, for their collaboration on and support of this project. The Perceptions Committee also thanks Faculty Senate President Doug Williams for his ongoing guidance and support during this project.

The following members of the SLU GETF contributed to the writing of this report: Jenny Agnew, Ellen Barnidge, Rina Chittooran, Leslie Hinyard, Denise Hooks-Anderson, Amanda Izzo, Michelle Lewis, Darcy Scharff, Angela Sharkey, and Constance Wagner.
BACKGROUND

Perceptions Committee: The Perceptions Committee of the GETF was charged with exploring perceptions of the opportunities and challenges faced by female faculty at Saint Louis University. The group sought to determine best practices used by other universities striving to investigate perceived gender inequities, to adapt these practices to the culture of Saint Louis University, and to align its efforts to collect data about perceived gender inequity of the institutional climate with that of the university administration’s planned 2016 Faculty/Staff Feedback Survey (hereafter, referred to as the Feedback Survey).

As a sub-committee, the Perceptions Committee met regularly over the 21-month span of the Task Force’s work. Additional meetings were held to consult with Human Resources leadership and the Feedback Survey vendor, Willis Towers Watson (WTW). With an awareness that experiences of gender inequity intersect with other issues and identities, including race, ethnicity, and age, the committee identified the following areas of inquiry to target for data collection: recruitment, hiring, appointment; availability of mentoring; promotion in rank; compensation; allocation of research support, space, and equipment; workload distribution (teaching, advising, service); retention; leadership and administrative appointments (deans, department chairs, committee chairs); family-friendly policies (parental leave, on-campus child care).

In total, the work of the Perceptions Committee has been mapped onto two phases. Phase 1, oriented toward fact-finding, consisted of the formulation of appropriate means of investigation of perceptions of gender equity. After a thorough review of the literature, and assessment of best practices at other universities, and with input from committee members with expertise in qualitative research, it was determined that examination of the following key areas of faculty experience would effectively gauge perceptions:

- Privilege
- Power and Influence
- Discrimination
- Challenges of balancing work and family
- Tenure and Promotion
- Mentoring
- Compensation
- Work Environment.

METHODOLOGY

At its initial meeting, the Perceptions Committee of the Gender Equity Task Force established the goal of assessing the above areas of faculty experience through a faculty climate survey and faculty focus groups. The committee agreed that phase 1 of their efforts would be committed to this assessment. Phase 2 of the committee effort was targeted toward analyzing data, developing a report and formulating specific recommendations for actions to address the findings specific to
perceived differences between female and male faculty at the University.

Utilizing best practices from other universities, the committee identified validated survey tools used by comparable academic institutions; obtained consent for use of their survey instrument and brought forward to university administration a proposal for a full-time faculty climate survey. Simultaneous with the committee’s efforts, the university revisited a plan to conduct a climate/feedback survey among faculty and staff. The university administration had partnered with Willis Towers Watson (WTW) on its prior climate assessment in 2014 and planned to utilize this vendor’s services for the 2016 survey. The Perceptions committee scrutinized the content area and responses of the 2014 Saint Louis University Climate Survey noting that the prior survey did not incorporate questions targeting an assessment of perceptions of gender equity. Recognizing that the university goals for the Feedback survey differed from the goals of the Perceptions committee and yet recognizing the hazard of survey fatigue, the Perceptions committee agreed to collaborate with university administration and WTW to embed within the planned Feedback survey questions with a specific focus on assessing perceptions of gender equity. The Committee spent extensive time and effort adapting its goals to align with the capacities of WTW to administer the university’s Feedback Survey. We recommended to WTW the use of an adapted format for questions from their databank that best reflected the goals of the Task Force and the unique culture of the university. Through this collaboration, the Committee and WTW devised fourteen equity-related questions that were incorporated into the Feedback Survey, which was administered in April 2016 (Table 2). Survey respondents were also given the option to respond in an open-ended comments section following each survey question.

As noted above, the initial recommendation and intent of the Perceptions committee included faculty focus groups to further explore areas of particular sensitivity of perceived disparity. The university’s agreement with WTW included focus group meetings and therefore the committee anticipated receiving data from WTW on these sessions to complete our assessment. Information on the outcome of focus groups lead by WTW was not released to the committee and therefore fell short of this goal.

Feedback survey results were released to the committee in a limited manner, that is, the committee received data related to those questions specifically requested by the Perceptions committee of the GETF and to responses from full-time faculty members aggregated at the university level. No college or school-level data were made available to the Perceptions committee. The work of Phase 1 was completed upon the administration of the Feedback Survey in April 2016.

Phase 2 efforts of the committee’s work consisted of the review and analysis of qualitative and quantitative responses to the Feedback Survey and the formulation of recommendations for addressing perceived disparities in experiences of full-time female faculty at the University.

After review of the question-specific responses, the Committee requested access to all Comment sections. The Provost granted this access; however, no School- or College-level data were provided. Thus all data reported here are aggregate responses of a) full-time faculty completing the Feedback Survey questions specifically embedded by the Perceptions Committee or b) those
faculty who created a comment in response to any survey question.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

**Quantitative Analysis of Survey Responses**

The quantitative analysis of the survey questions was conducted by Willis Towers Watson and provided to the committee through an interactive spreadsheet. Descriptive statistics of the proportion of male and female faculty that responded “Favorable,” “?,” or “Unfavorable” to the equity questions embedded in the WTW Feedback Survey were provided to the Committee and are reported here. Inferential statistical analysis of comparisons of responses between male and female faculty were not conducted by WTW and, therefore, are not included in this report.

