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## About the Women's Power Gap

The Women's Power Gap Initiative at the Eos Foundation seeks to dramatically increase the number of women leaders from a diverse set of backgrounds across all sectors of the economy in Massachusetts. We conduct and commission actionable research on prominent sectors of the economy, measure the extent of the power gap, and propose solutions to reach parity. Wherever possible, we capture data on racial and ethnic diversity. In 2018, in addition to the WPG in Higher Education study, we issued a report of Massachusetts Public Boards and Commissions as well as the top Business Advocacy Organizations in the state. We will be publishing a WPG in K-12 education report in the spring of 2020 in partnership with the Rennie Center for Education. For updates on the Initiative and to learn more, visit WomensPowerGap.org.

## About the Wage Project

The WAGE Project (WAGE) is a grassroots nonprofit dedicated to a single goal: to eliminate the gender wage gap. After devoting more than a decade to advancing women's earning power throughout the country through the delivery of salary negotiation workshops, WAGE now focuses on transforming workplaces and employers' practices of hiring, promoting, and retaining women, especially women of color. In this regard, WAGE sees the elimination of the Women's Power Gap as essential to significantly reduce the gender wage gap.
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## PREFACE

In 2018, the Women's Power Gap Initiative published our first report on women's leadership at the highest levels within Massachusetts' institutions of higher education. We chose to focus on the higher education industry because we believe the sector could and should lead the way for other sectors to achieve gender parity

> We chose to focus on the higher education industry because we believe the sector could and should lead the way for other sectors to achieve gender parity at the top.

at the top. We found that while women had made significant inroads into the "pipeline positions" to the presidency (primarily provosts and deans), they were not proportionately represented as presidents. This finding indicates that the lack of parity among the total number of female presidents across the 92 schools cannot be explained as a "pipeline" problem, leading us to question whether implicit bias is at play. We see the same glass ceiling phenomenon at the CEO level in corporate America, so we should not be surprised to find it in academia, as well.
Our goal was to launch a positive public dialogue among leaders in higher education, state government, students, alumni, and the public at large. It has been a busy year and we have seen some real progress. Of the 14 presidential transitions for the 2018/2019 academic year, women were selected for $50 \%$ of those positions, adding a total of five net new women presidents to the field. Women now hold 34 of 92 presidencies or $37 \%$, which is a significant gain over the $31 \%$ they held in 2018. Three of those institutions, Massasoit Community College, Williams College, and the New England Conservatory of Music, welcomed their first female presidents.

## We found that while women had made

 significant inroads into the "pipeline positions" to the presidency (primarily provosts and deans), they were not proportionately represented as presidents.Our public community colleges and private master's and bachelor's colleges have achieved gender parity among the total number of their presidents, with women leading eight of 15 community colleges and 17 of 33 private colleges. The community colleges also led in racial/ethnic representation. The gender and racial/ ethnic balance community colleges have achieved is both
remarkable and essential to their mission: Remarkable given the relatively lower pay they are able to offer administrative and academic leaders which means they must cast a very wide and inclusive net in looking for talent. Essential because community colleges face a unique set of challenges since they serve many lowincome students of color with the greatest risk factors for college persistence. Having leaders who reflect their student body is a key component to overcome the persistence challenge. We found that community colleges have some of the most advanced diversity practices and policies among all categories of schools, presenting an important learning opportunity for the field.
We are pleased that 63 of 92 institutions in this year's study verified gender and racial data. This racial data is perhaps the most significant addition to the report, and we thank those schools for their time, collaboration, and interest in our work. Additionally, my colleague Marta Rosa and I engaged in deep conversation with a sizeable cross-section of 20 schools to identify effective diversity and inclusion practices; a separate publication documenting those findings and case studies will soon be released.
I hope you read this report carefully and thoroughly. I welcome your feedback and your involvement as we work together to make Massachusetts institutions of higher education the gold standard for the country with respect to inclusive leadership.


Andrea Silbert
President, Eos Foundation


## THE NUMBERS AT A GLANCE <br> DATA AS OF MAY 15, 2019

## Progress

- 50\% of the $\mathbf{1 4}$ new presidents appointed during academic year 2019 were Women OUTGOING COHORT (AY18 PRESIDENTS)


INCOMING COHORT (AY19 PRESIDENTS)


- Three schools - Massasoit Community College, New England Conservatory of Music, and Williams college added their first female presidents
- Massachusetts' 15 community college presidents count $\mathbf{8}$ women and $\mathbf{4}$ women of color
- The pipeline is full! Women are $\mathbf{4 8 \%}$ of all provosts and $\mathbf{5 5 \%}$ of all deans and senior leadership team members statewide
- State universities and community colleges have reached gender parity among their board members


## Challenges

- Number of schools that have never had a female president: 30
- Number of doctoral universities with a female board chair: $\mathbf{0}$
- Glass ceiling? If women are half of provosts and deans, why are they only $\mathbf{3 7 \%}$ of all presidents?
- Women lead only $\mathbf{2 2 \%}$ of our doctoral universities and none are women of color
- There are no female presidents among our $\mathbf{9}$ state universities
- Of the 92 presidents represented in this study, only 6 are women of color
- Percentage of female board chairs among our 25 public college/university boards: 24\%, and $\mathbf{0}$ are women of color


## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

## Women are Making Gains in the Number of Presidencies

There were 14 presidential transitions for the academic year, which ran from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. Seven of the new presidents were women. This leaves the state with a count of 34 (37\%) female presidents, of whom six ( $7 \%$ ) are women of color, and eight ( $9 \%$ ) are men of color. When compared to 2018, we had a net increase of five female presidents and one woman of color.

## But, Not All Presidential Positions are Equal

While women have increased in number, it is critical to consider that not all presidential positions are equal, particularly with respect to compensation. Of the ten most highly compensated presidents in our data set, we find only one woman. Women comprise $47 \%$ of presidents at associate's institutions, but only $22 \%$ of doctoral schools. Further, average doctoral presidential compensation is more than four times that of associate's schools ( $\$ 790,938$ and $\$ 189,555$ ).

## Women Presidents Hire More Women Among Their Top Ten Most Highly Compensated Employees

Campuses led by women presidents averaged $52 \%$ of women among the top ten most highly compensated employees at their schools, and those women took home
$53 \%$ of the earnings. Of the schools led by men, women comprised $39 \%$ of the top ten, but only brought home $30 \%$ of all the earnings.

## Parity Differs Greatly by Type of Institution - Our Public Community Colleges and Our Private Colleges Lead

Figure 1 shows us that achieving parity varies significantly by institution type. Specifically, $73 \%$ of our community colleges have achieved gender parity (note they constitute 15 of the 17 associate's colleges), as have $55 \%$ of our private colleges (note - they constitute 33 of the 42 BA/MA schools).

## Parity Differs Greatly by Type of Institution - Our Doctoral Universities and Special Focus Institutions Trail

Few special focus and doctoral schools have achieved parity, with only three of 15 (20\%) and two of 18 (11\%), respectively, rated as satisfactory. As doctoral universities enroll nearly one-half of all students in Massachusetts and have an outsized influence on our state due to their sheer size, research capabilities, and impact on the economy, we spend a considerable amount of time examining them in this report. Among 18 institutions, doctoral universities count just four women presidents, and not a single female board chair. Further, $38 \%$ have fewer than $30 \%$ women on their boards of trustees.

FIGURE 1
GENDER PARITY RATING BY INSTITUTION TYPE


We were curious to determine whether the lack of parity among doctoral schools was influenced by the fact that many of them are more selective than other schools. Selectivity is measured by the student acceptance rate, and ranges from $5-7 \%$ at Harvard and MIT to $100 \%$ at community colleges. A preliminary examination yielded no clear link between increased selectivity and lower gender parity.

## The Women's Power Gap Drives the Gender Wage Gap

Women comprise $44 \%$ of the top ten highest paid employees across the 92 institutions. Yet average total compensation for the women in this sample was $\$ 257,355$, as compared to $\$ 330,712$ for men, such that

## Of the 10 most highly compensated presidents in our data set, we find only one woman.

 women earned $78 \%$ of what men did, or 78 cents on the dollar. Their gender wage gap is 22 cents which is larger than the Massachusetts statewide gender wage gap of 17 cents. The primary driver of this pay gap is the power gap - the fact that women don't hold the top paying jobs. Women are far less likely to hold leadership spots at the high paying institutions, such as the doctoral universities. Further, among the top ten most highly compensated staff, women are more likely to hold spots towards the bottom. As such, when women reach parity among top leadership positions in academia across all types of institutions, we would expect this gender wage gap to be eliminated.
## Gender and Racial/Ethnic Diversity are Hard to Achieve and Harder to Sustain

Gender parity and racial/ethnic balance are highly fluid and, like a see-saw, can easily fall out of balance with personnel changes, particularly at the presidential level. We examined a few individual presidential transitions and observed the profound impact the president had on gender diversity. The singular impact of the president points to a critical need for schools to develop systems and institutionalize practices, which will stay in place after presidential transitions.
We also took a closer look at a number of schools which were formerly women's colleges and found that gender balance fell off quickly when those schools became co-educational. "Gravity" seems to take hold in many of these schools, with societal norms pulling their management back to more traditional archetypes of male-dominated leadership.
In our interviews with 20 institutions, we found a number of good diversity practices, but few written policies and systems to codify and institutionalize them.

Since the boards of trustees are the fiduciaries and in charge of hiring presidents, we asked presidents about the role their boards of trustees played, or could play, in institutionalizing practices. Most respondents did not see a role for their boards in this capacity, instead suggesting the only way to sustain diversity, equity, and inclusion would be to embed their commitment in the institutional culture, particularly within the faculty. However, we suggest schools need to both embed diversity and inclusion in their cultures, and develop formal systems and procedures to ensure fair processes and outcomes. We believe that boards of trustees do have a role to play in ensuring good practice becomes good policy.

## The Racial/Ethnic Power Gap

Women of color comprise only 7\% of presidents, $7 \%$ of provosts, and $2 \%$ of board chairs. Men of color hold $9 \%, 8 \%$, and $6 \%$, respectively. As with gender parity, disparities in leadership for people of color differ by type of institution. A small number of community colleges are close to proportionate representation for racial and ethnic minorities, presenting the field with successful practices and policies. The remaining institutions, with few exceptions, are far behind. It is critical to note that the data in this study includes all racial and ethnic minorities in the category of people of color and that we are not able to further parse data for under-represented racial minorities (URM). To fully understand the extent

> The singular impact of the president points to a critical need for schools to develop systems and institutionalize practices, which will stay in place after presidential transitions.
of the racial/ethnic power gap, the next step would be to work with institutions to disaggregate this data and look at the numbers of African Americans, Latinx, Asian Americans, and other populations independently.

## We Still Have a Long Way to Go

While Massachusetts is moving in the right direction with the recent additions of seven female presidents, far too many schools are making minimal progress toward gender parity and racial/ethnic representation at the highest leadership levels. One-third of all of Massachusetts institutions of higher education have never had a female president ( 30 of 92 ) and $28 \%$ have fewer than $30 \%$ women (critical mass) on their boards. There are six schools that have never had a female president or board chair, and who currently count fewer than $30 \%$ women on their boards: Assumption College, Boston University, College of the Holy Cross, Franklin W Olin College of Engineering, Northeastern University, and Stonehill College.

