

UCI ADVANCE PROGRAM Annual Report
September 30, 2002

	Table of Contents	Page #
	Narrative	2
Table	Data	
1	Institution Wide Data - # and % faculty, yrs @ rank, time @ institution, salary	9
2	School of the Arts – Summary Data	10
3	School of Biological Science – Summary Data	10
4	College of Medicine – Basic Science – Summary Data	11
5	College of Medicine – Clinical Science – Summary Data	11
6	School of Engineering – Summary Data	12
7	Graduate School of Management – Summary Data	12
8	School of Humanities – Summary Data	13
9	Information & Computer Science – Summary Data	13
10	School of Physical Science – Summary Data	14
11	School of Social Ecology – Summary Data	14
12	School of Social Science – Summary Data	15
13	Number and percent current women and men full professors	15
14	Number and percent current women and men associate professors	16
15	Number of women in Endowed / Named Chairs	16
16	Number and percent women in administrative positions	17
17	Tenure Review Outcomes by Gender	17
18	Separations Stats by Gender	18
19	New hires by School	18
20	Number and percent women in non-tenure track positions	19

Advance Program First Year Report
September 30, 2002

The goal of the UCI Advance Program is to address gender inequities in the faculty by increasing the recruitment, retention and advancement of women across the entire university. The specific aims that we have proposed and are now operational are 1) appointment of School-based Faculty Equity Advisors and ADVANCE Term Chairs; 2) development and maintenance of a database of gender equity indicators; 3) increase the recruitment of women in fields in which they are underrepresented; 4) implementation of a faculty development program leading to retention and advancement of women in all areas. The first year progress report of our Work and Responsibilities, as listed in our Cooperative Agreement No. SEB-0123682 follows:

Section C.

1. PROGRAM ORGANIZATION:

The administration of the ADVANCE program is as follows:

Principal Investigator, Susan V. Bryant, 10 %

Co- PI, Herb Killackey, 10 %

Director, Priscilla Kehoe, 50 %

Coordinator, Dina Jankowski, 100 %

10 Equity advisors, 15 – 20 % time per individual

3 Researchers / Consultants, 10-12 % per individual

2. TIMELINE:

While the award was made October 1st, 2001, the necessary management and staff were not fully operational until January 2002, therefore our activities and fiscal status will be approximately 9-12 months behind the timeline originally created in some areas and a one year lag in other areas. For example, our Term Chairs will begin January 2003.

However, now that a successful organization is in place, the UCI ADVANCE Program has and will continue to make considerable progress toward our stated goals.

3. APPOINT AND TRAIN EQUITY ADVISORS:

From campus-wide faculty nominations, an Equity Advisor was selected from each of the eight SMET schools to a two-year term. The Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) resolved to finance the inclusion of the School of Arts and School of Humanities into the Advance Program and thus, an Equity Advisor representing each school on campus was chosen to assist in achieving the goals of the Program. The PI (Bryant), CoPI (Killackey), Director (Kehoe), Coordinator (Jankowski) and the 10 Equity Advisors comprise the ADVANCE Program Advisory Committee (APAC).

The APAC met approximately every other week, from January to June 2002. During those meetings the Equity Advisors were given workshops on appointments and promotions procedures from Associate Executive Vice Chancellor (AEVC) Killackey (CoPI), sexual harassment and discrimination information from Director Kirsten Quanbeck (Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity), awareness training seminar from Professor Judy Rosener (Graduate School of Management), mentoring instruction from

Professor Sue Duckles (College of Medicine), and ethnic diversity issues from Professor Duran Bell (Social Sciences). These workshops and the ensuing discussions were successful in educating the Equity Advisors on the issues integral to the institutional culture. Moreover, ways of removing the barriers that impede changes in the culture, as well as oversight of fair practices and procedures, were revealed. Following these sessions, the Equity Advisors carried out their functions with a greater knowledge of the available formalized and informal processes, the data that represent the state of the campus, and ways of dealing with the interpersonal issues that arise.