**Qualitative Analysis of Survey Comments**

Three committee members conducted the initial analysis by open coding all qualitative responses on the Feedback Survey. Four major themes, each with supporting comments, were identified and then further analyzed using focused coding to define sub-themes (see Attachment 1). A fourth committee member conducted constant comparative analysis to verify the integrity of each theme and sub-theme, meaning that each quotation assigned to a theme or sub-theme fit with its definition. Themes and sub-themes were grouped and summarized and were used for analysis (see Attachment 1). Finally, a fifth committee member independently validated the themes and sub-themes and examined the document for clarity and coherence (See Attachment 2).

**RESULTS**

**Quantitative Data Results**

At the time the 2016 Faculty/Staff Feedback Survey was administered, SLU faculty was comprised of 1468 full-time faculty: 819 male and 649 female. Of survey respondents, there were 440 males and 423 females, that is, 53.7% of male faculty and 65% of female faculty responded to the survey.

Table 1 presents the distribution of full-time faculty respondents to the Feedback Survey. There was a roughly even distribution of female and male faculty respondents (49% and 51%, respectively). More tenure track (TT; 55.7%) than non-tenure track (NTT; 44.3%) faculty responded to the survey. Figure 1 presents the distribution of faculty respondents by gender and tenure status. The proportion of respondents by gender and tenure status (in proportional order) are as follows: 30.98% TT male faculty, 24.18% NTT female faculty, 23.84% TT female faculty, and 18.95% NTT male faculty.
Table 2 presents the full results for each equity question embedded in the WTW Feedback Survey. Figure 2 presents the proportion of male and female faculty who provided unfavorable responses to each of the equity items in the survey. Data are presented as analyzed by WTW and statistical comparisons are not made between groups.

The responses were examined using the lower quartile (25%) of dissatisfaction. If 25% or more of the respondents indicated dissatisfaction, then the Perceptions Committee considered those items as “significant.” If 20% or more of the respondents indicated dissatisfaction, those responses were considered “approaching” dissatisfaction and were included as still warranting
attention. When examining the responses, the largest discrepancies in unfavorable responses between male and female faculty members were for satisfaction with involvement in decision-making (Q33), relationship between performance and compensation (Q46), equitable guidance and mentoring (Q48c), equitable distribution of leadership opportunities (Q48d), equitable distribution of workload/courses (Q48g), equitable distribution of service responsibilities (Q48h), and alterations in family planning (Q59). In all aforementioned instances, a higher proportion of women than men responded unfavorably to the item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Favorable Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>? Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Unfavorable Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q10—I believe that applicants for faculty positions in my department are evaluated without bias</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33—My department Leadership gives me recognition for a job well done.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33—I am satisfied with my involvement in decisions that affect my work.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42—My work schedule allows sufficient flexibility to meet my personal/family needs.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44—I think my performance on the job is evaluated fairly.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46—There is a clear relationship between performance and compensation in my department</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48a—In my department, the following are designated in an equitable manner: Research support</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48b—In my department, the following are designated in an equitable manner: Equipment</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48c—In my department, the following are designated in an equitable manner: Guidance and mentoring</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48d—In my department, the following are designated in an equitable manner: Leadership opportunities</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48e—In my department, the following are designated in an equitable manner: Promotion</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48f—In my department, the following are designated in an equitable manner: Tenure</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48g—In my department, the following are designated in an equitable manner: Workload/Courses</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48h—In my department, the following are designated in an equitable manner: Service responsibilities</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q59—I have altered my desired family plans due to the tenure clock. (N)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The unfavorable columns are those that disagreed with the statement, with the exception of Q59 where it represents people who agreed with the statement.

*The ? column are those who neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement.
Within questions specifically asking about equity or distribution of resources, respondents who answered “unfavorable” were given the opportunity to attribute the inequity to a checklist of factors. Table 3 presents the proportion of “unfavorable” respondents that checked gender, race, and/or ethnicity as an attribute responsible for their “unfavorable” response to the item. (Note: respondents were able to check more than one attribution on the checklist.) For every question in which respondents were allowed to indicate their belief of the source of their unfavorable response, proportionally more women than men indicated that gender was a factor in their perception of inequity. When further examined by stratifying gender by race and gender by tenure, the areas of “unfavorable” mentioned in Table 3 became even more pronounced.
Figure 3. Responses to sub-questions by gender.

*Percentage of unfavorable respondents who indicated gender was a determinant of their Unfavorable designation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C44</td>
<td>Due to Gender</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Ethnicity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Race</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C46</td>
<td>Due to Gender</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Ethnicity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Race</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C48</td>
<td>Due to Gender</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Ethnicity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Race</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C48b</td>
<td>Due to Gender</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Ethnicity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Race</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C48c</td>
<td>Due to Gender</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Ethnicity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Race</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C48d</td>
<td>Due to Gender</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Ethnicity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Race</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C48e</td>
<td>Due to Gender</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Ethnicity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Race</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C48f</td>
<td>Due to Gender</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Ethnicity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Race</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C48g</td>
<td>Due to Gender</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Ethnicity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Race</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C48h</td>
<td>Due to Gender</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Ethnicity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Race</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of unfavorable respondents who indicated the variable was a determinant of their unfavorable designation.
Qualitative Data Results

It is important to note that in almost every instance, qualitative responses on the Feedback Survey supported, clarified, and expanded on the major quantitative findings. The information that follows describes the four themes and associated sub-themes that emerged from the qualitative analysis of faculty comments on the Feedback Survey.

