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Executive Summary

In fall of 2001 the University Committee on Women appointed a Task-Force on Data Analysis to examine issues of data collection and reporting on the status of women at Iowa State University. The Task-Force was composed of administrators from the Office of Institutional Research, The Provost’s Office, Human Resources/Equal Opportunity & Diversity, and faculty and professional and scientific staff from various units at ISU. Administrators acted as liaisons to their respective offices and facilitated and organized the collection of data. In the fall of 2001 Provost Richmond approved the sharing of data among the committee members.

The Task-Force was charged to report back to the UCW with its findings about the current state of data collection and reporting on the status of women at ISU. The charge emphasized the need to identify areas of strength as well as weakness in the annual reports of women’s status and to lead the effort for developing and recommending a set of key indicators that can be collected annually to reflect the status of women at ISU. In May of 2002 Jackie Litt, the Chair of UCW, submitted a report on data collection to the Provost’s office (Appendix A). The main conclusions of this report are:

1. There is a striking lack of coordination and continuity among offices on campus in the reporting on the status of women on campus.

2. There is no overall University plan to monitor the status of women on campus. Although personnel and administrative data are routinely collected we know of no determined plan to evaluate these data with gender equity issues in mind nor a precise method for doing so.

3. We have not discovered any University benchmarks through which women’s progress is tracked and measured.

The second charge of the Task-Force was to identify significant problem areas in women’s status on campus. This Report on the Status of Women at ISU summarizes the key findings of the Task-Force and presents recommendations for improvement. The main conclusions of this report are:

1. There are very few women in the highest administrative ranks at the University.

2. There are only eight women department chairs out of a total of 56 departments.

3. Women faculty and P & S employees are concentrated at lower ranks and have made minimal gains in the past eight years in their representation at higher ranks.

4. Newly hired tenure-track women faculty have higher attrition rates than newly hired tenure-track men faculty, particularly in the first three years of their employment. In a comparison between men and women hired since 1994, by the end of their third year 16 percent of women have resigned compared to 4 percent of men.

Both reports include extensive recommendations for recording and improving women’s status on campus. The recommendations were generated through consultation with women leaders at Iowa State University.
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1.0 Introduction

“The University Committee on Women works to promote a university climate that fosters the full participation of women faculty, staff, and students. The committee concerns itself with policies and practices that may cause particular difficulties for women as employees and students” (UCW Mission Statement, 2002). One of the major tasks of UCW in recent years has been the generation of reports on the status of women at Iowa State University. Research is essential in our capacity to address gender equity issues on campus.

In fall of 2001 the University Committee on Women appointed a Task-Force on Data Analysis to examine issues of data collection and reporting on the status of women at Iowa State University. The Task-Force was composed of administrators from the Office of Institutional Research, The Provost’s Office, Human Resources/Equal Opportunity & Diversity, and faculty and professional and scientific staff from various units at ISU. Administrators acted as liaisons to their respective offices and facilitated and organized the collection of data. In the fall of 2001 Provost Richmond approved the sharing of data among the committee members.

The Task-Force was charged to report back to the UCW with its findings about the current state of data collection and reporting on the status of women at ISU. The charge emphasized the need to identify areas of strength as well as weakness in the annual reports of women’s status and to lead the effort for developing and recommending a set of key indicators that can be collected annually to reflect the status of women at ISU. In May of 2002 Jackie Litt, the Chair of UCW, submitted a report on data collection to the Provost’s office (Appendix A).

A second charge of the Task-Force was to identify significant problem areas in women’s status on campus. This Report on the Status of Women at ISU summarizes the key findings of the Task-Force and presents recommendations for improvement. For details about data collection see Part 2.0 of this report and Appendix A.