## THIRTY INSTITUTIONS HAVE NEVER HAD A FEMALE PRESIDENT

| American International College | Mass Maritime Academy |
| :--- | :--- |
| Assumption Collegeł | MCPHS University |
| BFIT | Merrimack Collegeł |
| Berklee College of Music | Montserrat College of Art |
| Boston Architectural College | Mount Wachusett Community College |
| Boston Collegeł | NE College of Business and Finance |
| Boston University | Northeastern University |
| Clark University | Northern Essex Community College |
| College of the Holy Crosst | Springfield Tech Community College |
| Fisher College | Stonehill Collegeł |
| Fitchburg State University | Tufts University |
| Olin College | UMass-Amherst |
| Gordon College | UMass-central office |
| Hult Business School | UMass-Medical School |
| Lasell College** | William James College |

** Indicates formerly a women's college. † Indicates Catholic institution.

## I. INTRODUCTION AND TERMINOLOGY

This study examined the status of women's leadership and racial/ethnic diversity among higher education institutions in Massachusetts. The methodology was developed to best reflect the path to the presidency, which differs by institution type, specifically in the case of doctoral universities, where it is rare to move from administration to the presidency. Consequently, we have modified the weighting system for the doctoral universities to take this into account.
This year, we made several changes to the ranking system. In partnership with the WAGE Project, we looked more deeply into compensation for the top ten highest paid employees at each school and added a weighting for that category. At the presidential level, we awarded points for the number of years a permanent female president held office rather than for the number of past permanent female presidents. Based on feedback from school leaders, we added the senior administrative team to the weighting.
The comprehensive data set is based on 92 institutions and focuses on academic year 2018/2019, with May 15, 2019 serving as the anchor date for recording the data. The following positions were analyzed:

- President/Chancellor (President)
- Provost/Chief Academic Officer (Provost)
- Senior Leadership:
- For the doctoral universities, we counted two groups of leaders - senior academic leaders and senior administrative leaders. Academic leaders were primarily deans of degree-granting schools. This category of senior leaders received more points than the senior administrative team.
- For all other institutions, we combined senior academic and senior administrative leadership in one category with equal weighting.
- Board Chair ${ }^{1}$
- Board of Trustees: The fiduciary board for the corporation. Only regular term, full-voting members are included in this study. Student trustees were not included.
In addition to gender data, this year we collected racial/ ethnic data for the president, provost, and board chair at all schools. We have aggregate diversity data for the members of the senior teams for 72 schools and boards of 67 schools. We relied on each institution to share selfreported gender and racial/ethnic data and are limited
by current record-keeping practice. Consequently, we are not able to report on LGBTQ, gender nonconforming, and other diverse categories. Further, we were not able to disaggregate the data on persons of color to ascertain what percentage are under-represented minorities (URM) as some studies have done. Given study limitations, we asked if individuals in leadership positions identified as a person of color with a binary response option of yes/no. Institutions generally use the
US Census Bureau definition and categorization when identifying racial/ethnic minorities or persons of color. $\underline{\underline{2}}$ For the purposes of this report, we use those two terms interchangeably. We use WOC and MOC to identify women of color and men of color, respectively in figures, tables, and graphs throughout this report.
For analysis purposes, the University of Massachusetts (UMass) system is the only UMass included among the comprehensive rank because it alone has a fiduciary board of trustees. However, the five UMass campuses are discussed when we introduce charts looking at president, provost, senior academic and administrative teams, and compensation. See Appendix B for further detail regarding UMass.
Institutional data, including enrollment figures broken down by gender, acceptance rate, and other variables, were taken from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). We adapted the Carnegie
Classification of Institutions of Higher Education to group public and private schools into one of four categories (see Appendix C for a list of schools by category):
- Doctoral universities include 12 private and five public doctoral schools in the Commonwealth, plus the UMass system/central office.
- Bachelor's colleges and master's universities (BA/MA) include 16 private bachelor's, 17 private, and nine public master's universities. For analysis purposes, BA/MA schools are grouped together.
- Associate's colleges (associate's) include 15 public community colleges and two private associate degree-granting schools.
- Special focus institutions include 15 schools offering both undergraduate and graduate programs based on the concentration of degrees in a single field or set of related fields.
For more detail on data collection and analysis refer to Appendix D. For complete information, visit our website at WomensPowerGap.org.


## II. MEASURING THE WOMEN'S POWER GAP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The Women's Power Gap measures how far women have to go to reach gender parity with men. To quantify it, we measure it by calculating the difference between the percentage of men and women in leadership positions in any sector or any group such as a board of directors. As you see in Figure 2, the largest gap in the top three leadership positions is that of board chair with a $48 \%$ power gap. This is followed by a power gap of $26 \%$ for presidents and just $4 \%$ for provosts. In addition, for the first time, we include diversity data, showing the significant power gap for women and men of color. The starkest data point is that women of color chair only two (2\%) of the boards of all the colleges and universities in our state.

FIGURE 2

## MEASURING THE WOMEN'S POWER GAP IN HIGHER EDUCATION



## III. COMPREHENSIVE GENDER LEADERSHIP RANKING

The comprehensive leadership ranking tells us where the institutions lie along a spectrum of progress on gender parity. We only ranked 87 of the 92 schools in the comprehensive index below because the five University of Massachusetts (UMass) schools do not have their own fiduciary boards. The UMass campuses are ranked separately, although the UMass-system appears in comprehensive rank. ${ }^{3}$
To break down the data, we assigned each school to one of four categories, based on their total weighting out of 125 points.

- Satisfactory: Institutions that have 80 or more total points
- Status Quo: Institutions that have between 60-79 total points
- Unsatisfactory: Institutions that have between 40-59 total points
- Needs Urgent Attention: Institutions that have less than 40 total points

We chose 80 points as the minimum for a satisfactory level of gender parity based on our analysis of points and the total number needed to reflect a balanced leadership structure across presidents, senior team, compensation, and board. For the UMass schools which do not have fiduciary boards, the levels were decreased by 20 points. See Appendix E for details on the methodology.
It is important to note that the ranking should not be interpreted to suggest that among the schools who have reached the category of "satisfactory," a school ranked number one has more parity than a school ranked number 21. In fact, the highest ranked institutions are primarily women's schools and have significantly more women in leadership than men, and consequently are beyond parity. If an institution is in our satisfactory category, we believe they have achieved gender balance. Now, the challenge is to sustain it, which requires intentionality, systems, and vigilance.

The ranking for the remaining three categories status quo, unsatisfactory, and needs urgent attention - indicates how far we believe each school must go to reach gender balance.

## COMPREHENSIVE GENDER LEADERSHIP RANKING OF ALL INSTITUTIONS

| RANK | INSTITUTION NAME | ENROLLMENT/ \%WOMEN | PRESIDENT | PROVOST | GHTING <br> SR. TEAM | BOARD | SALARY | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Bay Path University* | 3,298 / 94\% | 40 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 125 |
| 2 | Simmons University* | 6,283 / 91\% | 32 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 117 |
| 3 | Emmanuel College** $\dagger$ | 2,083 / 74\% | 40 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 110 |
| 3 | Wellesley College* | 2,508 / 98\% | 40 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 110 |
| 5 | Mount Holyoke College* | 2,334 / 99\% | 39 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 109 |
| 5 | Smith College* | 2,918 / 98\% | 39 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 109 |
| 7 | Berkshire Community College | 1,847 / 62\% | 31 | 15 | 23 | 20 | 16 | 105 |
| 8 | MGH Institute of Health Professions | 1,215 / 84\% | 40 | 0 | 23 | 20 | 20 | 103 |
| 9 | Quinsigamond Community College | 7,368 / 58\% | 18 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 103 |
| 10 | Roxbury Community College | 1,928 / 70\% | 28 | 15 | 30 | 9 | 20 | 102 |
| 11 | Becker College | 1,892 / 58\% | 21 | 15 | 30 | 16 | 20 | 102 |
| 12 | Bristol Community College | 7,637 / 63\% | 23 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 12 | 100 |
| 12 | Regis College** ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | 2,166 / 83\% | 40 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 100 |
| 14 | Cambridge College | 2,261 / 74\% | 32 | 0 | 30 | 17 | 20 | 99 |
| 15 | North Shore Community College | 6,087 / 62\% | 24 | 15 | 30 | 9 | 20 | 98 |
| 16 | Springfield College | 3,246 / 56\% | 25 | 15 | 30 | 8 | 20 | 98 |
| 17 | Bentley University | 5,543 / 45\% | 31 | 15 | 30 | 6 | 16 | 98 |
| 18 | Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts | 1,588 / 62\% | 12 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 97 |
| 19 | Bunker Hill Community College | 11,881 / 57\% | 40 | 0 | 30 | 7 | 20 | 97 |
| 20 | Holyoke Community College | 5,565 / 62\% | 21 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 96 |
| 21 | Labouré College $\dagger$ | 870 / 89\% | 27 | 15 | 25 | 8 | 20 | 95 |
| 21 | Massasoit Community College | 7,154 / 56\% | 20 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 95 |
| 23 | Cape Cod Community College | 3,221 / 61\% | 14 | 15 | 27 | 18 | 20 | 94 |
| 24 | Anna Maria College** ${ }^{\text {t }}$ | 1,445 / 54\% | 23 | 15 | 30 | 9 | 16 | 93 |
| 25 | Greenfield Community College | 1,830 / 61\% | 20 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 16 | 91 |
| 26 | Babson College | 3,329 / 45\% | 25 | 0 | 30 | 15 | 20 | 90 |
| 27 | Dean College | 1,301 / 54\% | 40 | 0 | 28 | 4 | 17 | 90 |
| 28 | Mass College of Art and Design | 2,064 / 70\% | 16 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 8 | 89 |
| 29 | Wentworth Institute of Technology | 4,457 / 21\% | 33 | 0 | 30 | 4 | 20 | 87 |
| 30 | Emerson College | 4,459 / 62\% | 13 | 15 | 30 | 7 | 20 | 85 |
| 31 | Amherst College | 1,836 / 49\% | 27 | 15 | 16 | 6 | 20 | 84 |
| 32 | Lesley University** | 4,732 / 82\% | 9 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 84 |
| 32 | Worcester State University | 6,434 / 61\% | 9 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 84 |
| 34 | College of Our Lady of the Elms** $\dagger$ | 1,580 / 75\% | 11 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 81 |
| 35 | Fisher College | 1,923 / 73\% | 0 | 15 | 30 | 15 | 20 | 80 |
| 36 | Mass Bay Community College | 4,629 / 52\% | 7 | 15 | 30 | 8 | 20 | 80 |
| 37 | Salem State University | 8,702 / 64\% | 19 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 79 |
| 37 | Wheaton College** | 1,688 / 61\% | 6 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 8 | 79 |
| 39 | Framingham State University | 5,691 / 65\% | 7 | 15 | 28 | 9 | 20 | 79 |
| 40 | Pine Manor College** | 450 / 49\% | 14 | 15 | 30 | 9 | 10 | 78 |
| 41 | Nichols College | 1,634/40\% | 39 | 0 | 23 | 6 | 9 | 77 |
| 42 | Williams College | 2,134 / 48\% | 20 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 16 | 76 |
| 43 | Endicott College** | 4,795 / 66\% | 5 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 75 |
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RANK INSTITUTION NAME
ENROLLMENT/
\%WOMEN

WEIGHTING PRESIDENT PROVOST SR. TEAM BOARD SALARY POINTS

| 44 | Hampshire College | 1,268 / 63\% | 0 | 15 | 30 | 9 | 20 | 74 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45 | Westfield State University | 6,237 / 55\% | 2 | 15 | 30 | 6 | 20 | 73 |
| 46 | Middlesex Community College | 8,206 / 57\% | 16 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 16 | 72 |
| 47 | New England Conservatory of Music | 844 / 47\% | 20 | 0 | 30 | 9 | 12 | 71 |
| 48 | Springfield Tech Community College | 5,343 / 59\% | 0 | 15 | 28 | 6 | 20 | 69 |
| 49 | Boston Architectural College | 695/49\% | 0 | 15 | 27 | 8 | 18 | 68 |
| 50 | American International College | 3,283 / 72\% | 0 | 15 | 30 | 3 | 20 | 68 |
| 51 | MCPHS University | 7,208 / 70\% | 0 | 15 | 30 | 6 | 16 | 67 |
| 52 | College of the Holy Crossł | 2,855 / 51\% | 0 | 15 | 30 | 5 | 16 | 66 |
| 53 | Montserrat College of Art | 368/74\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 16 | 66 |
| 54 | Worcester Polytechnic Institute | 6,642 / 35\% | 24 | 0 | 26 | 7 | 8 | 65 |
| 55 | Suffolk University | 7,201 / 56\% | 22 | 0 | 23 | 9 | 12 | 65 |
| 56 | Bridgewater State University | 11,019 / 61\% | 4 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 64 |
| 56 | Urban College of Boston | 812/93\% | 9 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 0 | 64 |
| 58 | Brandeis University | 5,721 / 58\% | 0 | 15 | 25 | 8 | 12 | 60 |
| 59 | Mount Wachusett Community College | 3,854 / 65\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 60 |
| 60 | Tufts University | 11,449 / 55\% | 0 | 15 | 19 | 8 | 16 | 58 |
| 61 | Lasell College** | 2,055 / 64\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 7 | 20 | 57 |
| 62 | Harvard University | 31,120 / 49\% | 11 | 0 | 24 | 9 | 12 | 57 |
| 63 | Assumption Colleget | 2,481 / 61\% | 0 | 15 | 24 | 5 | 12 | 56 |
| 64 | University of Mass-system*** | 74,571 / 51\% | 0 | 15 | 27 | 6 | 8 | 56 |
| 65 | Boston University | 33,355 / 59\% | 0 | 15 | 24 | 6 | 12 | 56 |
| 66 | Benjamin Franklin Institute of Tech | 609 / 14\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 6 | 20 | 56 |
| 67 | Western New England University | 3,776 / 43\% | 0 | 15 | 20 | 5 | 15 | 55 |
| 68 | NE College of Business and Finance | 1,175 / 72\% | 0 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 0 | 55 |
| 69 | Franklin W Olin College of Engineering | 380/48\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 5 | 20 | 55 |
| 70 | Bay State College | 717 / 71\% | 2 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 12 | 54 |
| 71 | Berklee College of Music | 6,762 / 39\% | 0 | 0 | 26 | 16 | 12 | 54 |
| 72 | Quincy College | 5,343 / 68\% | 5 | 0 | 28 | 9 | 12 | 54 |
| 73 | New England College of Optometry | 527 / 74\% | 3 | 0 | 30 | 8 | 12 | 53 |
| 74 | Northern Essex Community College | 5,726 / 61\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 12 | 52 |
| 75 | Stonehill Colleget | 2,498 / 59\% | 0 | 0 | 27 | 5 | 20 | 51 |
| 76 | William James College | 748 / 78\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 6 | 15 | 51 |
| 77 | Gordon College | 1,963 / 66\% | 0 | 15 | 17 | 6 | 12 | 51 |
| 78 | Curry College | 2,799 / 59\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 4 | 15 | 49 |
| 79 | Fitchburg State University | 7,075 / 62\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 8 | 48 |
| 80 | Eastern Nazarene College | 848/60\% | 12 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 10 | 47 |
| 81 | Clark University | 3,153 / 60\% | 0 | 0 | 23 | 6 | 16 | 46 |
| 82 | Massachusetts Maritime Academy | 1,780 / 14\% | 0 | 0 | 24 | 6 | 12 | 42 |
| 83 | Northeastern University | 21,489 / 48\% | 0 | 0 | 24 | 5 | 12 | 41 |
| 84 | Hult International Business School | 2,798 / 42\% | 0 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 11 | 37 |
| 85 | Merrimack Collegeł | 4,191 / 54\% | 0 | 0 | 23 | 5 | 8 | 35 |
| 86 | Mass Institute of Technology | 11,466 / 39\% | 8 | 0 | 15 | 7 | 4 | 35 |
| 87 | Boston College | 14,628 / 54\% | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 15 |