Two of the Equity Advisors had to resign their position, one from the School of Physical Sciences who left the campus on a one year sabbatical and the other because she was made interim Vice Dean of the Graduate School of Management (GSM). The Deans of both schools recommended replacements, both which are now in place. From the School of Physical Sciences we have Professor Richard Chamberlin and from GSM we have Professor John Graham. They have met with the ADVANCE Advisory Committee several times, demonstrating a commitment that will serve us well.

4. **TERM CHAIRS:**

To further the aims of the UCI ADVANCE Program for Gender Equity, we have proposed to appoint two Faculty Term Chairs to individuals of scholarly distinction that have a strong commitment to gender equity. The establishment of the ADVANCE Chairs will enhance the career development of the recipients, will provide a visible display of institutional commitment to gender equity, and will highlight the types of gender equity related activities that are rewarded. The recipients of the ADVANCE Chairs will have an ongoing commitment to the UCI ADVANCE Program and be an active member of the UCI ADVANCE Advisory Committee. The Term Chairs will provide the occupants with \$50,000/year for 5 years in discretionary funds to enhance their career development. At the end of the 5-year term, the recipients will be known as Senior ADVANCE chairs, without funds.

The process by which the ADVANCE Program can appoint two Term Chair was lengthy but now complete. The necessary approval has been obtained from the UCI Office of Advancement, UCI Academic Senate and the University of California Office of the President. We are now accepting nominations from the Deans of the eight SMET schools originally funded by the NSF Advance grant (Biological Sciences, COM, Engineering, GSM, ICS, Physical Sciences, Social Ecology, and Social Sciences). ADVANCE Chairs may be nominated from existing tenured faculty as well as newly recruited faculty. The nomination period will continue from October 1 to November 1, 2002, with the term of the ADVANCE Chairs beginning on January 1, 2003 and run through December 31, 2008.

Selection Criteria:

The recipients of these term chairs should have made significant contributions through research and or other creative activity that have had a major impact on their discipline, either through a career-long record of contributions, or as a result of a major contribution.

In addition, eligible individuals will have evidence of a tangible commitment to issues of gender equity in their teaching or service, involvement in activities that enhance the mission of the UCI ADVANCE Program such as demonstrated leadership and or accomplishment in issues of equity.

Selection Process:

Executive Vice Chancellor, Michael Gottfredson, will select the candidate with advice from a committee of five, comprised of

- S. Bryant, Dean of Biological Sciences and PI of the UCI ADVANCE Program grant
- H. Killackey, Associate Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Personnel and Co-PI of the NSF ADVANCE Program grant
- P. Kehoe, Director of the ADVANCE Program
- Dean of one of the 8 NSF ADVANCE grant schools not nominating a candidate
- Member of the Advisory Panel on Scholarly Honors and Awards (or two if all Dean's make a nomination)

5. **DATABASES:**

An important mechanism for the identification of barriers to full equity is an objective survey of the current conditions on campus. The UCI Office of Academic Personnel, directed by the Co-PI Killackey has provided the ADVANCE Program with data that include information required by NSF and necessary for the quantitative database we have proposed to develop and maintain. To supplement the collection of all the components required for the database, the researchers (Professors Judy Stepan-Norris, Matt Huffman and a graduate student) have developed a survey of individual faculty and chairs that deal with climate issues as well as items that lead to inequities. The Internal Review Board (IRB) has reviewed the survey several times and has now offered only minor criticisms related to the maintenance of confidentiality. We have made the few changes to the consent form, etc., and returned the survey to the IRB for an expedited review. It should be approved and ready for use in November.

The proposed qualitative database, to be obtained by the use of individual faculty interviews, is currently being developed by Professor Kristen Monroe with the assistance of a graduate student and postdoctoral student.