The committee considered the following questions essential to the study of gender equity:

- Is there gender equity in the recruitment, retention, and promotion of women faculty?
- Are women represented at the highest levels in their employment categories and how have the percentages changed over time?
- Are there gender differences in the retention rates of new assistant professors?
- Are there gender differences in salary and salary growth between men and women faculty?
- Do men and women graduate students receive comparable types and amounts of University funding?
• Are women proportionately represented at high levels of administration, such as Deans, Department Chairs and central administrative positions?

2.0 Data Gathering Techniques


The Task-Force reviewed data related to women in the IR “Fact Book” which summarizes demographic information collected annually. IR provided to the committee, for limited distribution, a salary equity study and tables reflecting the hiring and retention patterns of women and men faculty.

The annual personnel data collected by the Offices of Institutional Research and Human Resources provided useful and vital information about gender stratification on campus. IR reported that their primary source for staff data resides in an historical database that has been developed from records maintained by the office of Human Resources, Provost, Payroll, and Accounting. (All counts were based on the October Payroll of each year.) This database was developed in 1990 which makes it possible to conduct both cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses of staff at Iowa State. It further provides flexibility to respond to many questions raised by committees such as UCW or others concerned with equity issues on campus. Administrative level data on the representation of women at various levels in the University structure are also readily available through IR.

Data to address other questions were gathered using personnel data and records in the office of Institutional Research, Human Resources, and the Provost’s Office. The Task-Force did not generate primary data but relied on personnel data collected through these various offices. Student data were collected from the official records maintained by the Office of the Registrar for the fall term of each year. The personnel data sources included payroll runs to calculate earnings and growth in class or faculty status, annual reports to the Board of Regents, and various state and federal compliance agencies.

3.0 Findings (all are based on 2001-2002 data unless otherwise indicated)

Students

a. Women comprise 45 percent of all undergraduates and 41 percent of all graduate students.

b. The ratio of women to men students has increased in the last decade among every level of student. Though still in the minority at most levels of education,
women students comprise greater than half of all students in Veterinary Medicine and in Special Studies. (Figures 1 and 2)

c. Women hold a somewhat smaller percentage of all ISU funded positions for graduate students than do men except for the combined teaching and research position. The percentage of women graduate students in funded positions has increased between 1993 and 2001 from 36 to 39 percent, except in the pre/post doctoral research associate category where it has declined by 10 percent. (Figures 3 and 4)

Professional and Scientific

a. Women are 49 percent of all P & S employees.

b. The percentage of women in each P & S grade level has increased since 1993-1994. Women are overrepresented at the lower grades and underrepresented at the higher grades. Women have made large gains in their representation at P & S grade levels 17 and above although only 14 women are at grades 19 or 20 in 2000 compared to 42 men in those grades. (Figures 5 and 6)

Merit

a. Women are 69 percent of all merit employees.

b. Women continue to hold almost all clerical positions and about three quarters of all supervisory/exempt positions. Men hold almost all security positions and about two-thirds of all blue collar positions. Technical positions across campus remain integrated by gender. (Figures 7 and 8)

Faculty

a. Women comprise 26 percent of all tenure-track faculty (tenured and tenure-eligible) up from 21 percent in 1993-1994. Women comprise 22 percent of all tenured faculty and 40 percent of tenure-eligible faculty. Women comprise 49 percent of all non tenure-track faculty down from 51 percent in 1993-1994. (Table 1)

b. Women are concentrated at lower academic ranks and have made minimal gains in the past eight years in their representation at higher academic ranks. In 2001-2002 women were 14 percent of full Professors, 31% of Associate Professors, 41% of Assistant Professors, and 57% of Instructors. Modest gains were made in the percentages of women at full and associate professor ranks (5 and 4% respectively). (Figures 9 and 10)

c. Women are vastly under-represented among the ranks of Distinguished and University Professors. In 2001 only 4.3 percent of all Distinguished Professors

