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SUMMARY

This report summarizes the work conducted by the Saint Louis University Faculty Senate Gender Equity Task Force pursuant to a charge delivered to us by SLU President Fred Pestello. Our work commenced in the summer of 2014 and concluded in May 2017.

In this report, we document the history and background of the Gender Equity Task Force, its work program and the results of its research, and its recommendations to the Faculty Senate and to the SLU administration for addressing issues facing full-time women faculty at Saint Louis University. We also set forth some unanswered questions regarding the status of full-time women faculty at Saint Louis University that could not be addressed by the Gender Equity Task Force, but that should be investigated in the future. We also set forth some information gathered by the Gender Equity Task Force on best practices that should be adopted by Saint Louis University in order to promote a more favorable environment for women faculty.

This report summarizes the conclusions of three separate research studies conducted by the Gender Equity Task Force, which are attached as Appendices. These conclusions include the following:

From Report #1 (attached as Appendix I):

• There are more men than women in full-time faculty positions at Saint Louis University. It should be noted that this gender imbalance stands in stark contrast to the gender composition of the SLU student population. While 44% of full-time faculty members are female, 60% of students are female.

• Women are more likely than men to be represented in non-tenure track faculty positions.

• Men are more likely to be full professors than women.

• These findings indicate that fewer women than men are represented in the ranks of full-time faculty members at SLU. Those women who are employed as full-time faculty members at SLU are clustered in lower status jobs, often with lower pay and less job security.

From Report #2 (attached as Appendix II):

• Female gender is negatively associated with pay for both SLUCare and Non-SLUCare full-time faculty members.

• Female faculty members are paid less than male faculty members at the same rank and with the same tenure status in 10 out of the 11 academic units at SLU that were included in the study.
Female full-time faculty members are paid less than male full-time faculty members at the same rank and with the same tenure status in 15 out of the 16 job categories at SLU for which data were compared.

These findings indicate that there is a pervasive gender pay gap at SLU.

From Report #3 (attached as Appendix III):

Female faculty members report a less favorable perception than male faculty members of the environment at Saint Louis University in several areas related to gender equity.

These areas of dissatisfaction include:

- involvement in decision-making,
- relationship between performance and compensation,
- equitable guidance and mentoring,
- equitable distribution of leadership opportunities,
- equitable distribution of workload/courses,
- equitable distribution of service responsibilities, and
- alterations in family planning.

The only area assessed where full-time female faculty members report a higher level of satisfaction than their male counterparts relates to university image.

These findings indicate that female faculty members are more likely than male faculty members to perceive a lack of equity in several important areas of their employment and they identify gender as the cause of the inequity.

Our investigation of the status of full-time women faculty members at SLU suggests that faculty gender equity is not a norm at SLU. The problems experienced by women faculty members have never been systematically explored up until now, nor have such problems been publicly acknowledged and addressed at any level within the university or any of its academic units. There is much work that can, and should, be done to remedy the problems that we have identified.

It is the conclusion of the GETF that full-time women faculty members at SLU are hindered in their ability to achieve their highest potential due to the problems identified in our three prior reports, which problems appear to be pervasive and systemic. It is also the conclusion of the GETF that there has been a failure historically to acknowledge and address such issues, which may be due to the lack of attention paid to gender equity at SLU, including the lack of a commitment to gender equity as a goal of the university and the lack of an infrastructure that could assist in achieving that goal. Finally, it is also the conclusion of the GETF that the problems experienced by full-time women faculty members are the product of policies and practices that operate to create and perpetuate gender inequity.
This report sets forth recommendations for specific, actionable steps that can, and should, be taken to improve the status of women faculty at SLU. Such recommendations are informed by our research studies, the conclusions that we have drawn from such research studies, and best practices for achieving gender equity that have been used at other universities and that have been documented in the academic literature. Briefly stated, these action steps include the following:

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

2. Establish a permanent joint Faculty Senate/Provost Committee on the Status of Women.

3. Acknowledge, and develop a plan to address, the SLU full-time faculty gender pay gap.

4. Create, review, and revise policies and practices to ensure equitable treatment for women faculty members.

5. Establish faculty gender equity as a norm on campus by adopting it as a goal of the university.

The members of the Saint Louis University Faculty Senate Gender Equity Task Force have worked since 2014: (1) to develop a structure and process that would enable us to fulfill our charge, (2) to engage in fact-finding directed at identifying factors that operate to disadvantage full-time women faculty members in their employment at SLU, and (3) to develop a series of actionable recommendations to address the problems facing women faculty in achieving their highest potential and advancing in their careers. Our work is now at an end. We have fulfilled our charge to the extent possible.

While we believe that our work has contributed to improving the status of women faculty at SLU, we emphasize that much important work still lies ahead. Additional steps need to be taken (1) to implement the Task Force recommendations and (2) to monitor such implementation on a regular basis. Additional issues that we could not address through the Task Force should remain on the agenda for future investigation.

We call on the Faculty Senate and the entire SLU faculty to take up this issue and to continue to work to improve the status of women faculty members at this institution in the years ahead. We trust that you will do so.
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I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND OF GENDER EQUITY TASK FORCE

Formation of Task Force

The Saint Louis University (SLU) Faculty Senate Gender Equity Task Force (GETF) was initiated at the suggestion of Dr. Jane W. Turner in July 2014 during her tenure as President of the Faculty Senate. Dr. Turner proposed the formation of a task force to Dr. Ellen Harshman, who was then serving as interim Provost. She also requested Dr. Fred Pestello, SLU President, to deliver a charge to the task force to investigate the status of women faculty members at the university. Both Dr. Harshman and Dr. Pestello were supportive of such a task force. Dr. Turner also requested Professor Constance Wagner of the School of Law to serve as chair of the GETF.

From July 2014 to May 2015, preparatory work was conducted. Professor Wagner proposed a structure and process for the GETF based on research she conducted on gender equity task forces at other universities. She also researched the academic literature on best practices for achieving gender equity for university faculty. Dr. Turner and Dr. Harshman requested deans and faculty assembly leaders of the various colleges and schools to nominate faculty members to serve on the GETF with the goal of appointing a representative to the GETF from each such college and school. By May 2015, the members of the GETF had been selected and invited to join. Dr. Turner requested Dr. Angela Sharkey of the School of Medicine to serve as co-chair of the GETF.

Task Force Members

The GETF is composed of full-time faculty members who represent each of the schools and colleges within the University, including tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, as well as assistant, associate, and full professors. Some members of the GETF also hold administrative positions as department chairs or program directors or coordinators in addition to their faculty positions. One of the members is an administrator who represents the Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity. The members of the GETF, and the academic unit that each represents, are as follows:

- Jenny Agnew, Assistant Professor, School for Professional Studies
- Hadi Alhorr, Associate Professor, John Cook School of Business
- Ellen Barmidge, Associate Professor, College for Public Health and Social Justice
- Bidisha Chakrabarty, Professor of Finance, John Cook School of Business
- Mary (Rina) M. Chittooran, Associate Professor, School of Education
- Omolara Fyle-Thorpe, Associate Professor, School of Nursing
- Mary Susan (Sue) Heaney, Professor of Pediatrics, School of Medicine
- Leslie Hinyard, Associate Professor of SLUCOR, Center for Health Outcomes Research
- Denise Hooks-Anderson, Assistant Professor, School of Medicine
- Rebecca Hyde, Associate Professor and Research Librarian, University Libraries
• Amanda Izzo, Assistant Professor of Women’s and Gender Studies, College of Arts and Sciences
• Donald Jacobs, Professor of Surgery, School of Medicine
• Michelle Lewis, Director, Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity
• Allison Miller, Associate Professor of Biology, College of Arts and Sciences
• Michelle Sabick, Dean and Professor of Engineering, Parks School of Engineering, Aviation, and Technology
• Gretchen Salsich, Professor of Physical Therapy, Doisy College of Health Sciences
• Darcy Scharff, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Associate Professor of Behavioral Science and Health Education, College for Public Health and Social Justice
• Angela Sharkey, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Professional Development, Professor of Pediatrics, School of Medicine (GETF Co-Chair)
• Travis Threats, Professor of Communication Sciences & Disorders, College of Arts and Sciences
• Constance Wagner, Associate Professor of Law, School of Law, Associate Professor of Women’s and Gender Studies (GETF Co-Chair)
• Kristin Wilson, Associate Professor, College for Public Health and Social Justice

Task Force Meetings

The first meeting of the GETF was held on May 18, 2015. At this initial meeting the following actions were taken: introduction of members and GETF co-chairs, discussion of definition of gender equity, discussion of task force charge, discussion of committee structure and selection of committee assignment by members, adoption of GETF work project time line.

After this first meeting, President Fred Pestello sent letters of appointment to each member of the GETF. He also delivered the following charge to the GETF:

1. 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;

2. 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

3. 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.

After the initial meeting of the GETF, much of the work of the SLU GETF was conducted through two committees, the Quantitative Committee and the Perceptions Committee. The goal of the Quantitative Committee was 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. Further detail on the work of each of these Committees is contained in Section II of this report.
The GETF met as a group on five subsequent occasions to discuss the research projects that were being conducted by the Quantitative Committee and the Perceptions Committee. The purpose of these meetings was to inform GETF members of the ongoing work program, to discuss important issues relating to such work program, and to formulate recommendations based on the results of the research being conducted. The dates of, and actions taken at, each of these meetings are as follows:

Meeting #2 - August 24, 2015: Introduction and remarks of new SLU Provost Dr. Nancy Brickhouse, update on progress of Quantitative Committee and Perceptions Committee work projects, report by Ms. Stacey Barfield Harrington, Assistant Provost, on the methodology and status of the Mercer salary studies to be conducted for the university (market comparison and equity analysis)

Meeting #3 - December 17, 2015: Presentation of interim report on GETF activities shared with the Faculty Senate on December 1, 2015 (including preliminary recommendations), report on activities of Quantitative Committee (including formulation of research questions, availability of data to support research questions, preliminary descriptive analysis of data on gender distribution of faculty, update on the Mercer Phase 2 gender pay equity study), report on activities of Perceptions Committee (including identification of key areas of concern, formulation of climate survey questions, coordination with Human Resources and Towers Watson, need for additional information gathering techniques such as use of focus groups), discussion of best practices research project of the GETF

Meeting #4 - May 17, 2016: Presentation on achieving gender equity for university faculty by Professor Adrienne Davis, Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement and Institutional Diversity at Washington University in Saint Louis, Presentation of report on GETF activities shared with the Faculty Senate on May 10, 2016, report on activities of Quantitative Committee (including presentation of descriptive analysis of data on gender distribution of faculty), report on activities of Perceptions Committee, report on updates and reorganization of GETF website, including expansion of the best efforts research library

Meeting #5 - September 28, 2016: discussion of plans for a final GETF report to the Faculty Senate, report on activities of Quantitative Committee (including presentation of findings of Mercer Phase 2 gender pay equity analysis), report on activities of Perceptions Committee (including gender equity questions included in Faculty/Staff Feedback Survey administered by Willis Towers Watson through Human Resources and availability of data), breakout groups for discussion of questions surrounding explanations for the findings of Report #1 and Report #2 issued by the Quantitative Committee

Meeting #6 - April 10, 2017: Remarks of Provost Brickhouse on the status of women faculty at SLU, breakout groups for discussion of recommendations to be included in final GETF report to
Faculty Senate, structure of permanent committee on the status of women, and additional areas for future research, formulation of recommendations for final report

In addition to these meetings, members of the GETF were given additional periodic updates from the GETF co-chairs via email and also were given opportunities to comment on the reports of the GETF that were being prepared and that were circulated to the members for review.

Reporting to University Constituencies

Dr. Turner was succeeded by Professor Douglas Williams as Faculty Senate President in May 2015 and Interim Provost Ellen Harshman was succeeded by Provost Nancy Brickhouse in the Fall of 2015. The GETF co-chairs met periodically with Professor Williams and Provost Brickhouse during the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 academic years to update them on the research projects of the GETF and to seek their advice on the work program being conducted. Provost Brickhouse also attended several GETF meetings and participated in the discussion.

The GETF co-chairs and the Quantitative Committee co-chairs gave three presentations to the Faculty Senate on the GETF research projects and the GETF recommendations as follows:

• May 10, 2016: Report #1

• February 21, 2017: Report #2

• May 16, 2017: Report #3 and Gender Equity Task Force Recommendations

In addition, they presented Report #1 to the Council of Academic Deans and Directors on April 19, 2016.

The GETF co-chairs gave three interim updates to the Faculty Senate on the status of the GETF work program on December 1, 2015, May 10, 2016, and September 26, 2016.

The GETF co-chairs presented a summary of the three research projects completed by the GETF and the GETF recommendations as follows:

• May 2, 2017: President Pestello and Cabinet

• May 4, 2017: Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee

• May 1, 2017: Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Mid-Career Faculty Development Task Force

Professor Wagner also presented a summary of the three research projects completed by the GETF and the GETF recommendations to the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies, College of Arts and Sciences, at a public forum on April 26, 2017.
II. COMMITTEES, THEIR RESEARCH PROGRAMS, AND RESULTS OF RESEARCH

The research conducted by the Gender Equity Task Force was accomplished through the use of two committees: the Quantitative Committee and the Perceptions Committee.

This section contains a description of the work of each of these two committees, including committee goals, committee members, formulation of research questions, committee project timeline, results of research, and recommendations.

A. QUANTITATIVE COMMITTEE

Committee Goals: The goal of the Quantitative Committee (QC) of the Gender Equity Task Force (GETF) was to provide a quantitative evaluation of gender equity among full-time faculty at Saint Louis University (SLU). President Pestello charged the Task Force to “examine data in multiple areas of university activity such as climate, recruitment, hiring and appointment of faculty, workload distribution, allocation of leadership opportunities, compensation, and promotion…”: Under this broad umbrella, the GETF QC sought:

- To formulate questions related to gender equity that could be addressed using quantitative data,
- To assemble or collect the data needed to address those questions, and
- To analyze data and generate a summary report.

Committee Members: The GETF QC was co-chaired by Leslie Hinyard and Allison Miller. Members of the QC included:

- Bidisha Chakrabarty, Professor of Finance, John Cook School of Business
- Mary Susan (Sue) Heaney, Professor of Pediatrics, School of Medicine
- Leslie Hinyard, Associate Professor of SLUCOR, Center for Health Outcomes Research
- Rebecca Hyde, Associate Professor and Research Librarian, University Libraries
- Donald Jacobs, Professor of Surgery, School of Medicine
- Allison Miller, Associate Professor of Biology, College of Arts and Sciences
- Michelle Sabick, Professor of Engineering, Parks School of Engineering, Aviation, and Technology
- Gretchen Salsich, Professor of Physical Therapy, Doisy College of Health Sciences
- Travis Threats, Professor of Communication Sciences & Disorders, College of Arts and Sciences
- Constance Wagner, Associate Professor of Law, School of Law, Associate Professor of Women’s and Gender Studies
- Angela Sharkey, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Professional Development, Professor of Pediatrics, School of Medicine

Committee Research Questions: The first step in the quantitative assessment of gender equity was the identification of specific research questions. The GETF QC met during the spring and
summer of 2015 to discuss research questions and to consider how to obtain data to address them. Ultimately, the GETF QC identified the following six research questions related to gender equity that addressed the charge given by President Pestello.