Note: Enrollment sourced from IPEDS and reflects 2017 data. Schools that list the same total point value but show a difference in rank, indicate a difference in the hundredth place; total points are rounded up for display purposes. * Indicates women's college. ** Indicates formerly a women's college. *** As there is only one board for the entire UMass-system, the UMass entry represents aggregated data for the five campuses and central office. † Indicates Catholic institution.

TABLE 3

## RANK OF UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS CAMPUSES

| RANK | INSTITUTION NAME | ENROLLMENT/ \%WOMEN | PRESIDENT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { _ WEIGHT } \\ & \text { PROVOST } \end{aligned}$ | TING $\qquad$ SR. TEAM | SALARY | TOTAL POINTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | UMass-Lowell | 18,315 / 40\% | 23 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 73 |
| 2 | UMass-Boston | 16,415 / 56\% | 10 | 15 | 22 | 12 | 59 |
| 3 | UMass-Dartmouth | 8,406 / 50\% | 14 | 0 | 30 | 8 | 52 |
| 4 | UMass-Medical School | 1,095 / 59\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 4 | 34 |
| 5 | UMass-Amherst | 30,340 / 50\% | 0 | 0 | 29 | 4 | 33 |

Note: Enrollment sourced from IPEDS and reflects 2017 data. All point values are rounded up for display purposes.

## Satisfactory - 37 of 92 schools ( $40 \%$ of total)

Ten of these schools are women's colleges or formerly were women's colleges, and two are special focus schools that educate students for professions that are dominated by women (i.e., nursing). UMass-Lowell and Lesley University are the only doctoral universities in this top

> Without intentionality, implicit bias acts like gravity, pulling institutions back to traditional male-dominated models of leadership.

category. Beyond those, 11 are community colleges, ten are private colleges, and three are state universities.

It is interesting to note that a couple of former women's schools which still count women as a significant majority of their students do not rate satisfactorily, reinforcing that without intentionality, implicit bias acts like gravity, pulling institutions back to traditional male-dominated models of leadership.

FIGURE 3

## INSTITUTIONAL RATINGS



## Status Quo - 25 Schools ( $27 \%$ of total)

With a few changes, some at the top of this list may soon reach parity, while others toward the bottom have much further to go. Small private colleges make up the majority of this group as well as four state universities and three community colleges. There are six doctoral universities in this group - American International College, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Suffolk University, Brandeis University, UMass-Boston, and UMass-Dartmouth.

## Unsatisfactory - 26 Schools (28\% of total)

This group includes both public and private schools, large universities and small colleges. The majority of the doctorate granting universities fall in this category or the one below.

## Needs Urgent Attention - 4 Schools (4\% of total)

These institutions - Boston College, Hult International, Merrimack College, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology - should give serious consideration to immediate changes to improve women's representation on their leadership teams, boards, and among their highest paid professionals.
For further analysis, we have included individual profiles of each school in Appendix G. In Appendix C, we have listed schools by institution type: doctoral universities, BA/MA institutions, associate's, and special focus institutions.

## IV. PRESIDENTS

## Key Findings

## Women are Making Gains in the Number of Presidencies

There were 14 presidential transitions for the academic year, which ran from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. Seven of the new presidents were women. This leaves

## Of the ten most highly compensated presidents in our compensation data set, we find only one woman.

the state with a count of 34 ( $37 \%$ ) female presidents, of whom six ( $7 \%$ ) are women of color, and eight ( $9 \%$ ) are men of color. When compared to 2018, we had a net increase of five female presidents and one woman of color.

## But, Not All Presidential Positions are Equal

While women have gained in numbers, it is critical to consider, that not all presidential positions are equal, at least with respect to compensation. Of the ten most highly compensated presidents in our compensation data set, we find only one woman. Disaggregating the data in Figure 4 below highlights the extent to which women are far better represented among the associate's colleges than the doctoral universities. Average compensation for presidents at doctoral universities is more than

## Private bachelor's colleges and master's universities count 52\% female presidents.

four times the average for those leading associate's schools (\$790,938 and $\$ 189,555$ ). See Section VI for the compensation analysis.
Of the associate's schools, the community colleges specifically lead the state on both gender and racial representation. They comprise 15 of 17 associate's institutions, and count $53 \%$ female presidents, $27 \%$ of whom are women of color. The other two associate's colleges, Quincy College and Urban College of Boston, do not have female presidents, bringing the aggregate for all associate's schools down to $47 \%$.
In turning to BA/MA schools, we count $40 \%$ female presidents. Separating out our nine state universities (none of which have a female president), we note that the private bachelor's colleges and master's universities count $52 \%$ female presidents, though only $6 \%$ women of color, an area which needs urgent attention.

Massachusetts' state universities count no female presidents, though with two leaders they do include $22 \%$ men of color. The lack of female leadership within this group is a major concern given women's enrollment at these schools averages $60 \%$. Further, there were five women leaders in this cohort in 2008, so the sudden drop represents a worrisome backslide. Of the last eight presidential transitions at our state universities, women were $39 \%$ of the finalist pools (those which went to the board for a final vote), yet won none of the appointments, leading us to question whether unconscious selection bias is at play among these boards during the presidential appointment process. We should expect our taxpayer-funded institutions to lead on diversity rather than trail the private sector.

The special focus schools include several in technology, business, healthcare/nursing, and music. As a group they count only $33 \%$ women presidents (most of whom run the healthcare/nursing institutions) and no leaders of color. These institutions count 54\% women enrolled and $59 \%$ students of color, calling out the urgent need for more diverse representation among their leadership.

FIGURE 4
GENDER AND RACE OF PRESIDENTS BY INSTITUTION TYPE


Among the doctoral universities, women lead only four of 18 institutions (22\%) - UMass-Boston (interim),

## Among the doctoral universities, both private and public, a full 50\% have never had a female president.

UMass-Lowell, Suffolk University, and Worcester Polytechnic Institute. None are women of color, however, three of the 18 presidents identify as men of color.

## Slow Progress for a Handful of Schools 1/3 of All Institutions Have Never Had a Female President

As Table 4 illustrates, one-third of institutions have never had a woman president, and again the percentages vary depending upon institution type. Among the doctoral universities, both private and public, a full 50\% have never had a female president, and the same is true of $60 \%$ of special focus institutions.

TABLE 4
INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE NEVER HAD A FEMALE PRESIDENT BY INSTITUTION TYPE

|  | TOTAL \# INSTITUTIONS | \#INSTITUTIONS NEVER HAD FEMALE PRESIDENT | \% INSTITUTIONS NEVER HAD FEMALE PRESIDENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PUBLIC | 30 | 8 | 27\% |
| Doctoral Universities (UMass campuses + central office) | 6 | 3 | 50\% |
| BA/MA (State Universities) | 9 | 2 | 22\% |
| Associate's (Community Colleges) | 15 | 3 | 20\% |
| PRIVATE | 62 | 22 | 35\% |
| Doctoral Universities | 12 | 6 | 50\% |
| BA/MA | 33 | 7 | 21\% |
| Associate's | 2 | 0 | 0\% |
| Special Focus | 15 | 9 | 60\% |
| TOTAL | 92 | 30 | 33\% |
| Doctoral Universities | 18 | 9 | 50\% |
| BA/MA | 42 | 9 | 21\% |
| Associate's | 17 | 3 | 18\% |
| Special Focus | 15 | 9 | 60\% |

## V. PROVOSTS AND SENIOR LEADERSHIP TEAMS

## Key Findings

Women are Well Represented Among
Provosts and Senior Leadership Positions
Overall, women constitute $48 \%$ of provosts and $55 \%$ of senior leadership teams, which provides the pipeline for parity among presidents. This robust pool should set the stage for our 92 Massachusetts schools to collectively reach parity among the number of presidents within the next few years as more presidential positions turn over. However, if obstacles, such as implicit bias are not addressed in the search processes, we might find ourselves waiting much longer.

## Yet, Doctoral Universities and Special Focus Institutions Have Far Fewer Female Provosts and Academic Deans

Turning to gender and race of provosts, we see a similar story to that of presidents. Women comprise $71 \%$ of provosts at associate's colleges, with $12 \%$ women of color and $6 \%$ men of color. Women also count half of all provosts at BA/MA schools. Doctoral and special focus institutions lag with $39 \%$ and $27 \%$ of women provosts, respectively.

One bright spot in this year's report is the prominence of women on presidents' senior leadership teams also called the president's cabinet. For the BA/MA, associate's colleges, and special focus schools, the senior leadership team includes both top academic and administrative positions. Among these schools, women comprise the majority of the senior leadership team positions at an average of $60 \%$. When looking at race, associate's colleges are the furthest along with $20 \%$ of people of color among their senior leadership teams, $14 \%$ of whom are women.
We examined senior leadership data in greater detail at doctoral universities given their size and complex organizational structures. These universities consist

FIGURE 5
GENDER AND RACE OF PROVOSTS BY INSTITUTION TYPE


FIGURE 7

## SENIOR ACADEMIC LEADERS BY GENDER AT DOCTORAL UNIVERSITIES


of independent degree-granting schools within their organizations (medical, law, and education schools, to name a few). In this structure, each academic dean is in effect the president of that particular college, exerting considerable influence and autonomy, while at the same time, reporting in to the university president. For doctoral universities, deans and provosts are the most typical path to the presidency, rather than top administrative positions. Figures 7 and 8 offer a view of these two paths, separating deans/senior academic leaders from senior administrative leadership at doctoral institutions. Women count $44 \%$ of dean positions and 45\% of senior administrative positions, indicating power gaps along both paths that are still to be overcome.

FIGURE 6
GENDER AND RACE OF SENIOR LEADERSHIP TEAM BY INSTITUTION TYPE


FIGURE 8
SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERS BY GENDER AT DOCTORAL UNIVERSITIES


## VI. COMPENSATION: A LOOK AT THE NUMBERS

This year's report introduces an analysis of the top ten most highly compensated employees at each of the schools based upon publicly available 990's for private institutions and the Commonwealth's Financial Records Transparency Platform (CTHRU) data for the public institutions. ${ }^{4}$ The most recent data available was from the fiscal year that ended June 30, 2017. The full data set may be found at WomensPowerGap.org. The compensation data lags the power gap data by two years, but still provides useful information which demonstrates how the women's power gap drives the wage gap.

Table 5 provides an analysis by school of both how many women are among the top ten most highly compensated employees at each institution, as well as what percentage of the total compensation women received. This second data point gives us a sense of where the women in the top ten fall in the numerical order from 1-10. For instance, if women are $70 \%$ of the top earners, but only received $50 \%$ of the total compensation for that school, it is likely that the women were on the lower rungs of the top ten pay ladder.