e. Tenure-track women hired since 1990 left ISU at higher rates than men. By the end of the ten year period between 1990 and 2000, 27 percent (N=77) of newly hired tenure-track women faculty had resigned compared to 20 percent of men (N=103). (Figure 11) Gender disparity in attrition is particularly evident in the early years of a faculty's tenure at ISU. In a comparison between men and women hired since 1994, by the end of their third year 16 percent of women have resigned compared to 4 percent of men. By the end of their fifth year 25 percent of women and 12 percent of tenure-track men had resigned. From years 4 to year 7 the attrition rates are similar for women and men. (Figure 12)

f. Income growth of men and women assistant professors is similar, although men were brought in at higher initial levels. (Figure 14)

g. At the full Professor level women faculty salaries are about 1 percent higher than men's within departments in FY 1994 but have been between 2 and 4 percent lower than men’s salaries in each year since 1994. Women Associate Professor salaries have ranged between 0 to 4 percent lower than men Associate Professor salaries within departments since 1994. Women Assistant Professor salaries have ranged between 0 and 5 percent lower than men Assistant Professor salaries since 1995. Since 1999 women and men Assistant Professor salaries within departments have been uniform.

h. There are currently 31 African American, nine American Indian, and 25 Hispanic women faculty on campus. Women make up 16 percent of Asian/Pacific Islanders (n=23). (Table 3)

**Administration**

a. Women are poorly represented at the centers of administrative power at ISU. There are no women in ISU’s higher administration (i.e. President, Provost, Vice Provost for Research and Advanced Studies/Dean of the Graduate College, Vice Provost for Extension, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs, Vice President Student Affairs, Vice President for Business and Finance).

b. Of the 8 Academic Deans two are women (Agriculture and Family and Consumer Sciences). The Library Dean is a woman.
c. In 2001-2002 only 8 of 56 departments at ISU are chaired by women (14 percent). (Table 4)

4.0 Recommendations

1. Leadership

The most important change that ISU can make if it is to attract and retain women faculty and staff is to appoint women to top leadership positions in the University. Experts in academic administration contend that the appointment of women to top administrative positions can help combat discrimination against women in departments, improve the recruitment and retention of women faculty and administrators, and help close the gender gap in rank between women and men. We recommend that ISU:

a. Recruit and hire women for top administrative offices.

b. Create leadership opportunities and administrative training for women on campus. The SLIC program is an excellent training ground for women interested in leadership positions on campus. However, there are very limited administrative opportunities for women who have completed SLIC training. We urge the Provost's, President's, and Dean's Offices to consider reestablishing administrative internships in their offices for interested faculty. We also recommend that the University support training for aspiring women administrators through the relevant higher education organizations.

c. Develop a robust retention program for senior women faculty and administrators.

d. Establish close communication between senior women faculty (particularly full Professors) and Department Chairs, Deans, and other central administrators. Since women are radically underrepresented in the administration and higher ranks of ISU we believe that a series of formal and informal practices should be developed that will make it possible for women's knowledge of gender issues to be integrated at the highest levels of academic power and decision-making. This might include a special council on women's issues that represent women across the campus (such as the Women's Leadership Consortium that has been established in the Provost's Office) as well as a cabinet of senior women faculty to advise the Deans, Provost and/or President.

e. Identify opportunities to increase women's representation and input on various standing committees and councils, such as President's Council, administrative search committees, and others.
2. Attrition

Our research uncovered a significant gender disparity in attrition, especially in the first three years of a faculty’s tenure.

We believe that ISU must develop programs to improve the retention of junior women faculty. While we have had reasonable success in recruiting women faculty, we have had much less success in keeping them here. This is one reason why ISU has a tremendous gender gap at the highest ranks of faculty: men are 86 percent and women 14 percent of all full professors.

