**Institutional Data:**

**MSU's Candidate Pipeline**

Early in the life of ADVANCE Project TRACS, much time was spent responding to common views about challenges related to diversifying the faculty. Below are examples from the ADVANCE Search Toolkit of responses that were, and are still, offered regarding efforts to cultivate diversity in the faculty recruiting process.

### RESPONSES TO COMMON VIEWS

- There are no women in our field, and those who are available are in high demand and MSU can't compete with our low salaries. Though women and minorities are scarce in some fields, it is rarely the case that there are none. In a study by Turner (in Diversifying the Faculty: the majority -54% of prestigious Ford Fellowship recipients of all whom are minorities) were not aggressively pursued for faculty positions despite holding postdoctoral research appointments for up to six years. Only 11% of women/minority scholars were recruited by several institutions thus, the remaining 89% were not involved in any "competitive bidding war."

- I am fully in favor of diversity, but we have to hire the best candidate. True. But what is the "best"? As mentioned previously, the criteria for "best" is a moving target. What is best for the department? The university? The students? Diverse faculty members can enhance the educational experience of students and can help enhance academic and research excellence. "Academic meritocracy." Although scholars have long believed that they select the best candidates based on objective criteria, decisions are in reality influenced by subtle biases about race, sex, sexual orientation, and age that have nothing to do with the quality of a candidate's work. A 2012 study published in PNAS by Mont Ramus et al., showed science professors given identical resumes for a lab manager raised the applicant with a man's name as more competent and offered $4000 more in starting salary than when the applicant had a woman's name. Both men and women science faculty showed this bias.

- But I am not biased. Even with the best of intentions, people have familiar others, those who look and think like us. This is why it is so difficult to broaden participation. Everyone has implicit connections between concepts. Decades of research on the Implicit Association Test at Harvard for example shows that both men and women associate "science" with non-minority men. The important thing is to acknowledge we all have these implicit associations to some extent and challenge ourselves and our colleagues to speak openly about these issues. To get the conversation started take the Harvard Implicit Association Test at: https://implicit.harvard.edu

**MSU’s experience overcoming the problem of the “leaky pipeline”:**

- A randomized field experiment, blocked by college, was conducted with all 23 STEM searches in one academic year (intervention n=14).
- Ruled out alternative explanations (number of women on the search committee; percentage of PhDs awarded nationally to women in that field)
- Compared to searches in the no-intervention condition, searches in the intervention:
  - phone interviewed significantly more women (p<.05)
  - on-campus interviewed a significantly greater proportion of women (p<.05).
  - 6.3 times more likely to make an offer to a woman candidate, and
  - Women candidates were 5.8 times more likely to accept the offer.
- Overall, results suggest that the intervention was effective in broadening the participation of women faculty in STEM.
- 14 Women in STEM/SBS were hired to start in Fall 2013 (48.3% of STEM hires)

(Smith et al., Bioscience, 2015)

---

**Below are data extracted from the Applicant Tracking System (ATS) for three tenure-track faculty searches at MSU in Spring 2015. The chart does not contain who accepted the offer.**

- Each search had undergone ADVANCE’s search training using the ADVANCE Project TRACS Search Toolkit.
- Applicants self-identified their race and gender, and were able to opt out of answering the EEO questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Letters &amp; Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Applicant Pool</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 101, 28% female</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 192, 11% female</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 112, 43% female</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Interview Pool</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 8, 38% female</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 15, 20% female</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 4, 25% female</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Interview Pool</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 4, 50% female</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 9, 33% female</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 4, 25% female</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended for Hire</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 2, 100% female</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 5, 40% female</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 1, 0% female</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To Consider:** Knowing that we can access these data, what types of analyses would be useful in understanding pipeline-related issues?
**Institutional Data: Advancing Equity Campus-Wide**

**Subtle Bias:**
- There is a gender gap within academia whereby men outpace women in terms of representation and in terms of earnings. (AAUP, 2014).
- Salary disparities across gender is a subtle bias problem, and favor males (Moss-Racusin et al., 2012).
- When evaluating women and men, we tend to apply different standards to success, even when told to base judgments relative to an “average person” (Biernat, Manis, & Nelson, 1991).
- In salary negotiations, women are likely to receive backlash if they show assertiveness (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010).
- For Academic Year 2015-16, female faculty at public universities earned 83% of what their male counterparts earned (AAUP 2015-2016 Faculty Compensation Survey, Survey Report Table 3, 2016).