**Question 1: What is the gender distribution of full-time faculty positions at SLU?**
A. What is the gender distribution of full-time faculty by college/school/center and by department?
B. What is the gender distribution of full-time faculty in terms of Assistant/Associate/Full Professor positions, in both tenure track/tenured positions and non-tenure track positions?
C. What is the gender distribution of full-time faculty in leadership positions?
D. What is the gender distribution of faculty in administrative positions (defined as those positions with administrative stipends)?
E. What is the gender distribution of faculty in administrative positions without official administrative stipends (as defined by department/program)?

**Question 2: Is there a gender disparity in the hiring practices of full-time faculty at SLU?**
A. Are there gender differences in the number of applicants for faculty positions?
B. Are men more likely to be hired than women when applicant pool is similar?
C. Is there a difference in rank between men and women at time of hire?
D. Is there a difference in salary between men and women at time of hire?
E. What is the distribution of men and women serving as chairs of search committees?
F. What is the distribution of men and women in terms of the composition of search committees?

**Question 3: Is there a difference in current base salary between men and women full-time faculty at SLU this year and in the past two years?**
A. Is there a difference in current base salary between men and women employed at SLU this year and in the past two years?
B. Does a difference persist after adjusting for rank and salary at hire?
C. Does the difference persist after adjusting for research productivity (for those who are engaged in research; productivity is defined by number of publications per year, internal/external awards, journal editorial boards, etc.)

**Question 4: Is there a gender difference in research resource allocation among full-time faculty at SLU with research components in their jobs?**
A. Is there a difference in resource allocation at time of hire (start-up funds, space allotment)?
B. Is there a difference in current resource allocation (annual research funds, lab space, conference travel, paper submission funds, graduate support lines for research assistantships)?
**Question 5:** Is there a gender difference in workload (teaching, research, service) among full-time faculty at SLU?

A. Is there a difference in number of courses taught?
B. Is there a difference in number of students taught?
C. Is there a difference in number of students mentored/advised?
D. Is there a difference in number of thesis/dissertation committees?
E. Is there a difference in distribution of graduate teaching assistantships?
F. Is there a difference in clinical workload:
   - Is there a difference in amount of scheduled clinic time?
   - Is there a difference in number of students taught?
G. Is there a difference in research workload (measured by productivity including proposals submitted, grants funded, manuscripts/books published, conference presentation, etc.)?
H. Is there a difference in service workload (measured by committee service/leadership at SLU and in the academic community)?

**Question 6:** Is there a gender difference among full-time faculty at SLU in the desire and perceived ability to take parental leave or receive other work-related accommodation upon the birth or adoption of a child or for eldercare?

A. Do men and women have the same opportunities to take leave associated with the birth or adoption of a child or for eldercare?
B. Is there a difference in the number of men and women who choose to take leave associated with the birth or adoption of a child or for eldercare?
C. Is there a difference among men and women in the amount of time taken for parental leave?
D. Is there a difference among men and women in the use of FMLA associated with parental leave?
E. Is/was there a cost associated with taking parental leave (time to promotion, salary differences, etc.)?
F. Is there a perception of negative consequences associated with taking parental leave?
G. Do men and women have the same option to “stop the clock” associated with the birth or adoption of a child?
H. Is there a difference among men and women in “stopping the clock” for tenure?
I. Is the decision to “stop the clock” made by the faculty member or is it made by the department? Is there a perception (or actual) negative consequences associated with “stopping the clock”?

**Committee Project Timeline:**

- July 13, 2015: Meeting with Stacy Barfield-Harrington, Michael Lewis, Steve Sanchez (Office of the Provost)
- July 22, 2015: Meeting of full Quantitative Committee
- August 14, 2015: Meeting of data working group, part of Quantitative Committee
- August 24, 2015: Gender Pay Equity Study Kick-Off (Mercer Phase 2)
- September 14, 2015: meeting with Stacey Barfield Harrington and Michael Lewis regarding data pull
September 23, 2015: Mercer project team meeting
October 27, 2015: Meeting with Mercer representatives regarding Mercer Phase 2
November 6, 2015: Meeting of full Quantitative Committee
December 7, 2015: Presented results of gender distribution analysis to full GETF
January 15, 2016: Meeting with Stacey Barfield Harrington and Mercer project team to discuss analytic strategy
January 26, 2016: Meeting with Mercer project team
February 3, 2016: Meeting with Michelle Lewis (Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity)
February 8, 2016: Meeting of full Quantitative Committee
March 14, 2016: Meeting of full Quantitative Committee
April 19, 2016: Presented results of gender distribution analysis to the Council of Academic Deans and Directors
May 10, 2016: Presented results of gender distribution analysis to Faculty Senate
May 19, 2016: Meeting with Stacy Barfield-Harrington and Mercer project team
June 20, 2016: Meeting with Dr. Joan Herbers, Ohio State University, NSF ADVANCE Grant recipient
September 19, 2016: Presented Mercer Phase 2 results to full GETF
December 13, 2016: Meeting with Quantitative Committee to discuss crafting of Mercer report
December 16, 2016: Meeting with Quantitative Committee to discuss crafting of Mercer report
February 21, 2017: Presented Mercer Phase 2 results to Faculty Senate

Results of Research (Including Collection of Data and Study Methodology) and Recommendations:

The GETF QC did not collect new data for any portion of the study. Rather, the GETF QC worked closely with the SLU Office of the Provost and the Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity to gain access to existing institutional data in order to address the research questions. Members of the SLU community who facilitated the procurement of institutional data include Stacy Barfield Harrington (Assistant Provost), Michael Lewis (Associate Provost for Faculty Development), Michelle Lewis (Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity) and Steven Sanchez (Assistant Provost). We are grateful for outstanding support and collaboration from these individuals, the Mercer team, and many others who have spent hours working with or on behalf of the GETF QC to provide the data needed to advance the goals of the task force.

The task of providing a quantitative evaluation of gender equity among full-time faculty members at SLU is not straightforward because some of the data required to assess gender equity are not collected on a regular basis, and/or are not collected in a way that facilitates analysis. Consequently, one of the main recommendations of the GETF is that specific types of data needed to assess gender equity, including recruitment and hiring practices, tenure and promotion practices, faculty workload allocation (among teaching, research, and service), faculty
performance metrics including research productivity, allocation of leadership roles, allocation of administrative stipends and course releases related to such leadership roles, availability and use of family-friendly policies, such as flexible work schedules, maternity and other family-related leave, and tolling of the tenure clock, among other types of data, should be collected on a regular basis and should be made available at the central administration level. Further, we recommend that regular reports based on these data be issued. Specific areas for improvement and data collection are noted below.