6. **GENDER EQUITY IN RECRUITMENT:**

- a. One of the key methods to change the institutional culture on campus is through the increased recruitment of women. To do this we must remove barriers that have been in place for too long and have impeded our ability to hire women across the campus. We have instituted checks and balances in the system that we hope will improve the process of recruitment. One example is the examination of search committee composition by the office of the EVC,

- b. so that each committee is assured of having both men and women as members. As of this week (September 30, 2002), new forms are being generated for all search committees in which the Equity Advisor must sign and certify that all is in order for the committee to carry out the search. The Equity Advisor will make certain that the search committee membership is appropriate, that the position is as broadly defined as possible, that the advertisement is placed in publications that will give us the best return, etc.
- c. We have developed and started using a recruitment manual that contains a list of Best Practices for the chair of the search committee and another list for the committee members. Included in the recruitment manual are the California Affirmative Action laws and the University of California guidelines for recruitment as well as several informative articles, The MIT Report and Is There an Unconscious Discrimination Against Women in Science? by Howard Georgi. The recruitment manual is available in hard copy and is now a PDF file on our website.

We have now determined that the recruitment manual provides assistance to the chair of the search committee but is often neglected by the committee members themselves. To counter this difficulty, we are developing a pamphlet for each school that will contain the Best Practices that are most pertinent for that particular school's needs. Included in the pamphlet will be the best places to advertise, the dos and don'ts of interviews, etc. The Equity Advisors are now in the process of developing these recruitment pamphlets that are school-specific and compact enough that search committee members will read it.

During the year the PIs, Director and Equity Advisors have met with search committees to orient them on the best practices for recruitment and answered questions concerning affirmative action. For the most part, the orientation was well received and awareness of the issues raised.

- d. A flow chart that addresses each stage of the recruitment process has been developed and will be instituted across the campus. The chart begins with the allocation of FTE to the department by the dean, advising the Equity Advisor of the future search, formation of the search committee, a scheduled meeting of the Equity Advisor with the search committee, examination and approval of the entire search plan by the Equity Advisor and the Dean. The chart also includes candidate availability data for the search. Each dean will, amongst other activities, examine short-listed candidates for approval and conclude with the tentative offer to the candidate.

As an addition to our program of Equity Advisors, we plan to institute the position of Community Equity Advisor, an individual that will attend to the problem of lack of ethnic diversity within the faculty at UCI. We have proposed that the UCI ADVANCE Program divert funds from discipline-based conferences to fund one Community Equity Advisor so that we can make every effort to recruit women of color to our faculty. The Executive Vice Chancellor, in conjunction with the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, will support two more Community Equity Advisors so that UCI can make every effort to recruit and retain men and women of color to the faculty. As with the Equity Advisors in place now, we will carry out nominations of tenured faculty that are

committed to ethnic diversity and gender equity. Once selected, these individuals will be Faculty Assistants to the Associate Executive Vice Chancellor giving them access to the Office of Academic Personnel and the necessary assistance to carry out their mission. The Community Equity Advisors will work in conjunction with the ADVANCE Program Advisory Committee to offer advice and expertise on recruitment mechanisms used to assure a diverse pool for all searches. Furthermore they will work closely with the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity to make certain that impartial practices are carried out in recruitment, retention and advancement for ethnically diverse faculty.

7. MENTOR PROGRAM:

We are in the process of developing a faculty orientation and mentoring program. The major goal of the orientation program is to ensure that assistant professors clearly understand the process of academic personnel review, criteria for promotion and the timing of reviews. Equity Advisors will schedule individual one-hour meetings with each assistant professor at two points: shortly after arrival and in the summer before the mid-career review (third year at rank). A handbook for assistant professors will be published that covers all the pertinent issues and will be distributed at the time of the first orientation session.

The session held before the mid-career review will focus on preparation of materials for the upcoming review with an emphasis on review criteria. A discussion about the eight-year rule, access to records and childrearing policies, etc. will be held with the assistant professor. Review of each individual's curriculum vitae will make it possible to address specific issues and to encourage the candidate to strengthen areas of weakness. This meeting will also provide an opportunity to answer specific questions, discuss alternative strategies with the candidate, and anticipate upcoming issues.