THEME ONE: GENDER INEQUITY

Four sub-themes related to gender inequity include hiring, promotion and retention; workload; compensation and benefits; and campus culture. In each of these categories, survey participants noted specifically that female faculty are treated differently than male faculty.

Hiring, Promotion, and Retention
Participants noted that the University needs to hire and promote women and minorities. Some feel there is an “inability to hire, promote and retain women and minorities.” The participants emphasized that female faculty are concentrated at the lower end of the academic hierarchy, and in some departments, there are very few female full professors, a perception that is supported by demographic data.

While in some departments, adjuncts are almost exclusively male, participants noted that women are overrepresented in non-tenure track positions, which often come with a greater teaching load and less pay. Feedback indicated that women are given fewer opportunities for promotion or are delayed in their progress toward tenure and promotion, and women of color often leave SLU before they go up for tenure. Mentorship and guidance to help women faculty navigate promotion and tenure is lacking, and it seems that in some schools (e.g., School of Law), women are negatively affected by a lack of information about promotion and tenure requirements.

Further, some respondents noted that in particular schools (e.g., Law), women have been fired more often than men.

Workload
Survey respondents expressed concern that women are assigned responsibilities in areas that are less valued. Some participants noted that female faculty have higher, less desirable teaching loads while other participants noted that female faculty often have higher service and/or administrative loads. Others perceived that women are more likely to be assigned “housekeeping” tasks and take on the bulk of committee work, and in some cases, are less likely to have the opportunity to chair committees.

A separate but related concern is the perception by participants that there is a lack of women and people of color in leadership positions. Some participants stated that women are not supported or encouraged to seek leadership positions and that University strategic initiatives have been led by men. One participant noted that because men hold most of the leadership positions, there is retaliation if women are vocal.
Compensation and Benefits
Survey respondents noted several areas of concern in regard to compensation and benefits. Respondents stated that there is a lack of equity in pay for men and women. The Mercer Phase 2 Study (reference Quantitative Committee Report) found that women in many departments make less than male colleagues at the same level. Further, there is a perception that women are either making less than men for the same amount of work or have to work harder for the same pay. In terms of benefits, participants perceive that spousal hires are more often granted to male rather than female prospects during the hiring process. Respondents noted that the administration does not appropriately manage work-life issues for women. For example, the University’s FMLA policy was described as not “very strong,” that it disadvantages female faculty, and is even worse for staff. Further, a lack of support services for faculty with young children, such as inadequate daycare options on campus, disproportionately affects female faculty. Some respondents feel that women’s jobs are less stable than men’s because women often are called upon to manage work-life issues.

Campus Culture
Survey respondents noted that sexism on campus contributes to a hostile or uncomfortable work environment for women. For example, a survey respondent noted that some male faculty members make objectifying, sometimes sexually explicit, comments to female faculty, staff, and students in regard to women’s appearance and the value of female students pursuing an “Mrs.” degree. Respondents stated that “women are treated with less respect than men.”

THEME TWO: LACK OF TRANSPARENCY

The lack of transparency was identified as a consistent theme in faculty perceptions, particularly as it related to administrator functioning. Within the larger category of transparency, two sub-themes arose: decision-making and inadequate communication. Faculty felt that the lack of transparency contributed to an environment that was marked by distrust, uncertainty and secrecy, that it did not promote shared governance, and that it set up barriers between faculty and administrators.

Decision-Making
Perceptions of lack of transparency varied, depending on the level of university administration. For example, faculty commented that they were generally satisfied with transparency in decision-making at the very highest levels of administration, but there was concern that senior leadership did not always share information about decision-making with mid- and lower-level administration. Further concerns had to do with limited transparency in decision-making at the unit level, with information and power residing in the hands of only a few individuals, and faculty often not being provided with information surrounding decisions that affected them.

Communication
While faculty voiced appreciation for transparency in communication among some mid-level leaders, there was widespread concern about the lack of clear and consistent messaging at the university. Faculty are calling for clarity regarding policies and procedures, particularly in the areas of human resources, finance, research funding, health care benefits, budgeting, and
THEME THREE: POLICIES AND PRACTICES THAT DISADVANTAGE JUNIOR FACULTY

Four sub-themes related to age and seniority emerged from the qualitative data: 1) a “good ol’ boy” network still exists, 2) there is a lack of understanding of junior faculty’s needs and priorities, 3) the negative impact of salary/compensation system on junior faculty, and 4) inadequate mentoring of junior faculty. We acknowledge that challenges faced by junior faculty are not restricted to female junior faculty members; however, given the perception that female faculty are concentrated at the rank of assistant professor we included these concerns in our report.

“Good Ol’ Boy” Network at SLU
According to participant feedback, there is a perception that the “good ol’ boy” network continues at SLU, beginning with the Board of Trustees. The network influences hiring practices and reward systems. The “old, unjust system of patronage” still exists; what we have now is just “a friendlier version of the old pattern.”

Lack of Understanding of Junior Faculty’s Needs and Priorities
Survey respondents perceive that senior administration does not understand the needs and priorities of junior faculty (e.g., related to research). Work-life responsibilities of younger faculty are not always considered, especially around tenure-clock issues. As a result, we continue to lose talented young faculty because the university--and its Board--do not understand the importance of resources, in terms of pay and research needs. One respondent noted, “If you want to attract and keep good people, you need to pay them more and on a level commensurate with the ‘top 100’ university you claim to be.” A culture of disrespect toward junior faculty and young staff continues to be acceptable. For example, the fact that reducing retirement benefits will hurt the young faculty more than it will senior faculty does not seem to have been considered.