Given the above-mentioned limitations in data availability, the GETF QC worked with several groups at the university to identify and utilize existing data to address a subset of the proposed questions. The acquisition of existing data to address questions defined by the GETF QC was complicated because the data needed to be retrieved from various sources within the university, some of the data contain highly sensitive information (pay), and because much of the data needed to address the questions identified by the GETF QC are either not collected by SLU, or, if collected, are not standardized across SLU making comparisons across individuals, departments, and colleges/schools/centers impossible. Further, because the GETF QC used data collected by other groups for other purposes, we were dependent on their operational definitions in order to address our questions.

For each of the questions posted by the GETF QC, we detail data acquisition, data analysis, results, and recommendations below. We note questions for which data were not available, available but not accessible, or accessible but not in a form that facilitates analysis. At the end of each section, we recommend what type(s) of data should be collected on an annual basis in order to properly assess each question.

**Research Question 1: What is the gender distribution of full-time faculty at SLU?**

The GETF QC issued a report on the results of its analysis of this question entitled “Quantitative Committee Descriptive Profile of Full-time Faculty Gender Distribution as of October 13, 2015 (dated April 19, 2016)”. This report is attached as Appendix I. References to Tables and Figures in this summary are to that report. To our knowledge, this study represents the first analysis of the gender distribution across full-time faculty job types by tenure status (tenured/tenure track, non-tenure track) and rank/job type (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Full Professor, Instructor, Research Faculty, Clinical Faculty or Other) at SLU.

**Data:** To investigate gender distribution at SLU, data were obtained from the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). OIR provided the GETF QC with individual-level information on demographics, department, tenure status, tenure track/non-tenure track, and rank. A full list of variables provided by the OIR is in Table 1.

**Analysis:** For the initial analysis of gender distribution, counts and percentages stratified by gender were examined for the following variables: tenure track (non-tenure track, tenure track, tenured), rank, and highest earned degree for the full university, each college/school/center, and
individual departments within each school. Results were presented for the University as a whole, as well as for individual college/schools/centers and, where adequate sample size permitted, by department.

**Results:** As of October 13, 2015, the full-time faculty of SLU consisted of 649 (44.21%) females and 819 (55.79%) males. Table 1 summarizes the distribution of faculty for the university as a whole. Gender distribution varies widely by college/school/center as well as by individual departments and it is the recommendation of the GETF QC that gender be examined at the level of smaller units.

Three overarching trends emerged with regards to the demographics of gender across the university:

1. There are more men than women in full-time faculty positions at SLU (Figure 1).
   - Of the 1468 faculty members at SLU, 56% (819) are male and 44% (649) are female.
   - In most units there are more males than females, with a few exceptions.

2. Women are more likely than men to be represented in non-tenure track faculty positions. There are fewer women than men in tenured and tenure track positions. (Figure 2)
   - 41% of male faculty members at SLU are in non-tenure track positions; in contrast, 57% of female faculty members at SLU are in non-tenure track positions.
   - 58% of males hold tenure track/tenured faculty positions at SLU. 14% of males hold tenure track positions and 44% of males hold tenured positions.
   - 43% of women hold tenure track/tenured faculty positions at SLU. 17% of females hold tenure track positions and 26% of female faculty members at SLU hold tenured positions.

3. Men are more likely to be full professors than women (Figures 3a and 3b).
   - Within non-tenure track faculty positions, 56% (170/302) of non-tenure track Assistant Professors are female, 49% (75/154) of non-tenure track Associate Professors are female, and 38% (30/78) of non-tenure track Full Professors are female.
   - Within tenured and tenure-track faculty positions, 48% of tenure-track Assistant Professors are female (95/199), 43% of tenured Associate Professors are female (106/246), and 23% (71/308) of tenured Full Professors are female.

**Remaining questions:**

This report addressed questions 1A and 1B outlined above: 1A) What is the gender distribution of full-time faculty by College/School/Center and by Department? 1B) What is the gender distribution of full-time faculty in Assistant/Associate/Full Professor positions, in both tenure
track/tenured positions and non-tenure track positions? Remaining questions that were not answered in this analysis are: 1C) What is the gender distribution of full-time faculty in leadership positions? 1D) What is the gender distribution of faculty in administrative positions (defined as those positions with administrative stipends)? 1E) What is the gender distribution of faculty in administrative positions without official administrative stipends (as defined by department/program)?

Recommendations:

1. Collect, analyze, and report data on gender distribution in faculty positions on an annual basis.

2. Identify factors driving the trends noted in this report in each School/College/Center.

3. Develop action plans for addressing gender differences in individual units.

4. Develop a plan to address gender balance in recruitment and hiring, including reporting on ongoing searches for non-tenure track and tenure track positions. Reports should include information on search committee composition, applicant pool, interview pool, and offers made.

5. Develop a plan to enhance mentoring and retention of female faculty members from the assistant professor level through to full professor. Mentoring and retention strategies should be explicit and embedded into departmental culture.

Question 2: Is there a gender disparity in the hiring practices of full-time faculty at SLU?

One potential hypothesis explaining differences in the distribution of genders among faculty positions and gender equity in general is related to hiring practices. A difference in distribution of genders among faculty positions might be the result of hiring practices. To investigate this issue, we posed the following questions:

A. Are there gender differences in number of applicants for faculty positions?
B. Are men more likely to be hired than women when applicant pool is similar?
C. Is there a difference in rank between men and women at time of hire?
D. Is there a difference in salary between men and women at time of hire?
E. Is there a gender difference in appointment to chair search committees?
F. Is there a gender difference in composition of search committees?

Data: To address gender disparity in hiring practices we worked with Michelle Lewis, Director of the Office of Institutional Diversity and Equity at SLU. On April 11, 2016 Michelle Lewis provided the GETF with data for the September 2012 – August 2013 period of applicant activity for full-time faculty positions at SLU. The data provided include: Requisition Number, Division (School or College), Department, Tenure status of the position (Tenure track, Non-Tenure Track), Rank (Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor), Gender, and Action (Pre-screened, Interviewed, Internal Hire, Hired, Re-Hired).
This valuable dataset includes 2078 records of candidates considered for full-time faculty positions during the 2012 – 2013 academic year. Units represented include Academic Affairs, Center for Sustainability, College of Arts and Sciences, College of Public Health & Social Justice, Cook School of Business, Doisy College of Health Sciences, Parks College, School for Professional Studies, School of Law, School of Medicine, and School of Nursing. This dataset, and similar datasets generated for each year, offer an important opportunity to assess the number of applicants for each position, the numbers of men and women who were pre-screened, who interviewed, and who were hired, by Unit and by Department, for Tenure-Track and Non Tenure Track full-time Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor positions.

**Analysis and Results:** Due to time constraints, analyses were not completed for this research question.

**Recommendations:** Data on hiring practices should be collected and reported annually at the central administration level. Additional staff support for data collection and analysis related to hiring practices is required.

**Research Question 3: Is there a difference in current base salary between men and women full-time faculty at SLU this year and in the past two years?**

The GETF QC issued a report on the results of its analysis of this question entitled “Quantitative Committee Full-Time Faculty Gender Pay Equity Analysis as of February 2, 2016 (dated February 2, 2017)”. This report is attached as Appendix II. References to Tables and Figures in this summary are to that report. To our knowledge, this study represents the first full-time faculty gender pay equity study that has been conducted and made publicly available at SLU.

Disparity in pay among female and male full-time faculty members has been documented at numerous institutions. The Chronicle of Higher Education maintains a database on salaries of full-time faculty members (https://data.chronicle.com/). Salary data published for SLU on the Chronicle indicate that full-time female faculty members at the Full Professor and Assistant Professor levels are paid less than male faculty members. However, these data do not allow for the determination of differences in pay among male and female faculty members in distinct units across the university. The goal of research question 3 was to explore differences in pay among full-time male and female faculty members.