Mentoring: In an effort to strengthen career development of assistant professors at the college level, a program of "Strategic Planning" is being instituted. A small group of senior faculty will meet every six months with each assistant professor making it possible to obtain independent advice. Some schools want these mentoring groups to be from outside of the individual's department, and other schools want to have a group from within. The important issue is that the faculty are familiar with University processes as well as the national research environment. Before each meeting, assistant professors will be asked to complete a set of goals in the areas of research, teaching and service, including both short-term (6 months) and long-term (1-2 years) goals in each area. These lists of goals form the basis for a half-hour meeting with a committee of senior faculty (3-4). In order to relieve anxiety, assistant professors will be reminded at each meeting that the purpose is to assist them, that no records are kept, and the agenda is theirs. Assistant professors are encouraged to focus their efforts and will be reminded of institutional resources available to them. This is also an opportunity for very busy young faculty to pause and assess their progress on a regular basis, as well as set appropriate goals.

8. INVESTIGATE AND ELIMINATE INEQUITIES:

The Equity Advisors have been directed to investigate inequities that may exist for some faculty. Thus far, the most compelling case for gender inequity has been in the area of salaries. In fact, a significant example of gender inequity can be seen in the salary residual data for women faculty in each school posted on our web site. The EVC's office

provided the Deans with a list of those faculty whose salary may warrant further examination and because of their position as Faculty Assistant to the Dean, the Equity Advisors are privy to this confidential information. This allows them to explore significant differences in salaries as well as investigate the veracity of claims brought to their attention by faculty members. Because the Academic Personnel procedures for advancement within the University needed further clarification, the EVC has directed the Office of Academic Personnel to develop a communication to the faculty to outline the available processes. This will make it easier for the Equity Advisors to direct individuals to the established mechanism and for the faculty themselves to seek an equity review.

9. RECRUITMENT AND ADVANCEMENT

See #6. In addition to the mandate and actions we have taken as shown in #6 to improve gender equity in recruitment, we are extremely pleased to report we have made some strides in the advancement of women faculty. The APAC has suggested that an important part of the selection and review process for Deans and Chairs should always include a formidable commitment to equity and diversity. The EVC strongly concurred and further suggested that the Equity Advisors should meet with selection and review committees as part of University policy. The policy proposed by the EVC, the work of Co-PI Killackey, and the Equity Advisors has led to an environment that features fair practices and procedures. Most recently, a woman faculty member has been promoted to the position as Dean in the School of Social Sciences and another woman faculty as Interim Dean in the School of Graduate Management, with two women Vice Deans. We now have six women Deans out of the ten schools on campus, providing the necessary administration to carry out the goals of the program, i.e. recruitment, retention and advancement of women faculty.

Last November, Director Priscilla Kehoe made a presentation on gender equity to the Executive Vice Chancellor's Academic Council that includes all Deans. A second presentation is being prepared for October to address where we are and what changes need to occur to make further progress. Other presentations on gender equity were made to the departmental chairs and several Academic Senate committees, including the Council on Academic Personnel. Our consultant on gender equity in the workplace, Professor Judy Rosener, has given the Equity Advisors a workshop on awareness of gender issues. In her workshop, Dr. Rosener addressed the stages of awareness and action, from stage 1 "We're Staying Out Of trouble" to stage 5 "It's Part Of The Culture." She also presented theories on "One Best Model", "Practices That Reinforce Assimilation", "Sexual Static" and "Lessons Learned From Others." In addition to these workshops, we had Professor Nancy Hopkins present the MIT story to the general faculty.

Just recently we had several presentations on "gender schemas" by Professor Virginia Valian. In the morning, she met with the Equity Advisors for a critique of our program and suggestions for improvement, at noon she gave a presentation to faculty, including Chairs and Deans, and another in the afternoon to mainly graduate students. Professor Valian's advice and information were extremely valuable, helping us sculpt our program to be more efficient as well as lending credence to the basic problem and solutions for

women in academia to our faculty and students in general. One suggestion we will take seriously is to have each Equity Advisor form an advisory committee within their school to assist them in the many duties they have to carry out. One Equity Advisor decided to call on the most respected scholars in his school to become part of his advisory panel, an undertaking that appears to be promising.