TABLE 5

## PERCENTAGE AND TOTAL COMPENSATION OF WOMEN AMONG THE TOP 10 MOST HIGHLY COMPENSATED EMPLOYEES BY INSTITUTION (RANKED BY PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN IN TOP 10)

| INSTITUTION NAME | \% WOMAN <br> IN TOP 10 | WOMAN $\%$ <br> TOTAL (\$) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Emmanuel College**ł | $86 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| Mount Holyoke* | $80 \%$ | $84 \%$ |
| Bunker Hill CC | $80 \%$ | $77 \%$ |
| Bay Path University* | $78 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| Regis College*ł | $71 \%$ | $74 \%$ |
| Elms College** | $71 \%$ | $62 \%$ |
| Simmons University* | $70 \%$ | $72 \%$ |
| Labouré Collegeł | $70 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
| Quinsigamond Community <br> College | $70 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
| Wellesley College* | $60 \%$ | $71 \%$ |
| North Shore CC | $60 \%$ | $64 \%$ |
| Roxbury CC | $60 \%$ | $64 \%$ |
| Smith College* | $60 \%$ | $64 \%$ |
| Cambridge College | $60 \%$ | $63 \%$ |
| Mount Wachusett CC | $60 \%$ | $62 \%$ |
| Amherst College | $60 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
| Holyoke CC | $60 \%$ | $60 \%$ |
| Salem State University | $60 \%$ | $59 \%$ |
| Bridgewater State University | $60 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| Mass Bay CC | $60 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| MGH Institute | $60 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| Worcester State University | $60 \%$ | $56 \%$ |
| Emerson College | $60 \%$ | $48 \%$ |
| Babson College | $50 \%$ | $54 \%$ |


| INSTITUTION NAME | \% WOMAN IN TOP 10 | WOMAN \% TOTAL (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Springfield College | 50\% | 53\% |
| Wentworth Institute of Tech | 50\% | 52\% |
| Framingham State University | 50\% | 49\% |
| UMass-Lowell | 50\% | 49\% |
| Mass College of Liberal Arts | 50\% | 48\% |
| Stonehill Collegeł | 50\% | 48\% |
| Cape Cod CC | 50\% | 47\% |
| Massasoit CC | 50\% | 46\% |
| Springfield Technical CC | 50\% | 46\% |
| Fisher College | 50\% | 45\% |
| Hampshire College | 50\% | 45\% |
| Westfield State University | 50\% | 45\% |
| BFIT | 50\% | 43\% |
| Olin College | 50\% | 43\% |
| Becker College | 50\% | 42\% |
| Endicott College** | 50\% | 40\% |
| Lesley University** | 50\% | 40\% |
| American International College | 50\% | 39\% |
| Lasell College** | 50\% | 39\% |
| Boston Architectural College | 44\% | 41\% |
| Dean College | 43\% | 56\% |
| Anna Maria College** ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 40\% | 51\% |
| Bentley University | 40\% | 43\% |
| Berkshire CC | 40\% | 43\% |
| Williams College | 40\% | 41\% |

[^0]| INSTITUTION NAME | \% WOMAN <br> IN TOP 10 | WOMAN \% TOTAL (\$) | INSTITUTION NAME | \% WOMAN <br> IN TOP 10 | WOMAN \% TOTAL (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tufts University | 40\% | 40\% | Assumption Collegeł | 30\% | 27\% |
| Clark University | 40\% | 39\% | NE Conservatory of Music | 30\% | 27\% |
| College of the Holy Crossł | 40\% | 37\% | Brandeis University | 30\% | 26\% |
| Middlesex CC | 40\% | 37\% | Berklee College of Music | 30\% | 24\% |
| Greenfield CC | 40\% | 36\% | Gordon College | 30\% | 24\% |
| Montserrat College of Art | 40\% | 35\% | Hult Business School | 29\% | 31\% |
| MCPHS University | 40\% | 28\% | Eastern Nazarene College | 25\% | 27\% |
| Western NE University | 38\% | 34\% | Pine Manor College** | 25\% | 20\% |
| Curry College | 38\% | 29\% | Nichols College | 22\% | 33\% |
| William James College | 38\% | 26\% | UMass-Dartmouth | 20\% | 27\% |
| Bay State College | 30\% | Not Available | Worcester Polytechnic Institute | 20\% | 25\% |
| Quincy College | 30\% | Not Available | Mass College of Art \& Design | 20\% | 23\% |
| Suffolk University | 30\% | 40\% | Wheaton College** | 20\% | 20\% |
| Boston University | 30\% | 37\% | Fitchburg State University | 20\% | 18\% |
| Harvard University | 30\% | 36\% | UMass-system | 20\% | 17\% |
| NE College of Optometry | 30\% | 32\% | Merrimack Collegeł | 20\% | 15\% |
| Northern Essex CC | 30\% | 29\% | UMass-Amherst | 10\% | 11\% |
| University of Mass-Boston | 30\% | 29\% | UMass-Medical | 10\% | 11\% |
| Bristol CC | 30\% | 28\% | Mass Institute of Technology | 10\% | 6\% |
| Mass Maritime Academy | 30\% | 28\% | Boston Collegeł | 0\% | 0\% |
| Northeastern University | 30\% | 28\% | Urban College of Boston | 0\% | 0\% |

Note: *Indicates women's college. ** Indicates formerly a women's college. †Indicates Catholic institution.

## Key Findings

## The Women's Power Gap Drives the Women's Wage Gap

Table 6 details average total compensation for women and men for presidents, provosts, and all others. While on average female presidents earned $94 \%$ of their male counterparts, overall, across all top ten employees, women took home 78 cents for every dollar earned by a man in this data set. Preliminary research of the gender pay gap from this sample doesn't point to significant pay differences for like positions at like institutions. For example, a female provost at a doctoral university, on average, earned about the same as a man in that same position. However, there were fewer female provosts within the doctoral universities.
Instead, we believe this gender pay gap is primarily attributable to two factors. First, while women are included as $44 \%$ of the top ten most highly compensated across all the institutions, more women ranked toward the lower rungs of their respective institutions' pay ladders. Second, the institutions with the highest pay, the doctoral universities specifically, have far fewer
women in the top ten. As such, the vast majority of the gender pay gap in these institutions is a direct result of the women's power gap. It is our hope that when women reach parity among top leadership positions in academia across all types of institutions, the gender pay gap will be eliminated. One notable exception is for those schools with outsized pay to men's athletic coaches as you see in table 8 on page 21.

TABLE 6

## AVERAGE COMPENSATION BY GENDER AND POSITION

| ALL SCHOOLS | MALE | FEMALE | WOMEN AS \% <br> OF MEN |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| President | $\$ 474,196$ | $\$ 443,811$ | $94 \%$ |
| Provost | $\$ 352,091$ | $\$ 277,373$ | $79 \%$ |
| All Others | $\$ 306,582$ | $\$ 234,607$ | $77 \%$ |
| Total | $\$ 330,712$ | $\$ 257,355$ | $\mathbf{7 8 \%}$ |

## Pay is Largely Determined by Type of Institution - Not All Presidents are Equal, Especially When it Comes to Compensation

Of the ten most highly compensated presidents, we find only one woman, which is not particularly surprising because women are significantly underrepresented among presidents of doctoral universities which pay the most. In fact, average compensation for presidents at doctoral universities is more than four times the average for those leading associate's schools (\$790,938 and $\$ 189,555)$, as per the chart below.

FIGURE 9

## AVERAGE PRESIDENTIAL COMPENSATION BY INSTITUTION TYPE



## Community Colleges and BA/MA Institutions Have Achieved Gender Parity in Compensation

Consistent with our findings in other sections, Table 7 tells us community colleges and BA/MA institutions in aggregate have achieved gender parity in compensation, both in the percentage of women in the top ten and in the total dollars women earn. However, it is important to note that this group includes a significant number of women's colleges which have a disproportionate share of women in leadership positions. Consequently, if we were to disaggregate the data to remove women's schools, we might see less balance among the remaining institutions.
wOMEN'S REPRESENTATION AND EARNINGS AMONG TOP TEN COMPENSATED EMPLOYEES BY INSTITUTION TYPE

| INSTITUTION TYPE | \% WOMEN <br> AMONG <br> TOP 10 | \% WOMEN <br> EARNINGS <br> AMONG TOP 10 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Doctoral Universities (18) | $30 \%$ | $26 \%$ |
| BA/MA (41) | $48 \%$ | $48 \%$ |
| Associate's (16) | $51 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Special Focus (14) | $42 \%$ | $38 \%$ |

## Public and Private Doctoral Universities Have the Lowest Representation of Women Earners and the Highest Compensation Gap

Women comprise only $30 \%$ of the most highly compensated employees at the 18 doctoral universities and bring home just $26 \%$ of the total compensation. Among institutions with the lowest women's representation and largest compensation gaps was Boston College which had no women among its ten highest earning employees. In fact, the most highly compensated woman at Boston College ranked 17th on their list. MIT, UMass-Amherst, and UMass-Medical had only one woman among their top ten. Only American International College, Lesley University, and UMass-Lowell counted 50\% women among their highest paid.

## Correlation Between Women Presidents and Percentage of Women in the Top 10 Most Highly Compensated

While this is a small data set, it appears that there is a correlation between the gender of presidents and the number of top female earners in their institutions. Campuses led by female presidents averaged $52 \%$ of women among the top ten who took home $53 \%$ of the earnings. Of the schools led by men, women made up $39 \%$ of the top ten, but only brought home $30 \%$ of all the earnings. This is a critical area for further study.

## The Top Ten of the Top Ten

Women accounted for only two of the ten most highly compensated individuals in the entire data set of 834 individuals, and only one of the top ten most highly compensated presidents.

The top ten earners received total compensation between $\$ 1.5$ and $\$ 2.5$ million and included eight men and only two women. All of the top ten earners were employed by five doctoral institutions: Boston College (2); Boston

## Women accounted for only two of the ten most highly compensated individuals in the entire dataset of 834 individuals, and only one of the top ten most highly compensated presidents.

University (1); Harvard University (4); Massachusetts Institution of Technology (2); Northeastern University (1).
Women in the top 10 included a university president and faculty member. The profile of the male top earners was more varied and encompassed non-academic job titles as
well. Of the eight men, two were university presidents, two athletic coaches, two investment managers, one faculty member, and one executive dean. The job titles of the top ten indicate that large, private doctoral institutions place a high value on non-academic positions, as much as traditional academic functions, such as provost and dean. The highest paid of all top earners was the football coach at Boston College.
Of note, Harvard's endowment is managed by an independent nonprofit. The compensation of Harvard's investment managers was, therefore, not included in this analysis. Harvard's investment managers earned between $\$ 1.4$ and $\$ 23.8$ million.

TABLE 8

## THE TOP 10 OF THE TOP 10 MOST HIGHLY COMPENSATED POSITIONS ACROSS ALL INSTITUTIONS

| INSTITUTION NAME | POSITION | GENDER | COMPENSATION |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boston Collegeł | Football Coach | Man | \$2,514,859 |
| Mass Institute of Technology | President MITIMCo | Man | $\$ 2,105,475$ |
| Harvard University | Faculty, Business School | Man | $\$ 1,865,014$ |
| Boston University | President | Man | $\$ 1,838,015$ |
| Mass Institute of Technology | Managing Director - MITIMCo | Man | $\$ 1,804,423$ |
| Harvard University | Faculty, Business School | Woman | $\$ 1,796,255$ |
| Harvard University | Exec. Dean for Admin | Man | $\$ 1,534,780$ |
| Harvard University | President | Woman | $\$ 1,533,575$ |
| Boston Collegeł | Men's Basketball Coach | Man | $\$ 1,480,826$ |
| Northeastern University | President | Man | $\$ 1,475,272$ |

Note: † Indicates Catholic institution.

## VII. BOARDS OF TRUSTEES AND BOARD CHAIRS

## Key Findings

Board Chairs Represent the Category of Leadership With the Greatest Power Gap
As you see in Figure 10, not one of the 13 doctoral university boards have a female board chair. The community colleges, which have done so well on gender parity in all other areas of leadership, count only four female board chairs among the 15 schools (27\%), none of whom are women of color. The Governor of Massachusetts is responsible for appointing board chairs and board members for the community colleges and the UMass-system. He also appoints the board members for the state universities, but not the chairs. Women chair only two of the nine state university boards. Private associate's and special focus institutions also have a significant board chair gender and racial power gap to address.

FIGURE 10
GENDER AND RACE OF BOARD CHAIRS BY INSTITUTION TYPE


## Boards of Trustees are Close to Gender Parity, but Far From Racial/Ethnic Balance

Across all institutions, $41 \%$ of board members are women. Disaggregating the data by institution type, we see BA/MA schools and associate's colleges leading the others. Our public and private BA/MA and associate's schools are near ( $45 \%$ average) and at ( $51 \%$ average) parity, respectively, while the doctoral universities and special focus boards lag behind - counting $34 \%$ and $35 \%$ women among their boards, respectively. Overall,

## Not one of the 13 doctoral university boards have a female board chair.

people of color hold $16 \%$ of board seats ( $9 \%$ women and $7 \%$ men). The only bright spot on race is among the associate's where $22 \%$ of seats are held by people of color ( $15 \%$ women and $7 \%$ men).