Attrition is clearly a problem for men and women faculty. Iowa State made 807 tenure track hires in the decade between 1990 and 2000. One hundred and eighty of those new hires resigned during that same period. In essence, Iowa State lost 22 percent of its newly hired tenure-track faculty (women and men) in the ten year period. Faculty attrition is economically costly, detracts from the educational mission of the institution, and limits the procurement of research grants and development of collaborative research. Specific retention efforts for women should include:

a. Monitor through exit interviews the reasons for women faculty resignations and develop a strategic plan to respond to the reasons. The Provost’s Office is a likely place to carry out these studies and retention efforts. We expect that some of the retention effort will involve financial resources and we recommend that the Provost’s Office develop a special fund for the retention of women faculty.

b. Continue and increase support of women’s units and programs on campus, such as the Margaret Sloss Women’s Center, The Women’s Studies Program, the Catt Center for Women and Politics, and the Program for Women in Science and Engineering. It is important to understand these as retention programs for faculty as well as educational programs for students. Well-funded women’s programs send a clear signal to faculty that the university is committed to gender equity.

c. Increase internal research support and funding for faculty and professional staff currently involved in interdepartmental and interdisciplinary research. Many women seek opportunities for professional advancement outside of their departments and we believe that administrative support of interdisciplinary research will support women’s research on campus. We believe that these research opportunities should be understood not only as seed money for further grant monies but also as retention efforts of women faculty who do not feel fully included in the activities of their home departments.

d. Reward administrators (Deans, Department Chairs and Program Directors) who support the recruitment, retention, and advancement of women faculty.

e. Develop and fund “family-friendly policies” (such as the arrival of children policy, subsidies for child care, and spousal accommodation policies) that will help
faculty balance “work and family” obligations. We believe that ISU should be a leader among our peer institutions in developing strong policies that support faculty’s domestic needs. These programs will improve recruitment and retention of faculty and will improve research productivity.

f. Undertake a special study of attrition of racial minority women faculty.

3. Campus Climate

a. Identify and publicize the achievements of women at Iowa State University.

b. Create opportunities and organize events that highlight the educational contributions of women on and off campus.

c. Promote campus events and celebrations for women at the level of the President’s Office.

d. Encourage open discussion of women’s issues for the purposes of education and awareness.

e. Bring nationally known speakers to meet with Dean’s Council, President’s Cabinet, and the Chair’s Council on matters related to the needs and interests of women.
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Report of the Task Force on Data-Analysis
Report of the *Task Force On Data Analysis*
Submitted by Jackie Litt
Chair of University Committee on Women 2001-2002

“The University Committee on Women works to promote a university climate that fosters the full participation of women faculty, staff, and students. The committee concerns itself with policies and practices that may cause particular difficulties for women as employees and students” (UCW Mission Statement, 2002). One of the major tasks of UCW in recent years has been the generation of reports on the status of women at Iowa State University. Research is essential in our capacity to address gender equity issues on campus.

One outcome of UCW research efforts have been growing questions about the relation between UCW’s research and the research undertaken by various University offices. In the fall of 2001 the University Committee on Women appointed a *Task-Force on Data Analysis* to examine and evaluate how data on the status of women on campus are collected and reported by the University. The *Task-Force* was charged to report back to the UCW with its findings about the current state of data collection and reporting and was asked to identify areas of strength as well as areas that need improvement. Beyond that, the *Task-Force* was asked to lead the effort in developing and recommending a set of key indicators that can be collected annually to reflect the status of women at ISU.

In addition to basic demographic information about enrollment and employment, the committee considered the following questions essential to the study of gender equity:

- Is there gender equity in the recruitment, retention, and promotion of women faculty?
- Are women represented at the highest levels in their employment categories and how have the percentages changed over time?
- Are there gender differences in the retention and promotion rates of new assistant professors?
- Are there gender differences in salary and salary growth between men and women faculty?
- Do men and women graduate students receive comparable types and amounts of University funding?
- Are women represented at high levels of administration, such as Deans, Department Chairs and central administrative positions?