Negative Impact of Salary/Compensation System on Junior Faculty
There is a belief that low pay and a limited rewards system disproportionately target junior faculty. Junior faculty struggle (with making plans, building programs, etc.) in the face of continuing shortages, cost-cutting, and reshuffling. Because the pay is so low relative to comparable universities, it is difficult to keep the best and brightest. Too many young, energetic faculty are expected to be involved in service activities (doing staff-level work) rather than focusing on teaching and research, which results in the “great ones leaving and the good ones not being successful.”

Inadequate Mentoring of Junior Faculty
Survey respondents indicated that SLU offers very limited mentoring for junior faculty. Mentoring is needed for professional growth, academic and research productivity, and tenure and promotion. One respondent suggested that the reason why the University is not able to retain women and people of color prior to being granted promotion and/or tenure is due to the lack of
mentorship coupled with the underlying expectation that they serve on more ancillary committees than their counterparts.

**THEME FOUR: LACK OF RACIAL EQUITY**

Of the respondents who provided additional feedback regarding their perceptions of inequities along the lines of race and skin color, the overwhelming majority focused on the need to devote more resources to the recruitment and retention of faculty of color. Specifically, two sub-themes were identified that centered around the financial resources, human capital, and infrastructure required to hire, retain and promote faculty from historically underrepresented groups. This would, in turn, promote increased diversity in the student population. While this section does not specifically focus on gender, it challenges us to consider how gender and race affect the way the institution influences opportunity and reward.

*Financial and Human Capital*
Some survey participants suggested that the University should have a funding source for the sole purpose of hiring faculty from historically underrepresented/marginalized populations. These identities included not only people of color, but individuals with disabilities, those from a cross-section of socio-economic backgrounds (including working-class), and members of the LGBTQI community. In one instance, a respondent suggested the creation of a capital campaign devoted to such purposes.

*Adequate Infrastructure and Leadership Support*
Nearly every comment stressed that having the support of the highest levels of University leadership is important to ensure the long-term success of any recruitment and retention efforts directed at increasing diversity.

A few respondents noted that the University’s current infrastructure is designed to adversely overburden the few faculty of color in the academy as they are frequently called upon to serve on various committees or assist with student mentoring, while trying to balance an inequitable workload that disadvantages junior faculty, people of color, women, and individuals who do not have children.

Another respondent suggested that the University create a way to incentivize departments that increase the diversity of their faculty by hiring more people of color.

**CONCLUSIONS**

An examination of the findings suggests that quantitative data collected through the Feedback Survey are supported by qualitative responses to survey items. Similarly, qualitative findings are reflected in the quantitative data that describe perceptions of gender equity at Saint Louis University. Female faculty report a less favorable perception of the environment at Saint Louis University in several areas related to gender equity. The only area assessed where full-time female faculty report a higher level of satisfaction than their male counterparts relates to
LIMITATIONS

Working with the rigid and limited survey models of WTW did not allow us to fully achieve our goals. The 2016 Feedback Survey was not designed to specifically assess the unique role and responsibilities of faculty at a university.

One Task Force member who participated in a WTW Focus Group stated that no questions were asked about gender. In that instance, the Task Force was limited by the sole administration of Focus Group questions by WTW. Moreover, the Focus Group was poorly attended (4 people out of 20-25 invitees) and included both faculty and staff members. Finally, as of May, 2017, WTW has not shared the results of the Focus Groups with the larger SLU community.

Efforts to further examine the experience of those at the intersection of gender and race, such as by stratifying responses as gender by race and gender by tenure, were limited by the small sample size. There were no survey responses from full-time female research faculty. Thus, no conclusions can be drawn about the perceptions of this group of faculty. Concerted effort should be made to better understand the perceptions of these faculty.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

Through the research efforts of this committee, additional questions have arisen; for example, how do the perceptions of female faculty members influence decisions to leave the university? Our charge was limited to an assessment of the environment for full time faculty. To date, we are not aware of a similar assessment of the perceptions of part-time women faculty.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Perceptions Committee recommends remedial action in the following areas of university activity:

1. **Institutional Structures and Best Practices**:

   At the level of senior institutional leadership, create a new position with responsibility, resources, and reporting structure to address the status of women.

   a. Establish a faculty gender equity specialist position in the Office of the Provost.

   b. Establish capacity to conduct future faculty climate surveys in the Office of the Provost. Efforts to assess the climate for women faculty should include assessment of part-time as well as full-time faculty perceptions, focus groups to explore areas of particular sensitivity, and collection and reporting of quantitative and qualitative data on equity issues. Importantly, based on the experience of the Perceptions Committee, the recurrent challenges in partnering with various vendors in an effort to achieve the goal of developing an effective tool to assess the perceptions of faculty and in analyzing the data
collected, it is our recommendation that the University develop internal organizational capacity to create, administer and analyze future and recurrent feedback/climate surveys.

c. Establish a permanent Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Women Faculty to monitor implementation of GETF recommendations and continue work on gender equity issues on campus.

d. Establish a point of contact for faculty gender equity issues such as an ombuds position.

e. Improve clarity and transparency in University-level communications regarding policies and procedures with particular attention to those that impact work-life integration such as FMLA.

f. Grant course releases to faculty engaged in current or future efforts similar to the work of the GETF to allow time and space to effectively engage in and complete these efforts.

g. In considering University processes and efficiencies, this committee recognizes the broader University efforts to focus on diversity and inclusion. However, the perception of committee members is that female faculty have not, to this point, been a focus of the University’s diversity and inclusion efforts.