GENDER AND RACE OF BOARD MEMBERS BY INSTITUTION TYPE


## VIII. PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

Massachusetts counts 29 public institutions of higher education, plus the UMass-central office. At the doctoral level, there are five campuses of the University of Massachusetts which report directly to the president of the UMass-system, who in turn reports to the board of
trustees. ${ }^{5}$ There are nine state universities which offer both master's and bachelor's degrees, and 15 community colleges which offer associate's degrees. Table 9 provides a look at gender parity across all categories by institutional type.

TABLE 9
GENDER AND RACE OF PRESIDENTS, PROVOSTS, AND BOARD CHAIRS AT PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

|  | WOMAN <br> PRESIDENT | WOC <br> PRESIDENTS | WOMAN <br> PROVOST | WOC <br> PROVOSTS | WOMAN <br> BOARD <br> CHAIR | WOC <br> BOARD <br> CHAIRS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $33 \%(10)$ | $13 \%(4)$ | $60 \%(18)$ | $13 \%(4)$ | $\mathbf{2 4 \%}(6)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| PUBLIC (30) | $33 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $33 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| Doctoral Universities (6) | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $56 \%(5)$ | $22 \%(2)$ | $22 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| BA/MA (State Universities) (9) | $53 \%(8)$ | $27 \%(4)$ | $73 \%(11)$ | $13 \%(2)$ | $27 \%(4)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| Associate's (Community Colleges) (15) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Key Findings

## Where are the Women Board Chairs?

As mentioned previously, the largest women's power gap in our full data set is found among women board chairs, and this pattern holds true for our public institutions, which is disappointing. Women chair only $24 \%$ of the boards across all 25 public boards and none are women of color. Public institutions should be leading the way for the private sector. Given that the Governor has sole authority to appoint the chairs of the community colleges and the UMass board, we suggest he add women of color, when the next chair transitions take place.

GENDER AND RACE OF BOARD CHAIRS AT PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS


[^1]
## Board Level Gender and Racial Leadership

Over the last year, the Governor has added a number of women to the boards of the community colleges and state universities - a great step forward. However, the UMass board counts only five women among its 17 non-student members. This is the same composition the UMass board has had for several years, despite four openings on the board over the past year. Three
openings were filled by white men and only one was filled by a woman of color.
We suggest the Governor set specific goals for reaching gender parity and far greater racial and ethnic representation across all public institutions. Presidents of community colleges and state universities would like to see more people of color on their boards and told us they are happy to work with the Governor on this issue.

TABLE 10

## GENDER AND RACIAL/ETHNIC LEADERSHIP AT THE BOARD LEVEL

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# BOARD } \\ & \text { MEMBERS } \end{aligned}$ | \# WOMEN <br> MEMBERS | \% WOMEN MEMBERS | \# WOC MEMBERS | \% WOC MEMBERS | \# MOC <br> MEMBERS | \% MOC MEMBERS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PUBLIC | 254 | 128 | 50\% | 26 | 12\% | 18 | 8\% |
| Doctoral Universities (UMass-system) | 17 | 5 | 29\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 24\% |
| BA/MA (State Universities) | 89 | 46 | 52\% | 7 | 8\% | 5 | 6\% |
| Associate's (Community Colleges) | 148 | 77 | 52\% | 18 | 17\% | 9 | 8\% |

## Community Colleges are Leading in Gender Parity and Racial/Ethnic Representation

Community colleges lead the public institutions and the state on gender parity and racial/ethnic representation across four key areas: president, provost, senior team,
and salary. Eleven community colleges receive a satisfactory rating, three fall into status quo, and one - Northern Essex Community Colleges - received an unsatisfactory rank on gender. When looking at racial and ethnic minorities, our public community colleges lead across all leadership categories.

TABLE 11

## COMPREHENSIVE GENDER RANK OF 15 COMMUNITY COLLEGES

| RANK | INSTITUTION NAME | ENROLLMENT/ \%WOMEN | PRESIDENT |  | EIGHTING SR. TEAM | BOARD | SALARY | TOTAL POINTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Berkshire Community College | 1,847 / 62\% | 31 | 15 | 23 | 20 | 16 | 105 |
| 2 | Quinsigamond Community College | 7,368 / 58\% | 18 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 103 |
| 3 | Roxbury Community College | 1,928 / 70\% | 28 | 15 | 30 | 9 | 20 | 102 |
| 4 | Bristol Community College | 7,637 / 63\% | 23 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 12 | 100 |
| 5 | North Shore Community College | 6,087 / 62\% | 24 | 15 | 30 | 9 | 20 | 98 |
| 6 | Bunker Hill Community College | 11,881 / 57\% | 40 | 0 | 30 | 7 | 20 | 97 |
| 7 | Holyoke Community College | 5,565 / 62\% | 21 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 96 |
| 8 | Massasoit Community College | 7,154 / 56\% | 20 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 95 |
| 9 | Cape Cod Community College | 3,221 / 61\% | 14 | 15 | 27 | 18 | 20 | 94 |
| 10 | Greenfield Community College | 1,830 / 61\% | 20 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 16 | 91 |
| 11 | Mass Bay Community College | 4,629 / 52\% | 7 | 15 | 30 | 8 | 20 | 80 |
| 12 | Middlesex Community College | 8,206 / 57\% | 16 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 16 | 72 |
| 13 | Springfield Tech Community College | 5,343 / 59\% | 0 | 15 | 28 | 6 | 20 | 69 |
| 14 | Mount Wachusett Community College | 3,854 / 65\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 60 |
| 15 | Northern Essex Community College | 5,726 / 61\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 12 | 52 |

## State Universities Have Reached Parity in Some Areas, but Lack Women Presidents and Board Chairs

State universities reach parity across two areas of leadership: provost and senior team, and they are near parity with $44 \%$ of women among top earners. Three state universities receive a satisfactory rating, four fall into status quo, and two - Fitchburg State University and Mass Maritime Academy - received an unsatisfactory gender rank. The lack of women presidents within this group is a major concern given women's enrollment at these schools averages $60 \%$, and that there were five women leaders among this cohort in 2008. This drop represents a backslide over the past decade and signals the need for deep thought and analysis among our state university leaders and their boards.

## GENDER AND RACE/ETHNICITY OF PRESIDENTS AT PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS



TABLE 12

## COMPREHENSIVE GENDER RANK OF 9 PUBLIC STATE UNIVERSITIES

| RANK | INSTITUTION NAME | ENROLLMENT/ \%WOMEN | PRESIDENT | PROVOST | GHTING SR. TEAM | BOARD | SALARY | TOTAL POINTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Mass College of Liberal Arts | 1,588 / 62\% | 12 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 97 |
| 2 | Mass College of Art and Design | 2,064 / 70\% | 16 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 8 | 89 |
| 3 | Worcester State University | 6,434 / 61\% | 9 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 84 |
| 4 | Salem State University | 8,702 / 64\% | 19 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 79 |
| 5 | Framingham State University | 5,691 / 65\% | 7 | 15 | 28 | 9 | 20 | 79 |
| 6 | Westfield State University | 6,237 / 55\% | 2 | 15 | 30 | 6 | 20 | 73 |
| 7 | Bridgewater State University | 11,019 / 61\% | 4 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 64 |
| 8 | Fitchburg State University | 7,075 / 62\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 8 | 48 |
| 9 | Mass Maritime Academy | 1,780 / 14\% | 0 | 0 | 24 | 6 | 12 | 42 |

## UMass-Lowell is a Model of Gender Parity

At the doctoral level, the UMass-system ranked unsatisfactory among the complete index of 87 institutions and lags our public community colleges and state universities. This is a call for immediate action. Looking at the campus level, UMass-Lowell has achieved
parity across leadership categories and serves as a shining model for the other campuses. UMass-Boston and UMass-Dartmouth appear to be making gains and are close to gender parity. However, both the UMassMedical School and UMass-Amherst have fallen behind, particularly with respect to women's compensation.

TABLE 13

## RANK OF UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS CAMPUSES

| RANK | INSTITUTION NAME | ENROLLMENT/ \%WOMEN | PRESIDENT PROVOST/CAO | WEIGHTING SR. ACADEMIC | SR. LEADERSHIP | SALARY | TOTAL POINTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | UMass-Lowell | 18,315 / 40\% | 230 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 73 |
| 2 | UMass-Boston | 16,415 / 56\% | 1015 | 13 | 8 | 12 | 59 |
| 3 | UMass-Dartmouth | 8,406 / 50\% | 140 | 20 | 10 | 8 | 52 |
| 4 | UMass-Medical | 1,095 / 59\% | 00 | 20 | 10 | 4 | 34 |
| 5 | UMass-Amherst | 30,340 / 50\% | 0 | 20 | 9 | 4 | 33 |

## IX. RECOMMENDATIONS

## Leadership and Institutional Structure

## Presidents Must Visibly Make Gender Parity and Racial/Ethnic Balance a Priority

Presidents must exert clear, deliberate, transparent leadership to achieve gender parity and racial/ethnic balance within their institutions. Presidents should articulate to trustees, employees, and students the importance of reaching parity as essential to achieving the educational mission of the institution, being competitive in the educational marketplace, and setting an example for society, industry, and government in the America of today. Presidents should establish goals for parity and report to all their constituencies annually on progress toward achieving their goals. Without strong, visible leadership by presidents, all other efforts are diluted if not inconsequential.

## Presidents Should Establish and Empower the Office of the Chief Diversity Officer

Presidents should designate a chief diversity officer and allocate funding to staff and resource an office that focuses and leads campus diversity and inclusion work, commensurate to the employee and student population. The chief diversity officer should be a senior leadership member reporting directly to the president and engaged as a member of the president's senior leadership cabinet. The chief diversity officer should also have a direct connection to human resources and the academic leaders in order to inform recruitment and hiring efforts. Moreover, the diversity leader must be well positioned to work across campus with all senior leaders.

Each president, working with their chief diversity officer, should determine and assign organizational responsibility to other members of the senior leadership team-academic and administrative-to achieve parity goals, review performance periodically, and consider following the increasingly accepted business practice of linking performance in these matters to compensation.

## Boards Should Establish and Empower a Lead Diversity Trustee

Trustees should appoint a lead diversity trustee on the executive committee to ensure the board focuses on gender and racial/ethnic balance as a priority goal within itself and in concert with the president. Board meetings should include presentations of diversity data for faculty and senior academic and administrative leadership positions.

## Programmatic Changes

## Boards and Hiring Committees Must Recognize and Articulate the Importance of Gender and Racial/Ethnic Diversity at all Points of the Presidential Search Process

The data suggest that women are well represented in the pipeline positions leading to the presidency, so their relatively lower numbers in the top job are not due to a lack of availability of highly-qualified women. Boards of trustees need to probe deeper into the recruitment and final selection process to examine whether unconscious bias has played a role along the way, and specifically, in the ultimate decision to hire the next executive. Despite a concerted effort to ensure women and people of color are fairly represented among applicant pools for top jobs (sometimes called the "Rooney Rule"), we still see disparate outcomes. Could it be possible that the Rooney Rule cuts both ways and, in certain situations, has the unintended consequence of hurting women and racial/ ethnic minorities? If boards and individuals in power consider a representative number of women in the pool as a sufficient measure to ensure a fair outcome, they may not be examining all ways that partiality can enter into the hiring process, such as unconscious bias. In some cases, we have heard hiring leaders and committees say all they can focus on is the applicant pool and after that, it is out of their hands. Presidents, hiring chiefs, and boards must articulate to the selection committees the critical value of diversity and the need to think about qualifications in less traditional ways.

## Institutions Should Work to Debias All Hiring and Advancement Processes

In addition to reworking job requirements and minimum qualifications, we recommend schools require diversity, selection bias, unconscious and implicit bias professional development in order to serve on search committees across the institution. The president and chief diversity officer should focus on equity of outcomes to measure whether implicit bias is still at play.

## Schools Should Conduct Thorough Compensation Analyses

We suggest each school conduct a thorough compensation analysis of all positions within the president's team/cabinet, the provost's team/cabinet, and deans, checking for trends in terms of which positions are typically held by women and what they pay. Universities should look at the number of female deans at their graduate schools and colleges, and conduct the same analysis. Are deans of the various schools (business, medicine, education, etc.) paid differently and among those deanships, which pay the most, how many have, or have ever had, women leaders?