The *Task-Force* was composed of administrators from the Office of Institutional Research, The Provost’s Office, Human Resources, and faculty and professional and scientific staff from various units at ISU. Administrators acted as liaisons to their respective offices and facilitated and organized the collection of data. In the fall of 2001 Provost Richmond approved the sharing of data among the committee members. The University administration, from the Provost’s Office, Human Resources, through the employees at IR proved incredibly open and flexible in responding to the *Task-Force*’s requests. We commend the leadership provided by these offices in supporting UCW’s monitoring of women’s status on campus. Faculty members were also working with the
Task-Force to generate research questions and interpretations of gender equity data. The Committee reviewed published reports by MIT, Caltech, and Purdue Universities for insights into research questions and models of analysis.

The Report presented below summarizes the activities of the Task-Force and its major findings and recommendations regarding data collection and reporting. Please note that the Task-Force is currently compiling a report that summarizes the data it collected on the status of women at ISU but that the report here focuses exclusively on administrative matters regarding the process of data collection and reporting.

Findings

Availability of Data
The committee began by taking inventory of the data that are currently available on gender equity, especially through the Office of Institutional Research (IR). The committee reviewed data related to women in the IR “Fact Book” which summarizes demographic information collected annually. IR provided to the committee, for limited distribution, a salary equity study and some tables reflecting hiring and retention patterns of female and male faculty.

The annual personnel data collected by the Offices of Institutional Research and Human Resources provide useful and vital information about gender stratification on campus. IR reported that their primary source for staff data resides in an historical database that has been developed from records maintained by the office of Human Resources, Provost, Payroll, and Accounting. (All counts were based on the October Payroll of each year.) This database was developed in 1990 which makes it possible to conduct both cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses of staff at Iowa State. It further provides flexibility to respond to many questions raised by committees such as UCW or others concerned with equity issues on campus. Administrative level data on the representation of women at various levels in the University structure are also readily available through IR.

Data to address other questions were gathered using personnel data and records in the office of Institutional Research, Human Resources, and the Provost’s Office. The Task-Force did not generate primary data but relied on personnel data collected through these various offices. Student data were collected from the official records maintained by the Office of the Registrar for the fall term of each year. The personnel data sources included payroll runs to calculate earnings and growth in class or faculty status, annual reports to the Board of Regents, and various state and federal compliance agencies.

Coordination
One of our most striking observations is the lack of coordination and continuity in the reporting on the status of women on campus. Excellent special reports have been generated on gender equity in faculty recruitment and retention, and salary equity. However, most of the committee members could not identify any “action” taken in response to the reports. Many of the current special reports offered only “raw data”
rather than interpretive memos so that the impact of findings on the issues they addressed have been ignored or minimized. It is unclear whose “responsibility” it is to “interpret” the raw data, disseminate findings, and generate solutions. Beyond that, there is no available “list” of reports and no easily identifiable office that is responsible for centralizing information.

Planning
As far as we can tell, there is no overall University plan to monitor the status of women on campus. Although personnel and administrative data are routinely collected we know of no determined plan to evaluate these data with gender equity issues in mind nor a precise method for doing so. (As an example of the current decentralized state of data collection, some of the special reports were initiated by individuals with particular interests rather than as part of a coordinated and regularly scheduled plan to monitor the status of women on campus.) Correspondingly, we have not discovered any University benchmarks through which women’s progress is tracked and measured.

There is no systematic study of faculty who have resigned from ISU. While a faculty member in Psychology has been involved in conducting “exit interviews” with and administering surveys to leaving faculty, it is not clear what structure has been established to respond to the findings or whether funding for the project will continue.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

UCW fully intends to continue its practice of examining the status of women on campus. Yet we strongly believe that it is the responsibility of the University administration itself to coordinate the collection and analysis of data on the condition of women. The Task-Force recommends that the university identify an office or officer in the Provost’s office to take responsibility for coordinating the continued study of women’s status of campus. Toward this end we recommend that:

1. An annual report on the status of women at ISU be presented to the President and Provost in June of each year. We recommend that the Provost’s Office compile the report.

2. Communication be increased between the various offices on campus that collect data on the status of women, particularly the Provost’s office, the office of Institutional Research, Human Resources, and the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity.