2. **Compensation and Workload Inequities:**

a. Implement Mercer Report recommendations of GETF to address the gender pay gap. Repeat pay equity studies on an ongoing basis.

b. Implement workload policies at college/school/department level that ensure equitable distribution of service and teaching workload for female faculty and for faculty from underrepresented groups.

3. **Hiring and Promotion:**

a. Review and revise recruitment and hiring policies and practices to incorporate focus on diversity and eliminate disparities in hiring of women and minorities.

   i. Craft a fundable proposal (NSF ADVANCE or other) to support efforts to create standard search committee processes and to develop other family-friendly work policies.

b. Review and revise tenure and promotion policies and practices to ensure clear and transparent standards and uniform application.
c. Institute mentoring programs for all faculty seeking tenure and promotion. A systematic approach to mentoring by senior faculty who can serve as role models needs to be established. Mentoring is needed for professional growth, academic and research productivity, and tenure and promotion.

d. Pay particular attention to the risk of gender imbalance of workforce reductions among female-majority, non-tenure track faculty positions.

e. Monitor and report the influence of perceptions of gender inequity on faculty decisions to leave the University.

4. **Limited Leadership Opportunities for Women:**

a. Increase visibility of female faculty who have achieved tenure. Ensure that these faculty have access to opportunities to participate on and lead committees with access to power and influence.

b. Review and revise existing policies and practices and develop new and transparent standards, if needed, for appointment of committee chairs and administrative positions in all colleges/schools/departments.

c. Develop leadership training institute for female faculty.

5. **Sexism on Campus:**

a. Establish standard procedures for committees, including search committees, to mitigate the risk that women and minorities are disadvantaged or unheard, such as implicit bias training for all faculty and administrators on the issue of gender and race bias.

b. Establish gender equity as a norm on campus, such as by including gender equity in the language of governing documents such as the University strategic plan and mission statement.
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GENDER

Workload inequities
- Inequity in how work is assigned, evaluated and rewarded. Women have higher, less desirable teaching loads. The effort they put into preparation - which takes away from time for scholarship - is not rewarded or valued.
- Female faculty members tend to have higher service/administrative loads that are not valued, do not count toward tenure, and take away from scholarship.
- Women are more likely to be assigned “housekeeping” tasks and take on the bulk of committee work and in some cases, are less likely to have the opportunity to chair committees.
- Women’s pay and rewards system need to be made explicit.

Hiring and promotion differ for women and men
- Need to hire and promote women and minorities and give them opportunities for authority. Some feel there is an “inability to hire, promote and retain women and minorities.”
- Female faculty are concentrated at the lower end of the academic hierarchy. In some departments there are very few female full professors. Heavy service commitments which are more common for female faculty are not valued in the credit toward promotion and tenure.
- Women are given fewer opportunities for promotion or are delayed in their progress toward tenure and promotion. Women of color often leave SLU before they go up for tenure.
- Mentorship and guidance to help women through promotion and tenure is lacking and it seems there is a lack of information about promotion and tenure requirements that affect women in some schools (e.g., School of Law).
- In some departments, adjuncts are almost exclusively men. Meanwhile, others feel that women over represent non-tenure track positions which often comes with a greater teaching load and less pay.

Compensation differs for men and women; Existing structures advantage men.
- Women in many departments make less than male colleagues at the same level regardless of experience or work performance.
- During the job negotiation phase, spousal hires are more often granted to male prospects than female prospects.
- There is a lack of equity in pay for men and women.
- There is a perception that women are either making less than men for the same amount of work or have to work harder for the same pay.

Less job security for women
- Women’s jobs are less stable than those of men because of having to manage work-life
issues.

- The School of Law saw more women fired than men.

**Limited leadership opportunities for women**

- There is a lack of women and people of color in leadership positions. Women are not supported or encouraged to seek leadership positions. Leadership on strategic initiatives at the University have been led by men.
- Female faculty feel there is retaliation when women speak up because all the men are in leadership roles.

**Sexism on campus**

- Sexism on campus contributes to a hostile or uncomfortable work environment for women.
- Women are treated with less respect than men.
- Some male faculty members make objectifying comments to female faculty, staff, and students. For example, making comments about women’s appearance, commenting on the value of female students pursuing an “Mrs” degree, or making sexually explicit comments.

**Policies**

- FMLA policies are not very strong and disadvantage female faculty. The policy is even worse for staff.
- Lack of support services for faculty with young children, such as no day care center on campus, disproportionately affect female faculty.
- Administration does not appropriately manage work-life issues for women.

**TRANSPARENCY**

**Decision-making**

- Some expressed satisfaction with University-level transparency in decision-making but not at the unit level (e.g., with regard to faculty leaders who are selected without faculty consultation).
- Concern about decision-making at the unit level with a few individuals having access to information and decision-making power that affect all faculty in the unit.
- Mid- and lower-level leadership not always provided with information from senior administration about decisions that affect faculty in their units.
- Faculty not provided with information surrounding decisions that affect them.