## The Governor Should Articulate a Clear Plan to Improve Gender Parity and Racial/Ethnic Representation Across Public Boards and Institutions of Higher Education

The Governor should use his appointing authority to expand gender and racial diversity on state and higher education trustee boards by setting specific goals for reaching parity across institutions including community colleges, state universities, and the UMass-system. Further, when appointing trustee chairs the Governor should immediately address the lack of women and specifically, the lack of women of color.

## Collective Bargaining Negotiations Should Always Include the Need for Gender and Racial Diversity

Public institutions should ensure that collective bargaining negotiations take into consideration the need for gender and racial diversity within hiring, promotion, and tenure positions. Together with the unions, institutions should set specific goals for improvement.

## Immediate Actions

## Immediate Board Vacancies Should be Filled with Women, Particularly Women of Color, Until Parity is Reached

At the institutional level, schools which have not achieved gender parity on their boards should fill immediate vacancies with women, and particularly, women of color, until parity is reached. Many schools look to alumni for board positions, and there are many accomplished and talented alumnae, among others, for schools to choose from. All institutions, public and private, should elevate more women to serve as chairs and officers on their boards when the next round of officers' terms expire.

## Unconscious Bias Training Should be Routine for Presidents, Boards, and Senior Leaders

At the institutional level, schools should routinely require "unconscious bias" training for boards, presidents, and other senior leaders to examine the role unconscious bias plays in hiring and decision-making. The Board of Higher Education should require all public board members to participate in the training.

## APPENDIX A

APPENDIX TABLE 1

## gender parity rating by institution type

| CATEGORY | DOCTORAL (18) | BA/MA (42) | ASSOCIATE'S (17) | SPECIAL FOCUS (15) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Satisfactory | 2 | 21 | 11 | 3 |
| Status Quo | 6 | 10 | 4 | 5 |
| Unsatisfactory | 8 | 10 | 2 | 6 |
| Needs Urgent Attention | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

Note: Data corresponds to Figure 1. Gender Parity Rating by Institution Type on page 7.

## LISTING OF INSTITUTIONS - NEVER WOMAN PRESIDENT, NEVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR, FEWER THAN 30\% WOMEN ON THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

| INSTITUTION NAME | NEVER HAD A WOMAN PRESIDENT | NEVER HAD A WOMAN BOARD CHAIR | COUNTS FEWER THAN $30 \%$ WOMEN ON BOARD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| American International College | X | Not Available | X |
| Amherst College |  | Not Available | X |
| Anna Maria College** $\dagger$ |  |  |  |
| Assumption Collegeł | X | X | X |
| Babson College |  |  | X |
| Bay Path University* |  |  |  |
| Bay State College |  |  |  |
| Becker College |  |  | X |
| Benjamin Franklin Institute of Technology | X |  | X |
| Bentley University |  | X | X |
| Berklee College of Music | X |  | X |
| Berkshire Community College |  |  |  |
| Boston Architectural College | X |  |  |
| Boston Colleget | X |  | X |
| Boston University | X | X | X |
| Brandeis University |  | X |  |
| Bridgewater State University |  |  |  |
| Bristol Community College |  |  |  |
| Bunker Hill Community College |  |  |  |
| Cambridge College |  |  |  |
| Cape Cod Community College |  |  |  |
| Clark University | X |  |  |
| College of our Lady of the Elms** $\dagger$ |  |  |  |
| College of the Holy Crosst | X | X | $X$ |
| Curry College |  |  | X |
| Dean College |  |  | X |


| INSTITUTION NAME | NEVER HAD A WOMAN <br> PRESIDENT | NEVER HAD A WOMAN <br> BOARD CHAIR | 30\% WOMEN ON BOARD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| INSTITUTION NAME | NEVER HAD A WOMAN PRESIDENT | NEVER HAD A WOMAN BOARD CHAIR | COUNTS FEWER THAN 30\% WOMEN ON BOARD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Simmons University* |  |  |  |
| Smith College* |  |  |  |
| Springfield College |  |  |  |
| Springfield Technical Community College | X |  |  |
| Stonehill Collegeł | X | X | X |
| Suffolk University |  | X |  |
| Tufts University | X | Not Available |  |
| University of Massachusetts-Amherst | X | N/A | N/A |
| University of Massachusetts-Boston |  | N/A | N/A |
| University of Massachusetts-central office | X |  | X |
| University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth |  | N/A | N/A |
| University of Massachusetts-Lowell |  | N/A | N/A |
| University of Massachusetts-Medical School | X | N/A | N/A |
| Urban College of Boston |  |  |  |
| Wellesley College* |  |  |  |
| Wentworth Institute of Technology |  |  | X |
| Western New England University |  |  | X |
| Westfield State University |  |  |  |
| Wheaton College** |  |  |  |
| William James College | X |  |  |
| Williams College |  |  |  |
| Worcester Polytechnic Institute |  | X |  |
| Worcester State University |  |  |  |
| Grand Total | 30 | 15 | 24 |

Note: Data corresponds to discussion in Executive Summary and Key Findings: We Still Have a Long Way to Go. *Indicates women's college.
** Indicates formerly a women's college. † Indicates Catholic institution. N/A - not applicable.

## APPENDIX TABLE 3

## MEASURING POWER GAP

| POSITION | WOMEN | MEN | WOC | MOC |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| President (92) | 34 | 58 | 6 | 8 |
| Provost (92) | 44 | 48 | 6 | 7 |
| Board Chair (87) | 23 | 64 | 2 | 5 |

Note: Data corresponds to Figure 2. Measuring the Women's Power Gap in Higher Education on page 11.

## GENDER AND RACE OF PRESIDENTS BY INSTITUTION TYPE

|  | TOTAL \# | \# WOMAN | \% WOMAN | IDENTS <br> \# WOC | \% WOC | \# MOC | \% MOC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PUBLIC | 30 | 10 | 33\% | 4 | 13\% | 5 | 17\% |
| Doctoral Universities (UMass campuses + central office) | 6 | 2 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 33\% |
| BA/MA (State Universities) | 9 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 22\% |
| Associate's (Community Colleges) | 15 | 8 | 53\% | 4 | 27\% | 1 | 7\% |
| PRIVATE | 62 | 24 | 39\% | 2 | 3\% | 3 | 5\% |
| Doctoral Universities | 12 | 2 | 17\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 8\% |
| BA/MA | 33 | 17 | 52\% | 2 | 6\% | 2 | 6\% |
| Associate's | 2 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Special Focus | 15 | 5 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| TOTAL | 92 | 34 | 37\% | 6 | 7\% | 8 | 9\% |
| Doctoral Universities | 18 | 4 | 22\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 17\% |
| BA/MA | 42 | 17 | 40\% | 2 | 5\% | 4 | 10\% |
| Associate's | 17 | 8 | 47\% | 4 | 24\% | 1 | 6\% |
| Special Focus | 15 | 5 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |

Note: Data Corresponds to Figure 4. Gender and Race of Presidents by Institution Type on page 15.

APPENDIX TABLE 5
GENDER AND RACE OF PROVOST BY INSTITUTION TYPE

|  | TOTAL \# | \# WOMAN | \% WOMAN | \# WOC | \% WOC | \# MOC | \% MOC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PUBLIC | 30 | 18 | 60\% | 4 | 13\% | 4 | 13\% |
| Doctoral Universities (UMass campuses + central office) | 6 | 2 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 17\% |
| BA/MA (State Universities) | 9 | 5 | 56\% | 2 | 22\% | 2 | 22\% |
| Associate's (Community Colleges) | 15 | 11 | 73\% | 2 | 13\% | 1 | 7\% |
| PRIVATE | 62 | 26 | 42\% | 2 | 3\% | 3 | 5\% |
| Doctoral Universities | 12 | 5 | 42\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 17\% |
| BA/MA | 33 | 16 | 48\% | 2 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Associate's | 2 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Special Focus | 15 | 4 | 27\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 7\% |
| TOTAL | 92 | 44 | 48\% | 6 | 7\% | 7 | 8\% |
| Doctoral Universities | 18 | 7 | 39\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 17\% |
| BA/MA | 42 | 21 | 50\% | 4 | 10\% | 2 | 5\% |
| Associate's | 17 | 12 | 71\% | 2 | 12\% | 1 | 6\% |
| Special Focus | 15 | 4 | 27\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 7\% |

Note: Data Corresponds to Figure 5. Gender and Race of Provosts by Institution Type on page 17.

## GENDER OF SENIOR TEAM FOR 92 INSTITUTIONS BY INSTITUTION TYPE

|  | TOTAL \# SR. TEAM | TOTAL \# SR. TEAM WOMAN | \% SR. TEAM WOMAN |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PUBLIC | $\mathbf{4 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 7}$ | $59 \%$ |
| Doctoral Universities (UMass campuses + central <br> office) | 134 | 69 | $51 \%$ |
| BA/MA (State Universities) | 114 | 66 | $58 \%$ |
| Associate's (Community Colleges) | 206 | 132 | $64 \%$ |
| PRIVATE | 885 | 472 | $53 \%$ |
| Doctoral Universities | 267 | 111 | $42 \%$ |
| BA/MA | 414 | 252 | $61 \%$ |
| Associate's | 18 | 11 | $61 \%$ |
| Special Focus | 186 | 98 | $53 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 1,339 | 739 | $55 \%$ |
| Doctoral Universities | 401 | 180 | $45 \%$ |
| BA/MA | 528 | 318 | $60 \%$ |
| Associate's | 224 | 143 | $64 \%$ |
| Special Focus | 186 | 98 | $53 \%$ |

Note: Data Corresponds to Figure 6. Gender and Race of Senior Leadership by Institution Type on page 17.

## APPENDIX TABLE 7

# RACE OF SENIOR LEADERSHIP TEAM AT 72 INSTITUTIONS 

| INSTITUTION TYPE | \# SR. TEAM WOC | \# SR. TEAM MOC |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Doctoral Universities (401) | 39 | 34 |
| BA/MA (395) | 43 | 13 |
| Associate's (159) | 23 | 10 |
| Special Focus (116) | 11 | 7 |

Note: Data corresponds to Figure 6. Gender and Race of Senior Leadership by Institution Type on page 17.

APPENDIX TABLE 8

## GENDER OF SENIOR ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERS AT DOCTORAL UNIVERSITIES

|  | TOTAL \# <br> SR. ADMIN | TOTAL <br> SR. ADMIN <br> WOMAN | \% SR. TEAM <br> ADMIN <br> WOMAN | TOTAL <br> \# SR. <br> ACADEMIC | TOTAL \# SR. <br> ACADEMIC <br> WOMAN | \% SR. <br> ACADEMIC <br> WOMAN |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Doctoral Universities (UMass campuses <br> + central office) | 97 | 47 | $48 \%$ | 37 | 22 | $59 \%$ |
| Doctoral Universities (12 private) | 175 | 76 | $43 \%$ | 92 | 35 | $38 \%$ |
| Total | 272 | 123 | $45 \%$ | 129 | 57 | $44 \%$ |

Note: Data corresponds to Figures 7 and 8. Senior Academic and Administrative Leaders by Gender at Doctoral Universities on page 17.

GENDER AND RACE OF BOARD CHAIRS BY INSTITUTION TYPE

|  | TOTAL <br> BOARD <br> CHAIRS | \# BOARD <br> CHAIR <br> WOMAN | \% BOARD <br> CHAIR <br> WOMAN | \# BOARD <br> CHAIR <br> WOC | \% BOARD <br> CHAIR <br> WOC | \# BOARD <br> CHAIR <br> MOC | \% BOARD <br> CHAIR <br> MOC |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PUBLIC | 25 | 6 | $24 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 1 | $4 \%$ |
| Doctoral Universities (UMass-system) | 1 | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| BA/MA (State Universities) | 9 | 2 | $22 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Associate's (Community Colleges) | 15 | 4 | $27 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 1 | $7 \%$ |
| PRIVATE | 62 | 17 | $27 \%$ | 2 | $3 \%$ | 4 | $6 \%$ |
| Doctoral Universities | 12 | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 1 | $8 \%$ |
| BA/MA | 33 | 13 | $39 \%$ | 2 | $6 \%$ | 3 | $9 \%$ |
| Associate's | 2 | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Special Focus | 15 | 4 | $27 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 87 | 23 | $26 \%$ | 2 | $2 \%$ | 5 | $6 \%$ |
| Doctoral Universities | 13 | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 1 | $8 \%$ |
| BA/MA | 42 | 15 | $36 \%$ | 2 | $5 \%$ | 3 | $7 \%$ |
| Associate's | 17 | 4 | $24 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 1 | $6 \%$ |
| Special Focus | 15 | 4 | $27 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |

Note: Data corresponds to Figure 10. Gender and Race of Board Chairs by Institution Type on page 22.