**2015-2016 Staff Salaries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY16 Classified Employee Salary by Gender and Longevity</th>
<th>FY16 Professional Employee Salary by Gender and Longevity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FTE Annual Salary Range</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-30K</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40K</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50K</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60K</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70K</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-80K</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80K+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100K+</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To Consider: Given that women are over-represented in the lowest paid fields and jobs on campus, what strategies can we use to close the pay gap?**

**2015-2016 Faculty Salaries**

**TT Faculty National Salary Comparison by Gender**

**Regression Analysis of Faculty Salaries**

**Model 1**
- Constant – Male: 83,316,023, 1,277,303
- Female: -11,670,229, 2,002,257, -237
- R² = .056

**Model 2**
- Constant – Male, Assistant: 66,907,399, 1,632,684
- Female: -3,728,303, 1,653,500, -.076
- Professor: 33,847,831, 1,993,359, .659
- Associate: 5,526,998, 1,924,473, .108
- R² = .403

**Model 3**
- Constant – Male, Assistant, Field - Other: 60,089,592, 1,882,829
- Female: -1,214,868, 1,641,518, -.025
- Professor: 32,550,042, 1,936,000, .633
- Associate: 6,316,024, 1,861,767, .123
- Field - STEM: 10,741,822, 1,677,902, .221
- Field - SBS: 9,960,378, 2,737,055, .120
- R² = .446

Dependent Variable: Salary
- *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
In 1976, five female faculty members sued MSU for unequal treatment.

The courts ruled in favor of the female faculty members, and determined that all contract position search committees must have “not less than 25% female representation”

Implications of the “25% Rule”

In a department, if less than 25% of the faculty are females or minorities, this necessarily results in a disproportionate service load.

Example of Policy:

MSU Faculty Handbook 241.01 University Promotion and Tenure Membership

“At least twenty-five percent (25%) of the membership of the committee shall be women; if this membership is not achieved by election, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall appoint such additional membership as may be necessary to achieve that representation.”

Mecklenburg v. Montana State Board of Regents 1976 Decision:

III. UNDERUTILIZATION OF FEMALES

A. Subject to the approval of the Board of Regents, the President will promulgate the Director of the School of Nursing to Dean status by 1 July 1976. (The male Director of the School of Business will be also named as Dean.)

B. As part of the governance change to a University Council system that requires minority and female representation, the President will dissolve the Administrative Council and President’s Forums replace them with an Operations Council that will include, as full members, the new female Dean noted above, at least three other female.

C. The Academic Personnel Board (new name) will be augmented by three women (normally that will mean 35% female representation and up to 44% when nurses are involved). The President will appoint three females at Associate or Professor rank now. Effective AY 1976-77, the female members will be appointed by the President from a slate of Associate Professors and Professors nominated by the University Council.

D. The President will issue a memorandum asking the University Council Committee to consider particular cases in assigning minority and female representation on all standing committees (currently the committees are about 34% women. Our current faculty is approximately 25% women.

E. Although the University is not prepared to terminate male faculty and administrators performing satisfactorily to hire females, the President will require a search committee, including not less than 25% female representation, for all future Regent contract positions and will actively encourage recruitment and selection of female and minority applicants for new openings and replacements if those qualifications are at least equal to male applicants. Additionally, at least one member on each search committee shall appoint the department concerned. Uniform procedures for organized search committees will be established. Female members of selection committees will have the right to submit a minority report to the President when a committee recommends hiring a male instead of a female applicant. The President makes the final determination on recommendations to the Regents.

F. Additionally, the President will encourage the Director of the School of Nursing to actively recruit male nursing faculty.

G. All administrative openings will be carefully maintained to determine if they could be filled by current MSU staff, male or female. Every effort will be made to eliminate unnecessary criteria which inhibit the ability of current staff to be promoted. Search committees will be asked to carefully consider local faculty applications. The special female member reporting rights noted in i above also apply.

To Consider: As we hire a more diverse cohort of assistant professors, do we need to evaluate unequal service burdens within the P and T process?