10. DEVELOPMENT, RETENTION AND ADVANCEMENT:

Each of the Equity Advisors has met with many senior faculty in their school. These meetings were both informative and productive. Individuals were able to voice concerns about the climate for women and underrepresented minorities. Specific concerns included interactions with colleagues, pay equity, and sexual harassment, to name a few. In meeting with Deans, Chairs, Departments and individuals, the Equity Advisors are raising awareness about the need to retain and advance women in their school. In an effort to improve visibility as well as value, the Equity Advisors are encouraging colleagues and administrators to nominate senior women faculty to endowed or named chairs and other distinguished awards and honors.

11. EVALUATION MECHANISMS:

We are in the early stages of developing and implementing evaluation mechanisms in order to monitor our progress. Thus far we have examined and evaluated our baseline data which includes: number and percentage of woman faculty: in tenure-track S&E, Arts and Humanities, by rank, department and school, in non-tenure-track positions, in administrative positions, on promotion and tenure committees, in endowed or named chair positions and on search committees. We are in the process of evaluating any and all changes that have occurred since the onset of our program, with the caveat that we were not fully operational until January 2002. The data attached to this report demonstrate that we have made some progress in the area of administration, adding 2 women Deans to the 4 that were previously in place. The School of Biological Sciences has made good progress in the recruitment of women faculty compared to previous years. We do not see such an improvement yet in the other schools on campus, however, we are confident that this will change with our recruitment strategies as they are instituted over time. We will be presenting the current data to the UCI Academic Council (EVC, Deans & Administrators) meeting in November, with recommendations on how to proceed to correct inequities still remaining. We will continue to internally evaluate data for progress on a semi-annual basis.

12. DATABASE:

See attached tables and their captions.

13. DISSEMINATION:

We have developed a recruitment manual described in section 6c. The recruitment manual, intended to assist search committees, is available by hard copy and PDF file via our web site at advance.uci.edu. Also in development is a pamphlet, designed as a school-specific abridged version of the recruitment manual, to be distributed to all faculty.

Our main method of dissemination is our website. The website has been developed as a tool for dissemination of information and data. Items currently listed on the site are: letter of support by the Executive Vice Chancellor, an overview of the ADVANCE program mission and goals, an organizational chart of program members including profiles for each, a listing of other NSF ADVANCE Institutional Transformation awardees, recruitment manual including best practices, listing of professional societies assisting in networking and employment, foundations offering grants, list of publications for students and professors, links to employment opportunities and support services including information on child care, education and housing at UCI, highlights of distinguished honors and awards, equity data for UCI and the UC system and salary residual data.

Data – University of California, Irvine
Annual Report 9/30/02

Given that all schools on campus are participating in the UCI ADVANCE Program, we are presenting gender equity data for the entire University of California Irvine as part of our first year report. For the most part, all data are derived from the most recent Academic Personnel annual report, October 31, 2001.

Table 1 represents the institution as a whole in terms of number and percent of tenure-track women at each rank, the average number of years for both men and women at their present rank, the average amount of time they have spent at the institution, the average salary for each rank, and the difference in salary between women and men. In general, there are 24% women tenure-track faculty with 18%, 33% and 31%, full, associate and assistant women professors, respectively. In the full and associate positions, the men are in rank and at the institution longer and salary differences are 4.6% and 1.4% less for women. At the assistant rank, the women are in rank slightly longer and are still receiving 5.9% less salary than the men assistant professors.

TABLE 1

University of California, Irvine – October 31, 2001 Institution Wide										
RANK	Number		%	Yrs @ rank		Time @ Institution		Salary		
	F	M	F	F	M	F	M	F	M	Difference (W - M)
Full	92	404	18	7.8	11.7	14.6	18.0	97,512.	109,292	- 11,780.
Associate	63	125	33	4.8	5.1	8.8	9.3	71,641.	72,673.	- 1,032.
Assistant	61	133	31	2.4	1.6	2.4	1.6	59,614.	63,372.	- 3,758.
Total:	216	662	24%							

Table 2- 12 represent each of the Schools on the UCI campus in the same manner as described in Table 1. (Faculty of the College of Medicine are separated by Basic Sciences and Clinical Medicine). The data represented in these tables constitute part of the database upon which the UCI ADVANCE Program will evaluate its ability to transform the culture of the institution, whereby fewer inequities will exist among faculty as a whole, and for women in particular.