APPENDIX TABLE 10

## GENDER OF BOARD MEMBERS FOR 87 INSTITUTIONS

$\left.\begin{array}{lccc} & \begin{array}{c}\text { TOTAL \# BOARD } \\ \text { MEMBERS }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \# BOARD MEMBERS } \\ \text { WOMAN }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% BOARD MEMBERS } \\ \text { WOMAN }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { PUBLIC } & 254 & 128\end{array}\right)$

Note: Data corresponds to Figure 11. Gender and Race of Board Members by Institution Type on page 22.

## RACE OF BOARD MEMBERS ACROSS 67 INSTITUTIONS

| POSITION | \# BOARD WOC | \# BOARD MOC |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Doctoral Universities (429) | 29 | 42 |
| BA/MA (655) | 63 | 30 |
| Associate's (134) | 20 | 10 |
| Special Focus (207) | 13 | 15 |

Note: Data corresponds to Figure 11. Gender and Race of Board Members by Institution Type on page 22.

## APPENDIX B

The University of Massachusetts (UMass) system, comprised of five campuses and one central office, counts one board chair and one governing board. As such, we rank the UMass-system and not the individual campuses in the comprehensive list of 87 institutions. However, leadership positions among the five UMass campuses are discussed when we look in depth at key roles including: president, provost, senior academic and administrative teams, and compensation. An analysis of gender and racial/ethnic parity among the five campuses is also addressed in the discussion of public institutions.

## 87 SCHOOLS WITH A FIDUCIARY BOARD

Satisfactory: Receive 80+ total points
Status Quo: Receive 60-79 total points
Unsatisfactory: Receive 40-59 total points
Needs Urgent Attention: Receive less than 40 total points

In addition, we include the five campuses among a count of 92 schools to identify the category each campus falls into, e.g., satisfactory, status quo, unsatisfactory, and needs urgent attention. With no board, the maximum point allocation for the five campuses is 105 points, compared to the other 87 institutions who have a maximum point allocation of 125 . See table below and Appendix E for more detail on this year's point allocation and weighting.

5 UMASS CAMPUSES<br>Satisfactory: Receive 60+ total points<br>Status Quo: Receive 40-59 total points<br>Unsatisfactory: Receive 20-39 total points<br>Needs Urgent Attention: Receive less than 20 total points

## APPENDIX C

## Doctoral Universities

The 12 private and 5 public doctoral schools in the Commonwealth include: American International College, Boston College, Boston University, Brandeis University, Clark University, Harvard University, Lesley University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Northeastern University, Suffolk University, Tufts University, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and UMassAmherst, UMass-Boston, UMass-Dartmouth, UMassLowell, and UMass-Medical School.

## Bachelor's Colleges and Master's Universities

For analysis purposes, BA/MA schools are grouped together. The 16 private bachelor's colleges, 17 private, and nine public master's universities in the state include: Amherst College, Bay State College, Becker College, College of the Holy Cross, Dean College, Emmanuel College, Fisher College, Gordon College, Hampshire College, Mount Holyoke College, Pine Manor College, Smith College, Stonehill College, Wellesley College, Wheaton College, Williams College, Anna Maria College, Assumption College, Bay Path University, Bentley University, Cambridge College, College of our Lady of the Elms, Curry College, Eastern Nazarene College, Emerson College, Endicott College, Lasell College, Merrimack College, Regis College, Simmons University, Springfield College, Wentworth Institute of Technology, Western New England University, Bridgewater State University, Fitchburg State University, Framingham State University, Massachusetts

College of Art and Design, Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts, Massachusetts Maritime Academy, Salem State University, Westfield State University, and Worcester State University.

## Associate's/Community Colleges

The two private associate-degree granting schools are Quincy College and Urban College of Boston, and 15 public community colleges include: Berkshire Community College, Bristol Community College, Bunker Hill Community College, Cape Cod Community College, Greenfield Community College, Holyoke Community College, Massachusetts Bay Community College, Massasoit Community College, Middlesex Community College, Mount Wachusett Community College, North Shore Community College, Northern Essex Community College, Quinsigamond Community College, Roxbury Community College, and Springfield Technical Community College.

## Special Focus Institutions

These 15 institutions include: Babson College, Benjamin Franklin Institute of Technology, Berklee College of Music, Boston Architectural College, Franklin W Olin College of Engineering, Hult International Business School, Labouré College, MCPHS University, MGH Institute of Health Professions, Montserrat College of Art, New England College of Business and Finance, New England College of Optometry, New England Conservatory of Music, Nichols College, and William James College.

## APPENDIX D

## Higher Education Institutions in Massachusetts - Data Collection

The data set for the Women's Power Gap in Higher Education: Study and Rankings, first published in September 2018, included 94 institutions, which included the University of Massachusetts (UMasssystem) during discussion of president and board data. This year, the institutional count is down to 92 due to the closing of Newbury College and the determination to eliminate New England Law, which has no provost, no board, and no board chair - positions critical to the categorial ranking. As discussed earlier, one UMasssystem was included in the comprehensive rank of

87 schools with the five UMass campuses included in analysis of the president, provost, senior academic and administrative teams, compensation, and public institution discussions.
After a thorough process of determining which leadership categories and selected positions should be included, researchers constructed a database based on publicly available information about such positions from college and university websites. Institutional data, including enrollment figures broken down by gender, acceptance rate, among other variables, were taken from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and the Carnegie Classification. To compare institutions similar to one another, a total of six schools,
including Regis College, Quincy College, Urban College of Boston, Massachusetts College of Art and Design, Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts, and UMassMedical School were moved from one Carnegie category to another for analysis.

## Research Methodology

All data collected through public sources was used to populate an institutional leadership profile of each school, which was then emailed to the president (or chancellor) of each institution, with a copy to her/ his assistant and the institutional research head, human resource director, or diversity and inclusion administration of the institution. The correspondence explained the study and requested that each school validate and/or edit their leadership profile, adding gender as well as racial/ethnic background for the incumbent in each position held on May 15, 2019, the anchor date for this academic year 2018/2019 study. Researchers then attempted, through several rounds of written and telephone follow-up requests, to work with the designated official(s) at each institution to ensure completion of the data request. In some cases, however, institutions determined that they could not complete the data request.

## Gender and Racial/Ethnic Data

A total of 63 institutions validated gender and racial/ ethnic data for all leadership positions captured in this study. An additional 4, for a total of 67 schools, validated all gender and racial/ethnic data for president, provost, and board chair. For the remaining 25 institutions, researchers conducted a comprehensive public search and detailed quality assurance process to identify gender and diversity data for provost, president, and board chair resulting in complete gender and racial/ethnic data for these three positions. Researchers also identified diversity data for the seven institutions that submitted partial data and two doctoral universities who did not respond to the data request. Racial/ethnic information is therefore a complete sample of 72 institutions. While great effort was taken to ensure precision of this data, we recognize that inaccuracies may have occurred and take responsibility for any errors.
As noted earlier, we relied on each institution to share self-reported gender and racial/ethnic data and are limited by current record-keeping practice. Consequently, we are not able to report on LGBTQ, gender non-conforming, and other diverse categories. Further, we were not able to disaggregate the data on persons of color to ascertain what percentage are underrepresented minorities (URM) as some studies have done. Given study limitations, we asked if individuals in leadership positions identified as a person of color with a binary response option of yes/no. Institutions generally 6. https://census.gov/topics/populations/race/about.html
use the US Census Bureau definition and categorization when identifying racial/ethnic minorities or persons of color. ${ }^{6}$ For the purposes of this report, we use those two terms interchangeably.

Institutions that validated data ( $N=63$ ): American International College, Anna Maria College, Assumption College, Bay Path University, Bay State College, Becker College, Benjamin Franklin Institute of Technology, Berklee College of Music, Berkshire Community College, Boston Architectural College, Boston University, Brandeis University, Bridgewater State University, Bunker Hill Community College, Cambridge College, Clark University, College of Our Lady of the Elms, Dean College, Emerson College, Emanuel College, Fisher College, Fitchburg State University, Framingham State University, Gordon College, Holyoke Community College, Lesley University, Massachusetts Bay Community College, Massachusetts College of Art and Design, Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Massachusetts Maritime Academy, Massasoit Community College, MGH Institute of Health Professions, Mount Holyoke College, Mount Wachusett Community College, New England College of Business and Finance, New England College of Optometry, New England Conservatory of Music, North Shore Community College, Northern Essex Community College, Pine Manor College, Quincy College, Quinsigamond Community College, Regis College, Salem State University, Simmons University, Smith College, Springfield College, Stonehill Community College, Tufts University, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, University of MassachusettsBoston, University of Massachusetts-central office, University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth, University of Massachusetts-Lowell, University of MassachusettsMedical School, Urban College of Boston, Wellesley College, Westfield State University, Wheaton College, William James College, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and Worcester State University.

Institutions that validated partial data ( $N=7$ ): Cape Cod Community College, Endicott College, Franklin W Olin College of Engineering, Greenfield Community College, Harvard University, Montserrat College of Art, and Suffolk University.
Institutions that did not respond ( $N=14$ ): Babson College, Bentley University, Boston College, College of the Holy Cross, Eastern Nazarene College, Hult International Business School, Lasell College, MCPHS University, Merrimack College, Middlesex Community College, Nichols College, Northeastern University, Roxbury Community College, and Wentworth Institute of Technology.
Institutions that declined to participate in the study ( $N=8$ ): Amherst College, Bristol Community College,

Curry College, Hampshire College, Labouré College, Springfield Technical Community College, Western New England University, and Williams College.

## Catholic Schools

There are ten Catholic institutions in our sample. Among these, Stonehill College's by-laws require that only a priest can serve as president of the school. Stonehill's by-laws also require that $50 \%$ of the board be comprised of priests. According to their by-laws, neither Boston College nor Merrimack College require
the president to be of clergy. We do not have this same detailed information on by-laws for the other schools. Historically, it appears that Assumption, Boston College, and Holy Cross also have only had priests serve as presidents. Merrimack, while a Catholic school, has a lay president. The remaining five schools are or were formerly women's colleges or educate students for professions that are dominated by women, as in the case of Labouré, which is a nursing school.

## APPENDIX E

This year, we made several changes to the ranking system. Overall, a total of 125 maximum points were allocated; 105 for campus leadership, where operationally hiring and compensation decisions that impact gender and racial parity are made, and 20 points at the board level. In addition, a larger group of senior academic and administrative leadership was considered. At the presidential level, we awarded points for the
number of years a permanent female president held office rather than for the number of past permanent female presidents. The compensation weighting category is new this year, and an important metric to consider on the path to parity in leadership.
Salary data can be found on our website at:
WomensPowerGap.org.

APPENDIX TABLE 12
POINT ALLOCATION/WEIGHTING USED TO DEVELOP THE COMPREHENSIVE INDEX

| INDICATOR | VARIABLE(S) | POINT ALLOCATION DOCTORAL UNIVERSITIES | POINT ALLOCATION ALL OTHER INSTITUTIONS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PRESIDENT - UP TO 40 POINTS |  |  |  |
| PRESIDENT | Current year woman - permanent | 20 | 20 |
|  | Current year woman - interim | 5 | 5 |
|  | Permanent woman between 1998-2018 (corresponds to 1 point/year) | 20 | 20 |
| SENIOR LEADERSHIP - UP TO 45 POINTS |  |  |  |
| CAO/PROVOST | Current year woman - permanent or interim | 15 | 15 |
| SR. ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP | 50\% Woman receives max point allocation | 20 | 15 |
| SR. ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP | 50\% Woman receives max point allocation | 10 | 15 |
| COMPENSATION - UP TO 20 POINTS |  |  |  |
| COMPENSATION | \% Women among top highest paid - 50\% receives max point allocation | 20 | 20 |
| BOARD - UP TO 20 POINTS |  |  |  |
| BOARD CHAIR | Current year woman - permanent or interim | 10 | 10 |
| BOARD MEMBERS | 50\% Woman receives max point allocation | 10 | 10 |

## APPENDIX F

The following tables provide a ranking of each institution compared to their peers by classification type.