**Data:** The establishment of the GETF coincided with a previously planned study addressing pay equity at SLU, the Mercer study. The Mercer Study, conducted by external analysis firm Mercer (www.mercer.com), had two phases: 1) to assess market equity in pay – to determine how SLU faculty were paid relative to comparable institutions/jobs (Mercer Phase 1); and 2) to assess institutional equity in pay – to determine if there were any differences in pay due to gender or
race (Mercer Phase 2). To avoid conducting a second pay analysis in the same year, the university encouraged the GETF QC to work with Mercer to address our research question 3.

Member of the GETF QC, representatives of the Office of the Provost, and Mercer analysts met numerous times to discuss the goals of Mercer Phase 2 and the goals of the GETF. During these meetings it was determined that the methodology proposed by Mercer to complete Phase 2 was not appropriate for the questions posed by the GETF related to pay equity. At the request of the GETF, Mercer completed a second analysis of the data set using methodology recommended by the GETF, including the variables to be included as drivers of pay, in order to determine if there were differences in pay among full-time faculty members based on gender. This methodology is widely accepted and used for faculty gender pay equity studies at private and public universities in the United States.

Data extracted from the SLU Banner system were provided by SLU to Mercer. These data represent faculty salaries on February 2, 2016 and the following variables: Total pay (SLUCare) or base salary (non-SLUCare) (primary outcome variable), Faculty contract length, Age (proxy for experience), Length of SLU service, Time in Rank, Time in Tenure, Tenure Status (Tenure Track, Tenured, Non-Tenure Track), Job Title, Percent of Actual Relative Value Units (wRVU) to FPSC Benchmark (SLUCare only), Academic Discipline or Medical Specialty, Natural logarithm of External Market Pay Median, Gender, Race/Ethnicity.

Analysis: The methodology recommended by the GETF and used by Mercer for the GETF portion of the Phase 2 analysis is detailed in Appendix II and included an ordinary least squares (OLS) regression method with forward, stepwise entry. Data were segmented into SLUCare and non-SLUCare faculty and separate linear regression models were developed for each segment. The outcome (dependent) variable of interest was, for SLUCare, total pay and, for non-SLUCare, base salary. Twelve independent variables were included in the analysis, including gender (male or female) and race.

Results: Gender is a significant predictor of pay at SLU. There are consistent, significant differences in pay among full-time male and female faculty members for the same job, with males earning more than females. The main conclusions of this study are:

1. **The factors identified in the Mercer study explain variation in pay reasonably well (Table 2).** For SLUCare faculty, the model explained 75% of the variation in the data, and for Non-SLUCare faculty, the model explained 70% of variation in the data. The factors used in the study include base salary (total compensation for SLUCare), contract length, age (proxy for experience), length of service, time in rank, time in tenure, tenure status, job title, percent of actual relative value units to FPSC Benchmark (SLUCare only), academic discipline or medical specialty, external market pay median, race/ethnicity, and gender.

2. **Female gender is negatively associated with pay in both SLUCare and Non-SLUCare models (Table 2).** Both models generated by the Mercer Phase 2 pay equity
study indicate that female gender predicts lower pay after adjusting for rank, tenure status and other variables that are considered drivers of pay.

3. **Female faculty members are paid less than male faculty members at the same rank and with the same tenure status in 10 out of 11 units in the university (Table 3; Figure 1).**
   - Female faculty members are paid less than male faculty members at the same rank and with the same tenure status in the College of Arts and Sciences, Doisy College of Health Sciences, John Cook School of Business, Parks College of Engineering Aviation, and Technology, College for Public Health and Social Justice, School of Education, School of Law, University Libraries, School of Medicine (Non-SLUCare), and School of Medicine (SLUCare).
   - Colleges/Schools exhibit varying degrees of differences in faculty salaries between female and male faculty members at the same rank and with the same tenure status, ranging from the College of Arts and Sciences, where female faculty pay is 2.04% less than male faculty pay, to the School of Law, where pay for female faculty members is 10.72% less than male faculty members.
   - There is only one unit where female faculty members are paid more than male faculty members at the same rank and with the same tenure status: the School for Professional Studies.

4. **Female full-time faculty members are paid less than male full-time faculty members at the same rank and with the same tenure status in 15 out of 16 job categories for which data were compared.** These categories include full professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, and researchers, in tenured, tenure track and non-tenure track positions (Table 4; Figures 2, 3).
   - The differences in pay between female and male faculty members at the same rank and with the same tenure status range from a low of -0.90% (for SLUCare tenure track assistant professors) to a high of -30.7% (for Non-SLUCare non-tenure track full professors).
   - There is only one job category in which female faculty members are paid more than male faculty members at the same rank and with the same tenure status: female SLUCare tenured associate professors earn 13.5% more than their male counterparts.

5. **The data indicate that race/ethnicity is negatively associated with pay in the SLUCare model in two out of six race/ethnicity categories (“Asian” and “Other”).** In the SLUCare model “Black”, “Hispanic”, and “Two or More Races” are not negatively associated with pay. **The data indicate that race/ethnicity is negatively associated with pay in the Non-SLUCare model in two out of six categories (“Asian” and “Two or More Races”).** In the Non-SLUCare model, “Black”, “Hispanic”, “Hawaiian” and “Other” are not negatively associated with pay (Table 2). It is possible that those at the intersection of gender and other minority status identities may be further disadvantaged. This dataset did not allow us to analyze the intersection of gender and race/ethnicity due to the small sample sizes of these groups at SLU.
Recommendations:

1. **Remedial action to address the gender pay gap**: It is the position of the SLU GETF that any gender pay gap of any magnitude is unacceptable and must be addressed. It is our understanding from the SLU Office of the Provost that the results of the Mercer Phase 2 analysis were reported out to the deans of the Colleges/Schools in March of 2016 and that remedial action was undertaken by some deans to address the most egregious cases of gender pay inequities for full-time female faculty members. However, SLU is a private institution that does not report faculty salary information and the extent of such remedial action is unknown to the SLU GETF. Even if such remedial action was taken, however, such action does not fully and adequately address the underlying differences identified in this report, namely the persistent gender pay gap that exists across all ranks, all tenure status categories and all Colleges/ Schools, with two exceptions noted above. The observed practice of paying female faculty members less than male faculty members for the same job is obvious from the results of the Mercer Phase 2 study and is very troubling for a university that includes in its mission statement a “commitment to justice.” We strongly urge the SLU Office of the Provost and the deans of the Colleges /Schools to take note of this striking finding and to develop a plan to close the gender pay gap for all full-time faculty members through future salary adjustments for full-time female faculty members.

2. **Regular monitoring of progress on faculty gender pay equity**: We recommend regular monitoring of gender pay equity, and reporting of any changes, at least on a biennial basis. The faculty gender pay equity analysis described in this report should be repeated every two years to monitor progress toward the goal of equity. The SLU Faculty Senate should be responsible for interpreting the results of such future faculty gender pay equity studies through a permanent Committee on the Status of Women. Many other private and public universities monitor faculty gender pay equity on a biennial basis to determine if issues of pay inequity exist or develop and if progress has been made within the university. Given what appears to be a pervasive and seemingly systematic difference in the average salaries between female and male faculty members at SLU, this is an area of serious concern that needs to be addressed by the SLU administration. These data should be reported using the 2016 Mercer Phase 2 study as the baseline for comparison. We recommend that the SLU Office of the Provost invest in permanent capacity to do such analysis rather than relying on consultants.