3. The University convene a committee to determine a plan for monitoring the status of women on campus and for establishing benchmarks to measure women’s progress.

4. IR continue to annually collect and review data assembled as presented in the table “Females by Major Administrative Unit (Appendix A).” This data had never been assembled in this format; it provides personnel information on a college-by-college basis as well by each of the major administrative units.
5. Longitudinal data on the status of women be tracked through the data provided in “Females by Major Administrative Unit” table as well as additional items as identified in the Task-Force report on the status of women at ISU.

6. A representative from UCW be appointed to the new focus groups on the “Fact Book” run by the Office of Institutional Research.

7. The University undertake a plan to track comparisons between the status of women at ISU to those at “peer 11” institutions.

**Task Force members:**
Margie Tabor (Coordinator), Office of Facilities Planning and Management.
Susan Carlson, Associate Provost
Kelly Chavez, Vice-President for Student Affairs
Carla Espinoza, Director of Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity.
Jackie Litt, Chair of UCW, Associate Professor in Sociology and Women’s Studies
Fred Lorenz, Professor of Sociology and Statistics.
Elena Polouchkina, Office of International Agriculture Programs
Lynn Zwagerman, Office of Institutional Research

The committee would like to thank Sharon Bird, Yong Wang, Pam Geringer, and Gebre Tesfagiorgis for their technical support of and contribution to this effort.
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Figures and Tables
As shown in Figures 1 and 2 the ratio of women to men students has increased in the last decade among every level of undergraduate, graduate, professional and special education. Though still in the minority at most levels of education, women students comprise greater than half of all students in Veterinary Medicine and in “Special” studies.
Figures 3 and 4 present employment information for women graduate assistants. Women comprise 41 percent of the total graduate student population, whereas men comprise 59 percent. Women continue to hold a somewhat smaller percentage of all ISU funded positions for graduate students than men do, in all categories except the combined teaching and research assistant position (in the 2001-02 academic year). Note, however, that the percentage of women graduate students in funded positions has increased somewhat over the last decade in every category except the Pre/Post-Doctoral Research Associate category.
Figures 5 and 6 represent the number and proportion of women in various Professional and Scientific grade levels for the 1993-94 and 2001-02 academic years. The percentage of women in each P&S grade level has increased since 1993-94. Women employees in P&S positions, however, are still over-represented at the lower levels and underrepresented at the higher levels. On the other hand, however, the largest gains for women in P&S grade levels has been at the higher levels suggesting that the gap in ranks between women and men in P&S positions is narrowing over time.
Shown in Figures 7 and 8 represent the number and proportion of women and men in merit positions across campus in the academic year 1993-94 and 2001-02. These graphs demonstrate clearly that some types of positions are much more segregated by sex than others. Women continue to hold almost all clerical positions and about three-fourths of all Supervisory/Exempt positions. Men hold almost all Security positions and about two-thirds of all Blue Collar Positions. Technical positions across campus remain integrated by gender.
Figures 9 and 10 represent the number and proportion of women faculty by rank in 1993-4 and 2001-02. Most noticeable is that women are somewhat over-represented in Instructor positions, and under-represented at all other ranks, particularly in tenured faculty positions. Note, however, that the percentage of women faculty has increased somewhat since 1993-94 in both the Associate and Full Professor levels indicating that while the gap in rank between women and men faculty is still large, it has narrowed somewhat. Data from payroll (Office of Institutional Research) not shown indicate, in addition, that women are still vastly under-represented among the ranks of Distinguished and University Professors. In 2001 only 4.3 percent of all Distinguished Professors were women and 19.4 percent of University Professors were women.
Figure 11. Percentage of Resignations of New Tenure-Track Hires (1990-2000)
Figure 12. Resignation Curves for Male and Female Assistant Professors
Figure 13. Mean Income Growth Curve for Assistant Professors