TABLE 2

University of California, Irvine – October 31, 2001 Arts										
RANK	Number		%	Yrs @ rank		Time @ Institution		Salary		
	W	M	W	W	M	W	M	W	M	Difference (W - M)
Full	10	11	49	5.3	9.73	12.3	18.18			-13,763.
Associate	3	10	23	3.33	5.8	9.67	11.3			3,020.
Assistant	4	8	34	2.75	.63	2.75	.63			63.
Total:	17	29	37%							

TABLE 3

University of California, Irvine – October 31, 2001 School of Biological Sciences										
RANK	Number		%	Yrs @ rank		Time @ Institution		Salary		
	W	M	W	W	M	W	M	W	M	Difference (W - M)
Full	10	44	19	10.8	12.25	18.8	19.5			-11,339.
Associate	2	10	20	2.5	4.8	7.0	9.6			
Assistant	1	13	7	0	2.1	0	2.38			
Total:	13	67	16%							

TABLE 4

University of California, Irvine – October 31, 2001 College of Medicine – Basic Sciences										
RANK	Number		%	Yrs @ rank		Time @ Institution		Salary		
	W	M	W	W	M	W	M	W	M	Difference (W - M)
Full	6	36	14	8.	13.1	16.	20.2			-11,111.
Associate	3	6	34	2.33	2.33	7.	13.8			-8,334.
Assistant	4	6	40	3.75	3.75	3.75	1.6			1,242.
Total:	13	48	22%							

TABLE 5

University of California, Irvine – October 31, 2001 College of Medicine - Clinical										
RANK	Number		%	Yrs @ rank		Time @ Institution		Salary		
	W	M	W	W	M	W	M	W	M	Difference (W - M)
Full	10	53	16	7.6	13.9	14.1	17.7			-16,821.
Associate	1	20	5	11.0	6.35	19.0	11.1			
Assistant	3	18	14	1.33	1.17	3.0	1.6			-2,561.
Total:	14	91	13%							

TABLE 6

University of California, Irvine – October 31, 2001 School of Engineering										
RANK	Number		%	Yrs @ rank		Time @ Institution		Salary		
	W	M	W	W	M	W	M	W	M	Difference (W - M)
Full	1	43	2	1.	8.2	13.	14.6			
Associate	5	12	29	4.6	3.5	7.4	7.1			1,612.
Assistant	3	15	17	2.	1.3	2.	1.4			-3,480.
Total:	9	70	11%							

TABLE 7

University of California, Irvine – October 31, 2001 Graduate School of Management										
RANK	Number		%	Yrs @ rank		Time @ Institution		Salary		
	W	M	W	W	M	W	M	W	M	Difference (W - M)
Full	5	16	24	3.	9.	15.4	13.9			-4,606.
Associate	3	3	50	5.7	4.3	12.7	7.3			2,400.
Assistant	4	10	29	3.	2.7	3.	2.7			-6,920.
Total:	12	29	30%							

TABLE 8

University of California, Irvine – October 31, 2001 School of Humanities										
RANK	Number		%	Yrs @ rank		Time @ Institution		Salary		
	W	M	W	W	M	W	M	W	M	Difference (W - M)
Full	18	53	25	6.7	12.3	13.4	19.6			-12,601.
Associate	25	14	65	5.2	4.3	8.5	7.9			3,178.
Assistant	22	14	60	2.5	1.6	2.6	1.6			2,244.
Total:	65	81	45%							

TABLE 9

University of California, Irvine – October 31, 2001 Information & Computer Science										
RANK	Number		%	Yrs @ rank		Time @ Institution		Salary		
	W	M	W	W	M	W	M	W	M	Difference (W - M)
Full	2	15	12	3.5	7.4	6.5	15.2			
Associate	2	11	16	5.5	2.5	12.	4.8			
Assistant	3	6	33	2.7	.8	2.3	.7			-466.
Total:	7	32	18%							