3. **Collection of additional information on drivers of faculty salaries**: As discussed under the heading of “Additional Research Questions” above, we recommend that the SLU Office of the Provost collect and analyze information concerning faculty performance and productivity, faculty workload allocation, starting salaries and time to promotion and utilize such information for future faculty gender pay equity studies.

4. **Training on Bias in Setting Faculty Salaries**: We recommend that the SLU Office of the Provost require training for deans and chairs of the various Colleges/Schools at SLU on the topic of bias, which may impact the setting of faculty salaries or evaluating faculty for merit increases.
5. **Support of SLU Mid-Career Faculty Development Committee**: The SLU GETF is aware that SLU has established a committee to support and develop mid-career faculty, many of whom are women. We endorse SLU's efforts to identify the factors that may inhibit or prevent such mid-career faculty from progressing to full professor status, which may negatively impact their salaries.

6. **Designated Point of Contact for Faculty Pay Equity Issues**: SLU does not currently have a mechanism for addressing concerns of individual faculty members regarding equitable treatment related to pay or other employment-related matters, such as an ombuds. We support the designation of a university official to serve as a point of contact for such faculty concerns on a confidential, independent, impartial and informal basis.

**Research Question 4: Is there a gender difference in research resource allocation among full-time faculty at SLU with research components in their jobs?**

We observed a difference in the distribution of men and women in tenured and tenure track faculty positions, with more men in tenure-track positions and more women in non-tenure track positions (Research Question 1, Appendix I). Typically, tenured and tenure track position include a significant research component, whereas in most cases non-tenure track positions have a relatively smaller component of the position dedicated to research.

In a university focused on the generation and dissemination of new knowledge, resources available for knowledge generation (i.e., research) determine in large part the scope of research activities that are possible and the professional fate of the faculty members conducting the research. One possible explanation for why there are fewer women in research-focused positions (tenured/tenure track), and why there are relatively few women at the rank of Full Professor, is because the resources provided for research differ among male and female faculty members.

In some disciplines, including many STEM disciplines, non-tenure track positions have a larger component of their job focused on teaching with little or no research. Why are there so few women in jobs with significant research components? Could this be because of differential allocation of research funds to men versus women?

To address this question, we asked whether or not there were differences in resources related to research including: 1) start-up funds negotiated at time of hire; 2) graduate student lines; 3) research space; 4) time for research (as measured by percentage of job dedicated to research as well as teaching load).

**Data**: To our knowledge, data required to address most aspects of this question are not currently collected in a systematic way at SLU. It is possible that data related to teaching load are available (see below), but these data have not yet been collected or analyzed by the GETF.

**Analysis and Results**: None.
**Recommendation:** Invest in university-wide infrastructure to track, analyze, and report data related to resource availability. Additional staff support for data collection and analysis related to resource availability is required.

**Research Question 5: Is there a gender difference in workload (teaching, research, service) among full-time faculty at SLU?**

Another possible explanation for differences in the distribution of full-time male and female faculty members in different jobs may be related to workload. Many faculty positions include a combination of teaching and research responsibilities. We were interested in exploring differences in workload in teaching among male and female faculty members.

For this question we were curious about the following differences among men and women in full-time faculty positions:

A. Is there a difference in number of courses taught?
B. Is there a difference in number of students taught?
C. Is there a difference in number of students mentored/advised?
D. Is there a difference in number of thesis/dissertation committees?
E. Is there a difference in distribution of graduate teaching assistantships?
F. Is there a difference in clinical workload:
   - Is there a difference in amount of scheduled clinic time?
   - Is there a difference in number of students taught?
G. Is there a difference in research workload (measured by productivity including proposals submitted, grants funded, manuscripts/books published, conference presentations, etc.)?
H. Is there a difference in service workload (measured by committee service/leadership at SLU and in the academic community)?

**Data:** It is our understanding that the data are available at SLU for a number of these questions including number of courses taught per semester, number of students taught per course per semester, number of students mentored/advised per semester, number of thesis/dissertation committees per semester. For others, it is not clear if the data are available (amount of scheduled clinic time, number of students taught, research workload measured by productivity, service workload).

**Analysis and Results:** None

**Recommendation:** Invest in university-wide infrastructure to track, analyze, and report data related to workload and productivity. Additional staff support for data collection and analysis related to workload and productivity is required.

**Research Question 6: Is there a gender difference among full-time faculty at SLU in the desire and perceived ability to take parental leave or receive other work-related accommodation upon the birth or adoption of a child or for eldercare?**
A. Do men and women have the same opportunities to take leave associated with the birth or adoption of a child or for eldercare?

B. Is there a difference in the number of men and women who choose to take leave associated with the birth or adoption of a child or for eldercare?

C. Is there a difference among men and women in the amount of time taken for parental leave?

D. Is there a difference among men and women in the use of FMLA associated with parental leave?

E. Is/was there a cost associated with taking parental leave (time to promotion, salary differences, etc.)?

F. Is there a perception of negative consequences associated with taking parental leave?

G. Do men and women have the same option to “stop the clock” associated with the birth or adoption of a child?

H. Is there a difference among men and women in “stopping the clock” for tenure?

I. Is the decision to “stop the clock” made by the faculty member or is it made by the department? Is there a perception (or actual) negative consequences associated with “stopping the clock”?

Data: To our knowledge, data related to faculty leave, availability of flexible work schedules or tolling of the tenure clock associated with birth or adoption are either not collected or not accessible at SLU.

Analysis and Results: None.

Recommendations: Review policies related to leave/accommodations made for birth or adoption, including flexible work schedules, maternity and other family-related leave, and tolling of the tenure clock, among others. Assess resources available to support families including childcare and eldercare. Collect data on faculty members who take leave, accommodations that are made for family leave, and impacts of leave on workload assignment, productivity, and professional advancement. Collect data on use of flexible work schedules and tolling of the tenure clock and their impact on faculty.
B. PERCEPTIONS COMMITTEE

Committee Goal: The goal of the Perceptions Committee was to explore perceived differences in full-time faculty experience based on gender at Saint Louis University.

Committee Members: Members of the Perceptions Committee included:

- Jenny Agnew (School for Professional Studies)
- Hadi Alhorr (John Cook School of Business)
- Ellen Barnidge (College for Public Health and Social Justice)
- Mary (Rina) M. Chittooran (School of Education)
- Omolara Fye-Thorpe (School of Nursing)
- Leslie Hinyard (SLUCOR)
- Denise Hooks-Anderson (School of Medicine)
- Amanda Izzo (College of Arts and Sciences)
- Michelle Lewis (Institutional Equity and Diversity)
- Allison Miller (College of Arts & Sciences)
- Darcy Scharff (College for Public Health and Social Justice)
- Kristin Wilson (College for Public Health and Social Justice)
- Angela Sharkey (School of Medicine)
- Constance Wagner (School of Law)

Research 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?

Methodology: The Perceptions Committee embedded fourteen questions touching on perceptions of equity in the workplace in the Faculty/Staff Feedback Survey administered by Human Resources through a third part consultant, Willis Towers Watson, in April 2016. The survey was sent electronically to all SLU faculty and staff. Respondents were asked to indicate how they perceived various aspects of the work environment using a scale ranging from favorable to unfavorable. In addition, respondents were given the opportunity to provide comments on the topic of equity, among other topics. The Perceptions Committee analyzed the responses provided by full-time faculty to the fourteen questions on equity and the comments submitted under the topic equity, using both quantitative and qualitative analysis methodology.