**Communication**

- Clear and consistent messaging is needed; greater transparency is critical.
- Appreciation for some communication by leaders
- Communication of policy and procedures is poor. For example, there is concern about HR, Finance and ORDS policies lacking clear and transparent communication. There was also concern about transparent communication about health care benefits and rationale for compensation.
- Strong concern about making patient feedback about physician performance public - and, yet, not making feedback about leadership public. There is a double standard and concern about the detrimental nature of sharing feedback about physician performance out of context.
• Need more transparency about social issues or connection to neighboring communities.
• Employees are willing to work with limitations of the budget when they know what is available and how the budgeting process works. Need more transparent communication to be part of the budget conversation.
• Call for more transparency regarding social issues on campus (e.g., race-based incidents).
• Need better communication regarding university-wide initiatives (e.g., the Bain assessment).
• Pay and compensation structure not communicated clearly by leadership.
• SLUCare should be more transparent regarding how faculty workload translates to rewards and promotion.
• Need more information regarding availability of and access to resources.

Impact of Lack of Transparency
• Creates an environment of distrust and uncertainty.
• Results in secrecy at every level.
• Does not promote shared governance.
• Sets up barriers between faculty and administrators.

AGE (OLD VS. YOUNG)
A “good ol’ boy” network exists at SLU:
• The “good ol’ boy” regime continues at SLU, beginning with the Board of Trustees. It influences hiring practices and reward systems. It needs to change.
• The “old, unjust system of patronage” still exists; what we have now is just “a friendlier version of the old pattern.”
• The new administration has not been willing to change the culture. “Rather it seems ….to be the case of simply imposing a new paradigm despite objections, much in the same way that the old paradigm was imposed despite objections.”
• The new administration is holding faculty and staff accountable for the budget deficits, instead of the folks who actually made many of the decisions regarding finance; again, an example of the old regime not changing to make SLU a better place to work and study.

Lack of understanding of junior faculty’s needs and priorities:
• Senior administration does not understand the needs and priorities of junior faculty (e.g., around research).
• Reducing retirement benefits will hurt the young faculty more than it will senior faculty.
• Work-life responsibilities of younger faculty not always considered, especially around tenure-clock issues.
• We continue to lose good, young faculty because the university (and its Board) does not understand the importance of resources, in terms of pay and research needs. “If you want to attract and keep good people, you need to pay them more and on a level commensurate with the “top 100” university you claim to be.”
• Culture of disrespect to junior and young staff continues to be acceptable and even rewarded.

Impact of Salary/Compensation System
• Low pay and limited rewards system disproportionately targets young faculty.
• Young faculty struggle (with plans, building programs, etc.) in the face of continuing shortages, cost-cutting, and reshuffling.
Because the pay is so low relative to comparable universities, it is hard to keep the best and brightest. We have already lost some of our brightest young faculty and are likely to lose more.

Too many young, energetic faculty are expected to be involved in service activities (doing staff-level work) rather than focusing on teaching and research, which results in the great ones leaving and the good ones not being successful.

Need to Mentor Junior Faculty
- Very limited mentoring of junior faculty occurs.
- Junior faculty need to be mentored by senior faculty who can serve as role models for them.
- Mentoring is needed for professional growth, academic and research productivity, and tenure and promotion.

DIVERSITY
Diversity encompasses all kinds of differences
- Diversity of all kinds is important (e.g., race/ethnicity, socioeconomic, religious, disability)
- Include adjuncts, senior-level women, individuals with disabilities, members of LGBTQ community, those from working-class backgrounds (in additional to traditionally under-represented groups such as Hispanics, Native Americans and African-Americans).
- We need to reflect the diversity of St. Louis, the surrounding community, and the US.
- Hiring diverse faculty needs to be made a priority.
- Allow open dialogue around minority opinions.
- Include diverse voices in curriculum and course offerings.
- Disproportionate number of white males in positions of leadership and/or power.

Increase recruitment and retention efforts for faculty of color
- Must garner support and commitment from top levels of administration.
- Dedicated financial resources are needed to bolster recruitment efforts.
- Incentivize departments to increase the diversity of their faculty.
- More attention given to salaries and higher salaries may help attract diverse faculty.
- It is not enough to hire faculty of color, we also need to create a climate that supports a diverse workforce.
- Develop more opportunities for female faculty of color to be mentored.
- Appoint faculty of color to leadership positions.
- Many staff and maintenance positions at SLU are filled by people of color; most faculty positions are not.

Increasing diversity of faculty will promote diversity and inclusion among students
- Hiring faculty of color will result in a more diverse student body
- Greater faculty diversity results in students of color feeling less marginalized.

Recognize and reduce bias and discrimination
- Race-based discrimination occurs around hiring practices
- Race-based and ESL-based discrimination is evident in hiring, evaluation, and tenure and promotion decisions
- Provide university-wide training on issues of diversity and cultural competence.
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The following material comes from the comments section of the 2016 Feedback Survey. The sections below replicate the sections from the survey; some comments have been moved to better fit within categories (e.g., comments made in the “Equity and Fairness” section about compensation have been moved to “Pay and Rewards”). Spelling/grammatical errors have not been corrected since these are direct quotations from respondents. What is included below is a representative sample of respondents’ comments.