TABLE 10

University of California, Irvine – October 31, 2001 School of Physical Sciences										
RANK	Number		%	Yrs @ rank		Time @ Institution		Salary		
	W	M	W	W	M	W	M	W	M	Difference (W- M)
Full	5	69	7	7.6	13.3	13.	18.7			-20,581.
Associate	4	11	26	5.8	8.5	8.6	12.5			7,257.
Assistant	2	19	10	6.	1.5	6.	1.5			
Total:	11	99	10%							

TABLE 11

University of California, Irvine – October 31, 2001 School of Social Ecology										
RANK	Number		%	Yrs @ rank		Time @ Institution		Salary		
	W	M	W	W	M	W	M	W	M	Difference (W - M)
Full	10	18	35	11.5	9.9	16.4	18.3			5,533.
Associate	5	10	33	5.2	6.2	10.6	11.9			-1,090.
Assistant	6	5	55	2.2	1.4	2.2	1.4			1,153.
Total:	21	33	39%							

TABLE 12

University of California, Irvine – October 31, 2001 School of Social Sciences										
RANK	Number		%	Yrs @ rank		Time @ Institution		Salary		
	W	M	W	W	M	W	M	W	M	Difference (W - M)
Full	15	45	25	9	11.5	14.6	18.			-9,109.
Associate	10	15	40	3.7	5.	7.4	9.1			-786.
Assistant	7	15	32	.9	2.5	.9	2.4			-1,985.
Total:	32	75	30%							

Table 13 represents the history of the current women and men full Professors at UCI in terms of how many and what percent were hired as Assistant, Associate or full Professors and the number of years that each group remained in each rank.

TABLE 13

History of Current Full Professors at UCI						
Hired in as:	Women		Men		Years at Rank	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Women	Men
Full	32	35	132	33	8.1	12
Associate	13	14	72	18	6.2	5.7
Assistant	47	51	199	49	4.7	4.5
Total:	92		403			

Table 14 represents the history of the current women and men Associate Professors at UCI in terms of how many and what percent were hired as Assistant and Associate Professors and the number of years that each group remained at each rank.

TABLE 14

History of Current Associate Professors at UCI						
Hired in as:	Women		Men		Years at Rank	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Women	Men
Associate	16	25	21	17	4.8	5.3
Assistant	47	75	103	83	5.17	4.94
Total:	63		124			

Table 15 represents the number of endowed chairs and how many are occupied by women and men. The 18 endowed chairs that are vacant include the two ADVANCE term chairs (UCI and NSF are co-sponsoring the chairs) that are now available for nominations and will be filled by the end of the year.

TABLE 15

ENDOWED / NAMED CHAIRS 01-02			
Total Chairs	Women	Men	Vacant
49	5	30	18

Table 16 represents the number and percent of women faculty in administrative positions for the years 2001 and 2002. In fact the number of Deans that are now women increased by 2, that is 6 of the 10 Deans are now women. The Graduate School of Management has an interim Dean while the search gets under way and the search for a Dean of Social Science resulted in the appointment of a women. These appointments were made with active participation of the UCI ADVANCE Equity Advisors, making certain that university processes are carried out and all faculty involved are represented. The Executive Vice Chancellor has demonstrated that commitment and service to gender equity and ethnic diversity are a necessary part of any Dean's evaluation.

For the position of department Chair, the number of women chairs has been reduced by 2, with only 22% of the Chairs being women this year. The process is now being implemented in which the evaluation of department Chairs will include their commitment and progress towards achieving gender equity in the recruitment, retention and advancement of their faculty.