Results: Female faculty members reported a less favorable perception of the environment at Saint Louis University in several areas related to gender equity. These areas of dissatisfaction included: involvement in decision-making, relationship between performance and compensation, equitable guidance and mentoring, equitable distribution of leadership opportunities, equitable distribution of workload/courses, equitable distribution of service responsibilities, and alterations in family planning. The only area assessed where full-time female faculty members reported a higher level of satisfaction than their male counterparts related to university image. These findings indicate that female faculty members are more likely than male faculty members to perceive a lack of equity in several important areas of their employment and they identify gender as the cause of the inequity.
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. Faculty engaged in similar efforts to the work of the GETF in the future should be granted course releases to allow appropriate time 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 and 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. Garner 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.
III. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GENDER EQUITY TASK FORCE

Our investigation of the status of full-time women faculty members at SLU suggests that faculty gender equity is not a norm at this university. Women are more likely than men to perceive inequity traceable to gender in several important areas of faculty activity. Analyses of data on pay and job status support these perceptions. As the three GETF research studies discussed in this report have revealed, there are numerous factors that operate to disadvantage full-time women faculty members in their employment at SLU. The problems experienced by this group of faculty members have never been systematically explored up until now, nor have such problems been publicly acknowledged and addressed at any level within the university or any of its academic units. There is much work that can, and should, be done to remedy the problems that we have identified.

It is the conclusion of the GETF that full-time women faculty members at SLU are hindered in their ability to achieve their highest potential due to these problems, which appear to be pervasive and systemic. Some of the issues identified include the following: fewer women than men faculty members (44% of faculty members are women, while 60% of students are women), women concentrated in non-tenure track positions, women concentrated in lower academic ranks, women not achieving full professor rank, existence of a pervasive gender pay gap, lack of women in leadership roles, lack of involvement in university decision-making, lack of mentoring, lack of family-friendly policies, and unfavorable perceptions of campus climate by women, including the perception that there is a lack of gender equity.

It is also the conclusion of the GETF that there has been a failure historically to acknowledge and address the above-mentioned issues, which may be due to the lack of attention paid to gender equity at the institution, including the lack of a commitment to gender equity as a goal of the university and the lack of an infrastructure that could assist in achieving that goal. For this reason, the GETF recommends that steps be taken to remedy this gap in the governance structure of the university by making gender equity a strategic priority of the institution and by creating organizational structures that will ensure that such strategic priority is operationalized at every level in the university.

It is also the conclusion of the GETF that the problems experienced by full-time women faculty members are the product of policies and practices that operate to create and perpetuate gender inequity. In some cases, gender inequity may arise because the policies are unclear or because the policies are not applied consistently as between women and men. In other cases, the lack of policies may result in these inequities. For this reason, the GETF recommends that SLU undertake a university-wide review of policies and practices that may operate to disadvantage women faculty or may hinder their professional advancement and career satisfaction. Such review should be followed by the creation, revision, and implementation of improved policies and practices that follow best practice for achieving faculty gender equity. In making our
recommendations, the GETF has been guided by its review of such best practices, which are discussed in Section V (Best Practices).

**Recommended Action Items:**

Set forth here are some specific, actionable steps that can and should be taken in the near term to improve the status of women faculty at SLU. Detailed explanations of these recommended action items are also provided below.

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

2. Establish a permanent joint Faculty Senate/Provost Committee on the Status of Women.

3. Acknowledge, and develop a plan to address, the SLU full-time faculty gender pay gap.

4. Create, review, and revise policies and practices to ensure equitable treatment for women faculty members.

5. Establish faculty gender equity as a norm on campus by adopting it as a goal of the university.

**Detailed Explanation of Recommended Action Items:**

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

   a. The role of the faculty gender equity specialist is to continue to identify and work to address gender equity issues involving women faculty members at SLU with the goal of promoting their professional development and career advancement.

   b. In addition, to support the work of the faculty gender equity specialist, it will be necessary to develop capacity within the Office of the Provost to conduct research studies of the type conducted by the GETF on a regular basis, including:

      i. faculty gender demographics tracking across the university, and by college/school/center;
      
      ii. faculty gender pay equity studies; and
      
      iii. faculty climate surveys to assess perceptions of gender equity.
c. The following research studies should be conducted on a regular basis, using the data collected by the three research studies conducted by the GETF as a baseline:
   i. Annually: faculty gender demographics tracking across the university, and by college/school/center;
      1. Such tracking should include the information contained in the GETF report on this topic (including tenure status and rank/job title) and should also track faculty leadership positions and faculty departures by gender;
   ii. Every three years: faculty gender pay equity study; and
   iii. Every three years: faculty climate survey to assess perceptions of gender equity.

d. The following faculty data, disaggregated by gender, should be collected and analyzed on a regular basis by the central administration:
   i. Starting salaries and research support allocations
   ii. Allocation of merit increases
   iii. Faculty leadership and administrative positions held (including committee chair, center or program director, department chair, assistant/associate dean, and dean) and compensation (additive pay or teaching release) associated with such positions
   iv. Recruitment and hiring practices
   v. Tenure and promotion practices
   vi. Workload allocation (teaching, service, research) and productivity
   vii. Use of maternity and other family leave (including Family and Medical Leave Act), flexible work arrangements to accommodate work-life integration, and tolling of the tenure clock.

e. Development of a women faculty leadership training program to create a pipeline for leadership positions and track progress on leadership positions.

f. Development of women faculty mentoring programs to facilitate professional development.

g. Designate a university ombuds in the Office of the Provost to address faculty concerns about gender equity on a confidential, independent, impartial, and informal basis.

2. Establish a permanent Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Committee on the Status of Women.
a. The role of the Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Committee on the Status of Women would be to monitor implementation of the GETF recommendations contained in this report and to continue work on gender equity issues on campus.

b. The Joint Committee should include representatives from a variety of colleges and schools, a representative from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and the faculty gender equity specialist from the Office of the Provost.

c. The Joint Committee should be charged with reviewing data analysis provided by the Office of the Provost, interpreting such data, and writing reports addressed to the Faculty Senate and the Provost with recommendations for achieving gender equity. At a minimum, such charge should cover the three areas researched by the GETF and listed in Item 1.c. above (faculty gender demographics study, gender pay equity study, climate survey covering faculty perceptions of gender equity).

d. The Joint Committee should be charged with exploring gender equity in additional areas identified in Item 1.d. above and Section IV (Areas for Further Inquiry), as deemed appropriate.

e. The Joint Committee should report to the Faculty Senate and the Provost on a regular basis and at least annually.

3. Acknowledge, and develop a plan to address, the SLU full-time faculty gender pay gap.

a. While some efforts have been made to identify outliers in the Mercer Phase 1 study and to address those outliers, no action has been taken to address the pervasive average pay differentials between women and men across the university.

b. Create a pool of funds to address the gender pay gap identified in the Mercer Phase 2 study that is separate from merit pool funds. Direct deans, department heads, and directors to distribute such funds and report on progress towards eliminating the gender pay gap in their academic units.

c. Develop and implement policies and practices on starting salaries and other resource allocations to avoid gender differentiated offers.
d. Implement policies and practices on merit pool distributions to avoid gender differentiated awards.

e. Set targets for, and monitor progress on, achieving faculty gender pay on a regular basis, using the results of the data analysis from the GETF gender pay equity study as a baseline.