Civility

- There needs to be some improvement in the climate for women at SLU. Over the years I have seen the mediocre climate for women manifested in a number of ways including comments by male faculty members about the physical appearance of female faculty members (within earshot or made directly to other female faculty members), dialogues by male faculty members with female undergraduate and graduate students about the value of pursuing an "MRS" degree and the general substandard nature of work completed by women relative to that completed by men, use of offensive/inappropriate language by male faculty members in work settings with mixed company (e.g., references to oral sex acts performed by women on men), and unwillingness for women to participate in a serious way in discussions about work issues (e.g., in faculty meetings). There is a general lack of awareness/sensitivity about how these types of actions generate an unfriendly work environment for women.
- Bullying of non-tenure track and adjunct faculty in terms of work load and teaching opportunities; also gender bias.

Diversity

- Bad on all counts. Too little diversity in hiring with respect to race and ethnicity, less so with gender (which has improved somewhat). Stratification of jobs by race and ethnicity and class. Administrators are mostly white, middle-to--upper class women and men, usually not first-generation college students. Faculty are mostly white, middle-to--upper class women and men, usually not first-generation college students. Lower-level staff are working-class women, some men, sometimes seeking a college education, but paid and treated badly. The Latinos on campus are mostly the groundskeepers, and the Blacks on campus are mostly cleaning the buildings. One day on campus can show how little actual progress has been made.
- Lack of diversity among faculty is an obvious problem - few African Americans (and many report feeling unwelcome), few senior women, etc. I think historically the university has been much less welcoming than it is today, and that equitable policies (family leave, flexibility) are not strong at the university, particularly with regards to maternity leave.
- Getting faculty closer to even 25th percentile pay will help morale and may, eventually,
help us attract a more diverse faculty. We are "a bunch of white women" and will stay that way if salaries don't budge. St. Louis itself often does not attract potential faculty members (no ocean, no mountains, etc.) and adding in a salary that is less than what most folks made right after graduation, does not help. We could increase staff diversity with better staff salaries as well. An example is someone who has been at SLU for 12-15 years with no performance issues and a bachelor degree and still making ~35K. There are few places to "move up" as a staff member (nothing in this building) so some move out instead.

- It is ESSENTIAL that we cease this insiders/old boy network approach to hiring. I am appalled at the hiring practices of my department, which center on hiring our own, as opposed to seeking the best scholars from leading institutions around the country.

**Equity and Fairness**

- There seems to be a tendency for the women to do the majority of the work while the men choose to help only for maximum exposure. This is not a blanket statement of all male faculty, but it seems to be a theme that repeats itself. In my experience, men and women in similar jobs are not treated equally. Men repeatedly have more resources, more opportunities for leadership, and are treated with more respect than women. Women are given heavier, less desirable teaching loads. While there is an acknowledgement on the part of leadership that this should not be, in practice, this is what happens.

- Too often, it is women faculty members who do the great majority of the service work at the university without receiving clear rewards, especially in the form of credit toward promotion and salary increases.

- Women faculty members are concentrated at the lower end of the academic hierarchy (like at most universities). The university needs to put more effort and resources into making sure that they are promoted at the same rate as are men. One of the problems has to do with the service load, which tends to fall much more heavily on women's shoulders at SLU, and which then takes time away from research. Another problem is the lack of support services for younger faculty members with families (e.g., on-campus daycare, or daycare subsidies), which again tends to disadvantage women more than men. The university also needs to have a more flexible tenure clock for parents of young children or those caring for elderly relatives (again, with women more often shouldering the burden).

- When people are called in to make something out of nothing, we are working way, way beyond what is reasonable. We are so understaffed we can barely keep the ship afloat despite tremendous effort. We think about work load in terms of numbers of classes taught, but service could be multiple full-time jobs. We just don't have the people to do it. As a result, there are some people who are shouldering enormous burdens way outside their pay grades--often junior faculty, underpaid staff, people of color, women, people who don't have children (because everyone assumes they are simply available to do even more work).

- There are significant issues of equity and fairness in how work is assigned, evaluated and rewarded. In terms of gender, these issues are both obvious (ex. different in pay at similar level, more awards and rewards for male faculty) and unstated (ex. different expectations for female and male faculty in terms of service, female faculty scholarship receiving less attention). There are also unresolved issues of status among different groups of faculty.
Some feel that the good old boys system returned during turbulence in law school leadership. There is hope that it can change going forward.

- I believe that inequities occur in many instances because women faculty members are assigned or, by default, take responsibility for time-consuming administrative work which is critical to the work unit, but which is undervalued, especially in comparison to research and scholarship.

- There is a huge problem with equity across the university faculty. Women are much more likely to be represented in non-tenure track positions and there are very few female full professors in either tenured or non-tenured positions. There is a perception of unequitable distribution of workload whereby female faculty are given more courses to teach, are asked to prep new courses more often, and perform more of the service functions than their male counterparts. Additionally, even when men are on committees

- In my opinion, SLU needs to consider more what its mission means at home. There is a lot of talk about being "men and women for others," while our faculty are given little more than the legally required minimum of family leave (for parenting, family illness, etc.), the staff are given even less, and the staff are paid so poorly that many must take on additional part-time jobs. Adjuncts are being discouraged from unionizing and receive extremely low compensation for their education, labor, and contribution. And our tuition is high and our student body lacking racial and economic diversity. I am disappointed in the way we talk about ourselves as "helping the St. Louis community" when we don't seem to be able to model a community that cares for its members. It feels deeply hypocritical.

- It is important that male faculty are asked to take on extra roles in departments, ie. the "housekeeping" type work of academia and not just the female faculty. It is important that directors and program chairs develop more awareness is how they differentially treat male and female faculty in communication style.