(Data: 1994-2001)
(Cohort Size: Female: 108; Male: 151)
Figure 14. Index: Women Faculty Salaries Compared to Men Faculty Salaries, All Colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY94</th>
<th>FY95</th>
<th>FY96</th>
<th>FY97</th>
<th>FY98</th>
<th>FY99</th>
<th>FY2000</th>
<th>FY2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Prof</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Faculty included in this analysis are A-Base and B-Base tenure-track faculty listed in the University payroll files as of October 31, of each year. Department heads are included at their full salaries. Faculty with titles of director or titles equivalent to Assistant Dean and higher are excluded. Faculty on phased retirement appointments are also excluded.

The index is calculated by comparing the average salary for women in each department to the average salary for men in the same department. The university index is an average of all the department indices. An index of 1.0 is parity.

Figure 13 provides a visual representation of women and men faculty salaries for each year beginning in fiscal year 1994 and ending in fiscal year 2001. The index for this graph was calculated by comparing average salaries for women in each department to average, weighted or summed? salaries for men in the same department. The university index is an average of all the department indices. An index of 1.0 is parity. Note that by comparing women to men faculty within each department, any existing salary gaps between departments are obscured. The university index does not capture gaps in salaries produced, for example, as a result of the under-representation of women in departments with salaries that are higher than the overall campus average. Note also that because the index is calculated by comparing salaries within rank (Assistant, Associate and Full Professor) sex gaps produced by the under-representation of women faculty at Associate and Full professor levels are also obscured. Gaps shown in Figure 13 between women and men faculty salaries are therefore conservative estimates.

As shown by the solid line in Figure 13, at the Full Professor level women faculty salaries were about 1 percent higher than men’s within departments in FY 1994, but have been between 2 and 4 percent lower than men’s salaries in each year since 1994. As shown by the long dashed line in Figure 13, women Associate Professor salaries have ranged between 0 to 4 percent lower than men associate professor salaries within department since 1994. And as indicated by the short dashed line in Figure 13, women Assistant Professor salaries have ranged between 0 and 5 percent lower than men Assistant Professor salaries since 1994. Notice however that since 1999 women and men Assistant Professor salaries within department have been uniform.
Table 1. Women faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tenure Track</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non Tenure Track</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Iowa State University Distinguished and University Professors (based on October 2001 payroll)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Title</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Professors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Iowa State University Race/Ethnicity: Tenure-Track Faculty (based on October 2001 payroll)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Other</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Iowa State University, Department Chairs/Heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total University</strong>&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>The counts are based on the names of department chairs/heads listed by the Office of the Provost on its website as of April, 2002.

<sup>2</sup>The College of Business has five departments and only three department chairs/heads. The following departments share a department chair/head:

- Accounting and Finance
- Management and Marketing

<sup>3</sup>The sum of the number of department chairs/heads in each college adds to more than the total number of department chairs/heads for the university. This is because six departments are administered by two colleges. These department chairs/heads are counted in each college but only once in the university total.

- Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering (colleges of Agriculture and Engineering)
- Biochemistry and Biophysics (colleges of Agriculture and Liberal Arts and Sciences)
- Economics (colleges of Agriculture and Liberal Arts and Sciences)
- Food Science and Human Nutrition (colleges of Agriculture and Family and Consumer Sciences)
- Sociology (colleges of Agriculture and Liberal Arts and Sciences)
- Zoology and Genetics (colleges of Agriculture and Liberal Arts and Sciences)

Table 4 displays data on the percentage of women and men currently serving as department chairs/heads in each college across campus. Overall women hold 14.3 percent of the department chair positions. Note however that the representation of women in these positions is not symmetrical across campus. Women hold no chair positions in the colleges of Business, Design, Education, and Engineering. Women hold 2 of 3 chair positions in the College of Family and Consumer Science, but no more than 20 percent of the chair positions in the other colleges (Agriculture, Liberal Arts and Sciences, and Veterinary Medicine).