4. Create, review, and revise policies and practices to ensure equitable treatment for women faculty.

a. Areas of concern identified include the following areas where women faculty members may be disadvantaged:
   i. compensation and allocation of other resources,
   ii. recruitment and hiring (including the large number of women in non-tenure track positions and the need for external search committee members and oversight for search committees),
      1. Establish a “Target of Opportunity” hiring pool for the purposes of recruiting highly qualified scholars from underrepresented groups,
   iii. tenure and promotion including mentoring (including concerns about promotion of mid-career faculty),
   iv. allocation of workload (including concern about excessive teaching, advising, and service responsibilities for women faculty at the expense of research responsibilities),
   v. leadership development including mentoring, and
   vi. family-friendly policies facilitating work-life integration.

b. Policies should be in writing, using language that is clear and not vague or ambiguous, and should avoid vesting excessive discretionary authority in committees or other persons that can operate to disadvantage women faculty. Policies should be consistently and uniformly applied to both women and men faculty members. Policies and practices should be communicated to, and be readily accessible to, faculty and any changes should be communicated in writing prior to their effective date.

c. Follow best practices for achieving faculty gender equity in creating, revising, and implementing such policies and practices.

5. Establish gender equity as a norm on campus by adopting it as a goal of the university.
a. Include the goal of achieving gender equity in university governing documents, such as the university mission statement and strategic plan.

b. Currently, the SLU mission statement does not contain language that addresses gender equity as a goal of the university. The SLU mission statement contains the following language, suggesting that it is an inclusive community:
   “In support of its mission, the University… Welcomes students, faculty and staff form all racial, ethnic and religious backgrounds and beliefs and creates a sense of community that facilitates their development as men and women for others”.

c. Currently, the SLU strategic plan (referred to as Magis) does not contain language that addresses gender equity as a goal of the university. The SLU strategic plan dated September 2015 contains the following language on diversity and inclusiveness:
   “Initiative Five, Goal 3: We will become a more diverse and inclusive community.

Objective 3.1: We will create and maintain an inclusive community by respecting the inherent dignity of each person and embracing people for the diversity of their identities, including race, ethnicity, sex, age, ability, faith, orientation, gender, class, and ideology.

Objective 3.2: We will actively recruit and retain a more diverse faculty and staff across all disciplines, with an emphasis on underrepresented and international populations.”

While this language signals an interest in inclusiveness and diversity, including sex and gender, it does not establish the principle of gender equity. One way to accomplish this goal would be to add language at the end of Objective 3.1 as follows: “and we will treat all members of our community fairly and equitably and ensure they are not disadvantaged because of their identities.”

d. Establish standard procedures to ensure that the goal of gender equity is operationalized at every level within the university.
   i. Set targets for gender equity indicators, regularly monitor progress toward achieving goals through use of baseline data provided by the GETF and comparative data provided by the Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Committee on the Status of Women, and establish an
accountability mechanism for deans and department chairs to achieve their assigned targets.

ii. Follow best practices for achieving faculty gender equity in the university setting.

iii. Take additional steps as appropriate to mitigate the risk that women are disadvantaged on account of their gender, such as by recognizing the presence of implicit gender bias in university decision-making.
V. AREAS FOR FURTHER INQUIRY

There were some areas that the GETF thought were relevant to evaluating the status of women faculty at SLU but that were not included in this study. This was due to the lack of availability of data at the central administration level or due to the fact that the research questions went beyond the charge delivered to the GETF. Some of these areas are identified throughout this report and the reports attached as Appendices I, II, and III.

These areas should be given consideration for further study at SLU since they are highly relevant to the status of women faculty. Some of these areas for further inquiry are set forth in the various GETF reports, as follows:

From Report #1 (Appendix I):

• "Questions Raised by this Analysis (Trends 1, 2, and 3)", pp. 14-15

From Report #2 (Appendix II):

• "Additional Research Questions", pp. 13-14

From Report #3 (Appendix III):

• "Additional Questions", p. 16

From this Report #4 on the Status of Full-Time Women Faculty:

• Quantitative Committee Research Questions 2, 4, 5, and 6, p. 16-17, 21-23
V. BEST PRACTICES FOR ACHIEVING GENDER EQUITY FOR WOMEN FACULTY

The investigative process used by the GETF and the problems the GETF has identified in this Report on the Status of Full-Time Women Faculty and its three related research reports are not unique to SLU. Starting in the early 1990's, both public and private universities in the United States have routinely established faculty task forces to address gender equity issues. Such task forces have conducted the types of studies undertaken by the GETF using similar methodologies. In some respects, the conclusions reached by the GETF parallel the conclusions reached by task forces at other universities. It should be noted, however, that the particular problems faced by women faculty members on account of their gender may vary from campus to campus. In addition, each university must develop its own approach to addressing the problem of faculty gender inequity. There is no one size fits all solution to these problems.

A growing body of best practices to promote women university faculty in their careers has developed in recent years. Other universities have adopted some of these best practices in response to the realization that their women faculty may be disadvantaged on account of their gender in various aspects of their employment. SLU has not yet followed this strategy. The GETF recommends in Recommendation III.4. above that SLU consider adopting best practices for policies and practices that may impact women faculty. Some of the most relevant best practices are analyzed in the following article: Constance Wagner, Change from Within: Using Task Forces and Best Practices to Achieve Gender Equity for University Faculty, 36 Saint Louis University Public Law Review __, (2017)(forthcoming) (Linked here see pp. 54-91). (Available at https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2955249)

In addition, the GETF has developed a best practices library that draws on research conducted by Constance Wagner and three of her graduate research assistants: Kelly Smallmon, SLU Law Class of 2017, Keri Smith, SLU Law Class of 2016, and Martha Gallagher, SLU Law Class of 2019. Rebecca Hyde supplemented and catalogued such best practices library so that it could be accessed by the GETF. She also prepared a bibliography, which is attached to this Report as Appendix IV.
APPENDIX I - Report #1: Saint Louis University Faculty Senate Gender Equity Task Force, TF Descriptive Profile of Full-Time Faculty Gender Distribution as of October 13, 2015 dated April 19, 2016 (Linked here)

(Available at https://sites.google.com/a/slu.edu/facultysenate/committees/gender-equity-task-force)
APPENDIX II - Report #2: Saint Louis University Faculty Senate Gender Equity Task Force, Full-Time Faculty Gender Pay Equity Study dated February 2, 2017 (Linked here)

(Available at https://sites.google.com/a/slu.edu/facultysenate/committees/gender-equit-task-force)
APPENDIX III - Report #3: Saint Louis University Faculty Senate Gender Equity Task Force, Full-Time Faculty Feedback Survey Data Analysis dated May 12, 2017 (Linked here)

(Available at https://sites.google.com/a/slu.edu/facultysenate/committees/gender-equity-task-force)
APPENDIX IV: Best Practices Research Summary and Bibliography

A. Some of the most relevant best practices are analyzed in the following article: Constance Wagner, Change from Within: Using Task Forces and Best Practices to Achieve Gender Equity for University Faculty, 36 Saint Louis University Public Law Review __, (2017)(forthcoming). (Linked here see pp. 54-91)


B. Bibliography of GETF Research on Best Practices for Achieving Gender Equity for University Faculty (prepared by Associate Professor and Research Librarian Rebecca Hyde) (Linked here)

(Available at https://sites.google.com/a/slu.edu/facultysenate/committees/gender-equity-task-force)