- Although the university supposedly values and expects research, teaching, and service, only research accomplishments seem to be considered when it comes to financial compensation. High levels of service activities, without which the university could not function, seem to be completed disproportionately by female faculty members. However, these activities reduce research productivity and are not valued when it comes to raises or promotion.

- There still is a good old boy network that rewards them at the expense of others.

- Teaching responsibilities fall disproportionately on women, who tend to take them seriously and spend time on them. This is not taken into consideration in the tenure and promotion process. Because women value their role as teachers, they may not have sufficient time to pursue scholarship. This works to their disadvantage because good teaching is not valued or rewarded.

- Women are not given adequate guidance and mentoring for tenure and promotion in the School of Law. This disadvantages them in the tenure and promotion process because they are not given adequate and accurate information about what is required for tenure and promotion, much less encouragement and support. In some cases, they are given misinformation or are told the requirements have changed suddenly and without prior notice. In some cases, women have sought mentoring for tenure and promotion purposes and been told it is not available.

25
Pay and Rewards

- Faculty in my department make way less than our peers at sister-universities. Pay inequity is also based on gender, as women in the department make less than make equals.
- I have expressed concerns about pay equity, particularly differences between men and women, in my department. I do not believe this issue is being adequately addressed.
- Women are paid less than men, and treated with less respect.
- Compensation is unfair across gender (Gender Gap). Benefits are unjust for those within the LGBT (adoption, spousal healthcare). Pay is generally low and uncompetitive at SLU. Pay is unevenly distributed across departments. Junior faculty in other departments make 20k more than I do. Why is this?
- We need equitable pay for men and women. We need equitable compensation for faculty across the board. We will continue to lose faculty if our salaries are not rectified to be in line with our peer institutions.
- Women are making less for doing the same amount of work. This is based upon conversations I’ve had at my own school and with faculty in other areas of the university.
- Female professors are paid lower salaries than their male colleagues, even when they outperform the men.
- There is a huge gender bias in terms of pay, at least in my workgroup and Department. The women are paid far, far less than their male counterparts. This is very well known, because we all see each other's salaries when we submit a grant with our colleagues. Plus, the meager 3% merit-based raises are insufficient for truly rewarding performance. The differences in pay raises for those who are very high performers and those who are low performers are so minimal as to be insulting. Obviously, faculty must be internally motivated to be a high performer at SLU, because there is certainly no external reward system for performance except the positive feedback given during the performance review process (which is nice, but still leaves me making thousands less than the lower ranked male faculty in my Department).
- The mercer study is known to exist and exhibited low pay conditions for faculty. This study has not been shared or addressed. There is no transparency here, why do the study if it will not be shared?
- I found out this year that I am paid 10% less than the (male) colleague I co-teach with. We have similar CV’s: similar number of papers and teaching evaluations, though I have had more grant funding and heavier teaching loads than he has. I have been here two years longer than he has. So why am I paid 10% less? For that matter, why are women here paid 10% less at every level, according to the AAUP compensation survey? Put your money where your mouth is, SLU: either you believe in social justice (and equitable pay) or you don’t. I find it really hard to want to continue to work here as a young, poor faculty member. I still have substantial student debt from my own degrees at SLU, and yet I have to pay out of pocket to park my car, can’t find affordable quality day-care near my work, have health benefit cost increases/dropped spouses, and only receive 6 weeks of maternity leave (when courses are a semester long anyway, and it would benefit us all to just have the class covered for the entire semester by someone else). We are a large organization in a city with large organizations that have great benefits. Let’s work on this.
- It is a widespread belief among faculty employees in my sector of the University that
there are rampant gender inequities in compensation between men and women. While we do not have access to numbers, and this widespread impression comes from non-systematic comparison of individual pay packets via informal peer-to-peer conversations, many would like a full disclosure of numbers documenting any gender gaps in compensation at the University, as well as action to rectify it.

- Pay equity is crucial, both in terms of peer institutions and gender / race equity. Noting when pay freeze restrictions have led to a faculty member's promotion to associate or full meaning a much smaller bump in terms of pay grade, and also how that smaller promotion pay raise affects percentage-based merit raises over time. For many faculty members, a complete lack of transparency around pay grades means that a substantial gender pay gap remains invisible.

Shared Governance

- While SLU does not collect statistics on retention and promotion by gender, it seems as though we lose many women, especially women of color, before tenure. My observations suggest both that these faculty may not be well mentored and that they perform more committee service than their male colleagues. I think the career development of individual faculty should be designed to help with this. The comment above relates to diversity. Inability to hire, retain, and promote women and minorities to full professor. Faculty are not empowered academically, by which I mean that their academic expertise is not valued in the administration's decision processes. A prime example is the gradual diminution of strategic planning initiatives that emerged from the TWGs to the point that priorities ultimately were decided by the President's Advisory Council, a body made up of about 50% administrators and also that had relationship to the initial strategic planning process On Leadership, because of examples like the one above (strategic planning process), it seems that senior leadership has little respect for academic expertise at the local level and little understanding that the university's value is plural expertise. The administration's disinterest in local academic expertise is compounded by the hierarchical, undemocratic structure of the Faculty Senate. The Executive Committee appoints all committee chairs; all committees report to the EC which decides what to tell the Senate; the EC often resists opportunities for other faculty groups to speak, which the EC seems to review as threats to its power. This perspective on the part of the Senate EC interferes with the Senate's ability to get input from, and reflect, the views of its plural constituents.