TABLE 16

Number and Percent of Women faculty in administrative Positions 2001-2002							
School	Women Deans		Total number of Chairs by school	# & % Women Chairs 2001		# & % Women Chairs 2002	
	2001	2002		#	%	#	%
Arts	1	1	4	2	50	1	25
Biological Science	1	1	4	0	0	0	0
College of Medicine	0	0	25	4	16	4	16
Engineering	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
Graduate School of Management	0	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Humanities	1	1	14	6	43	6	43
Information & Computer Science	1	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Physical Science	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
Social Ecology	0	0	4	1	25	1	25
Social Science	0	1	7	3	38	2	29
Total Campus	4	6	65	16	25%	14	22%

Table 17 represents the outcome of tenure reviews by gender for the last 5 years up to 2001. The number of denials are few and do not seem to differ by gender, given the sample size for women is small. These data do not offer any evidence about the number of women or men that might have left prior to tenure review. With input from the Office of Academic Personnel, we are working towards developing a measure to determine how many assistant professors leave prior to tenure review and the reason for their leaving.

TABLE 17

Tenure Review Outcomes by Gender 1996 - 2001								
	# Reviews		# Promotions		# Denials		Reappt. / Other **	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	# W	#M	Women	Men
2000-01	6	19	3	13	2	2	1	4
1999-00	5	20	5	14	0	3	0	3
1998-99	8	13	8	12	0	0	0	1
1997-98	9	11	7	10	1	1	0	0
1996-97	7	14	1	14	0	0	0	0

Table 18 represents the number of faculty separations for the last 5 years organized in general categories for those that have resigned, retired or deceased. At this juncture, we do not have data to assist us in determining the reason for those who have resigned. In conjunction with the Office of Academic Personnel and Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, the UCI ADVANCE Program will develop a more expedient process for exit interviews that will provide information about resignations due to perceived inequities.

TABLE 18

SEPARATION STATS BY GENDER										
Reasons:	1997		1998		1999		2000		2001	
Gender	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M
Resignation	10	11	3	20	2	9	5	7	2	3
Retirement	1	9	2	4		7	1	5		13
Death				1			1			
Total:	11	21	5	25	2	16	7	12	2	16

Table 19 represents those tenure-track faculty that were employed since October 31, 2001, the date from which most of our data were derived. In the table, we show the number of newly hired faculty for each of the 10 schools on campus broken down by gender and percent women. While the UCI ADVANCE Program is only in existence for one year, we believe we have made at least a modest impact in our recruiting efforts. The Schools of Social Ecology, Humanities and Arts hired 60%, 57% and 50% women faculty, respectively, a record marginally better than previous years. However, the newly hired faculty in the School of Biological Sciences are 50% women, an outstanding improvement from previous years. For the other six schools, our recruitment efforts are underway, but have not progressed enough to make a difference in the number of women faculty employed this year.

TABLE 19

NEW HIRES Oct. 31, 2001 - 9/30/02				
School	Total new faculty	Newly hired Women	Newly hired Men	% Women
Social Ecology	5	3	2	60
Humanities	14	8	6	57
Arts	4	2	2	50
Biological Sciences	7	3.5	3.5	50
Information & Computer Science	4.5	1	3.5	23
College of Medicine	13	2.5	10.5	19
Social Sciences	16	3	13	19
Engineering	11.5	1	10.5	9
Physical Sciences	11	1	10	9
Graduate School of Management	1	0	1	0
Total New Faculty:	87	25	62	29%

Table 20 represents the number and percent of women in non-tenure track positions in each of the 10 schools at UCI. Women hold 32% of non-tenure track positions, while a small number compared to men, it is significantly greater than the 24% of the tenure-track positions are held by women. The UCI ADVANCE Program intends to explore the issue of women in non-tenure track positions and whether they can be recruited for more prestigious positions.

TABLE 20

Number (#) and Percentage (%) of Women in Non-Tenure track positions As of October 1, 2001			
School	Total Faculty	# Women	% Women
Arts	130	52	40
Biological Science	264	93	35.2
College of Medicine	865	280	32.4
Engineering	160	21	13
Graduate School of Management	67	20	30
Humanities	286	148	52
Information & Computer Science	78	10	13
Physical Science	268	38	14
Social Ecology	83	39	47
Social Science	184	61	33
Total Campus	2385	762	31.9%