## APPENDIX TABLE 13

## RANK OF 13 DOCTORAL UNIVERSITIES

| RANK | INSTITUTION NAME | ENROLLMENT/ \%WOMEN | PRESIDENT |  | IGHTING SR. TEAM | BOARD | SALARY | TOTAL POINTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Lesley University** | 4,732 / 82\% | 9 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 84 |
| 2 | American International College | 3,283 / 72\% | 0 | 15 | 30 | 3 | 20 | 68 |
| 3 | Worcester Polytechnic Institute | 6,642 / 35\% | 24 | 0 | 26 | 7 | 8 | 65 |
| 4 | Suffolk University | 7,201 / 56\% | 22 | 0 | 23 | 9 | 12 | 65 |
| 5 | Brandeis University | 5,721 / 58\% | 0 | 15 | 25 | 8 | 12 | 60 |
| 6 | Tufts University | 11,449 / 55\% | 0 | 15 | 19 | 8 | 16 | 58 |
| 7 | Harvard University | 31,120 / 49\% | 11 | 0 | 24 | 9 | 12 | 57 |
| 8 | UMass-system | 74,571 / 51\% | 0 | 15 | 27 | 6 | 8 | 56 |
| 9 | Boston University | 33,355 / 59\% | 0 | 15 | 24 | 6 | 12 | 56 |
| 10 | Clark University | 3,153 / 60\% | 0 | 0 | 23 | 6 | 16 | 46 |
| 11 | Northeastern University | 21,489 / 48\% | 0 | 0 | 24 | 5 | 12 | 41 |
| 12 | Mass Institute of Technology | 11,466 / 39\% | 8 | 0 | 15 | 7 | 4 | 35 |
| 13 | Boston College $\dagger$ | 14,628 / 54\% | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 15 |

Note: The rating category for doctoral universities is based on a maximum of 125 points. Refer to Appendix E for more detail. ** Indicates formerly a women's college. †Indicates Catholic institution.

RANK OF 42 BACHELOR'S COLLEGES AND MASTER'S UNIVERSITIES

| RANK | INSTITUTION NAME | ENROLLMENT/ \% WOMEN | PRESIDENT | PROVOST | IGHTING <br> SR. TEAM | BOARD | SALARY | TOTAL POINTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Bay Path University* | 3,298 / 94\% | 40 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 125 |
| 2 | Simmons University* | 6,283 / 91\% | 32 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 117 |
| 3 | Emmanuel College** $\dagger$ | 2,083 / 74\% | 40 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 110 |
| 3 | Wellesley College* | 2,508 / 98\% | 40 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 110 |
| 5 | Mount Holyoke College* | 2,334 / 99\% | 39 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 109 |
| 5 | Smith College* | 2,918 / 98\% | 39 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 109 |
| 7 | Becker College | 1,892 / 58\% | 21 | 15 | 30 | 16 | 20 | 102 |
| 8 | Regis College**† | 2,166 / 83\% | 40 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 100 |
| 9 | Cambridge College | 2,261 / 74\% | 32 | 0 | 30 | 17 | 20 | 99 |
| 10 | Springfield College | 3,246 / 56\% | 25 | 15 | 30 | 8 | 20 | 98 |
| 11 | Bentley University | 5,543 / 45\% | 31 | 15 | 30 | 6 | 16 | 98 |
| 12 | Mass College of Liberal Arts | 1,588 / 62\% | 12 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 97 |
| 13 | Anna Maria College** $\dagger$ | 1,445 / 54\% | 23 | 15 | 30 | 9 | 16 | 93 |
| 14 | Dean College | 1,301 / 54\% | 40 | 0 | 28 | 4 | 17 | 90 |
| 15 | Mass College of Art and Design | 2,064 / 70\% | 16 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 8 | 89 |
| 16 | Wentworth Institute of Tech | 4,457 / 21\% | 33 | 0 | 30 | 4 | 20 | 87 |
| 17 | Emerson College | 4,459 / 62\% | 13 | 15 | 30 | 7 | 20 | 85 |
| 18 | Amherst College | 1,836 / 49\% | 27 | 15 | 16 | 6 | 20 | 84 |
| 19 | Worcester State University | 6,434 / 61\% | 9 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 84 |
| 20 | Elms College** $\dagger$ | 1,580 / 75\% | 11 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 81 |
| 21 | Fisher College | 1,923 / 73\% | 0 | 15 | 30 | 15 | 20 | 80 |
| 22 | Salem State University | 8,702 / 64\% | 19 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 79 |
| 23 | Wheaton College** | 1,688 / 61\% | 6 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 8 | 79 |
| 24 | Framingham State University | 5,691 / 65\% | 7 | 15 | 28 | 9 | 20 | 79 |
| 25 | Pine Manor College** | 450 / 49\% | 14 | 15 | 30 | 9 | 10 | 78 |
| 26 | Williams College | 2,134 / 48\% | 20 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 16 | 76 |
| 27 | Endicott College** | 4,795 / 66\% | 5 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 75 |
| 28 | Hampshire College | 1,268 / 63\% | 0 | 15 | 30 | 9 | 20 | 74 |
| 29 | Westfield State University | 6,237 / 55\% | 2 | 15 | 30 | 6 | 20 | 73 |
| 30 | College of the Holy Crosst | 2,855 / 51\% | 0 | 15 | 30 | 5 | 16 | 66 |
| 31 | Bridgewater State University | 11,019 / 61\% | 4 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 64 |
| 32 | Lasell College** | 2,055 / 64\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 7 | 20 | 57 |
| 33 | Assumption Collegeł | 2,481 / 61\% | 0 | 15 | 24 | 5 | 12 | 56 |
| 34 | Western NE University | 3,776 / 43\% | 0 | 15 | 20 | 5 | 15 | 55 |
| 35 | Bay State College | 717 / 71\% | 2 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 12 | 54 |
| 36 | Stonehill Collegeł | 2,498 / 59\% | 0 | 0 | 27 | 5 | 20 | 51 |
| 37 | Gordon College | 1,963 / 66\% | 0 | 15 | 17 | 6 | 12 | 51 |
| 38 | Curry College | 2,799 / 59\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 4 | 15 | 49 |
| 39 | Fitchburg State University | 7,075 / 62\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 8 | 48 |
| 40 | Eastern Nazarene College | 848 / 60\% | 12 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 10 | 47 |
| 41 | Mass Maritime Academy | 1,780 / 14\% | 0 | 0 | 24 | 6 | 12 | 42 |
| 42 | Merrimack Collegeł | 4,191 / 54\% | 0 | 0 | 23 | 5 | 8 | 35 |

Note: The rating category for BA/MA institutions is based on a maximum of 125 points. Refer to Appendix E for more detail. * Indicates women's college. ** Indicates formerly a women's college. † Indicates Catholic institution.

## RANK OF 17 ASSOCIATE'S DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

| RANK | NSTITUTION NAME | ENROLLMENT/ \%WOMEN | PRESIDENT | PROVOST | EIGHTING SR. TEAM | BOARD | SALARY | TOTAL POINTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Berkshire Community College | 1,847 / 62\% | 31 | 15 | 23 | 20 | 16 | 105 |
| 2 | Quinsigamond Community College | 7,368 / 58\% | 18 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 103 |
| 3 | Roxbury Community College | 1,928 / 70\% | 28 | 15 | 30 | 9 | 20 | 102 |
| 4 | Bristol Community College | 7,637 / 63\% | 23 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 12 | 100 |
| 5 | North Shore Community College | 6,087 / 62\% | 24 | 15 | 30 | 9 | 20 | 98 |
| 6 | Bunker Hill Community College | 11,881 / 57\% | 40 | 0 | 30 | 7 | 20 | 97 |
| 7 | Holyoke Community College | 5,565 / 62\% | 21 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 96 |
| 8 | Massasoit Community College | 7,154 / 56\% | 20 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 95 |
| 9 | Cape Cod Community College | 3,221 / 61\% | 14 | 15 | 27 | 18 | 20 | 94 |
| 10 | Greenfield Community College | 1,830 / 61\% | 20 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 16 | 91 |
| 11 | Mass Bay Community College | 4,629 / 52\% | 7 | 15 | 30 | 8 | 20 | 80 |
| 12 | Middlesex Community College | 8,206 / 57\% | 16 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 16 | 72 |
| 13 | Springfield Tech Community College | 5,343 / 59\% | 0 | 15 | 28 | 6 | 20 | 69 |
| 14 | Urban College of Boston | 812 / 93\% | 9 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 0 | 64 |
| 15 | Mount Wachusett Community College | 3,854 / 65\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 60 |
| 16 | Quincy College | 5,343 / 68\% | 5 | 0 | 28 | 9 | 12 | 54 |
| 17 | Northern Essex Community College | 5,726 / 61\% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 12 | 52 |

Note: The rating category for associate's colleges is based on a maximum of 125 points. Refer to Appendix E for more detail.

## APPENDIX TABLE 16

RANK OF 15 SPECIAL FOCUS INSTITUTIONS


Note: The rating category for special focus institutions is based on a maximum of 125 points. Refer to Appendix $E$ for more detail. $\downarrow$ Indicates Catholic institution.

## APPENDIX G - INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES

The profiles to follow present a summary of each school for academic year 2018/2019 with May 15, 2019 used as the anchor date for data used in the comprehensive ranking and weighting schema. Where possible presidential transitions beginning on or after July 1, 2019 are noted; these will be captured in next year's comprehensive rank for academic year 2019/2020. As noted in the methodology:

- For doctoral universities, we weighted academic leadership (mainly academic deans) and administrative leadership separately, granting more points to the academic leadership given their portfolios running their individual schools.
- For all other institutions, we combined both academic and administrative into one group senior leadership.
- For past female president weighting, only permanent past female presidents received points.
- For current presidents, both interim and permanent female presidents are included,
but interim receive fewer points than current permanent presidents.
- Board members do not include students with limited terms.


## Profile Key

- W - Woman/Women
- M - Man/Men
- MOC - Man of color
- WOC - Woman of color
- N/A - Not applicable
-     * Indicates women's college
- ** Indicates formerly a women's college
- $\dagger$ Indicates Catholic institution
- "-" Connotes that either the data was not submitted or not available.
- ${ }^{r}$ Data reflects publicly available information that researchers made every attempt to validate.

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 22 | $14 \%(3)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $27 \%(6)$ |
| SR ACADEMIC | 3 | $100 \%(3)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 10 | $50 \%(5)$ | $10 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## STATUS QUO

AIC reached parity among senior academic and administrative teams and in terms of the number of women in the top ten most highly compensated. They have far too few women on their board of trustees,
and need both women and men of color in leadership. AIC is one of 30 schools that have never had a female president. AIC validated all data.

AMHERST COLLEGE PRIVATE,BACHELOR'S • 1,836 ENROLLED, 49\% W

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 24 | $29 \%(7)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 11 | $27 \%(3)$ | - | - |

## SATISFACTORY

Amherst scored well with a female president, provost, and with $60 \%$ women in the top ten highest compensated employees. However, we would expect
more women on the board and among the senior leadership team. Amherst declined to validate this data. ${ }^{r}$

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 24 | $46 \%(11)$ | $4 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 9 | $56 \%(5)$ | $11 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Anna Maria scored well with a female president, provost, and with $56 \%$ women among the senior leadership team. We would expect parity among
the most highly compensated employees and at the board level. Anna Maria counts few women and men of color in leadership. Anna Maria validated this data.


ASSUMPTION COLLEGE PRIVATE,MASTER'S • 2,481 ENROLLED, 61\% W PRESIDENT: FRANCESCO CESAREO - MAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO
BOARD CHAIR: FRANCIS BEDARD•MAN
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: NO PROVOST: LOUISE CARROLL KEELEY • WOMAN \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 30\% (3 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 27 | $26 \%(7)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 10 | $40 \%(4)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Assumption benefits from a female provost and is almost at parity with the leadership team, but falls behind in all other categories. With $61 \%$ female enrollment, we would expect to see greater parity in leadership. There are no people of color in any
leadership positions. Assumption is one of only six schools that have never had a female president, never had a female board chair, and counts fewer than 30\% women on their board. Assumption validated all data.

BABSON COLLEGE PRIVATE, SPECIAL FOCUS • 3,329 ENROLLED, 45\% W
PRESIDENT: KERRY HEALEY • WOMAN
BOARD CHAIR: MARLA CAPOZZI • WOMAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
PROVOST: MARK RICE • MAN
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 50\% (5 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 37 | $24 \%(9)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 19 | $53 \%(10)$ | - | - |

## SATISFACTORY

Babson scored well across all categories of gender parity. The only area in which they fall short is on the percentage of women on their board. Kerry Healey
was replaced by a male, Stephen Spinelli, after July 1, 2019. Babson did not respond to the request to validate this data. ${ }^{\text {r }}$

BAY PATH UNIVERSITY* PRIVATE, MASTER'S • 3,298 ENROLLED, 94\% W
PRESIDENT: CAROL LEARY • WOMAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: PATRICIA PIERCE - WOMAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
RANK PROVOST: MELISSA MORRISS-OLSON • WOMAN \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 78\% (7 OF 9)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 33 | $61 \%(20)$ | $6 \%(2)$ | $9 \%(3)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 10 | $80 \%(8)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Bay Path received points across all categories in this study. As a women's college, we expect to see strong representation of women in leadership roles, and
at Bay Path, this is the case. However, the institution counts few women and men of color in leadership. Bay Path validated all data.

PRESIDENT: MARK DEFUSCO • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: ALTHEA BLACKFORD • WOC
PROVOST: WILLIAM CARROLL • MAN

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 7 | $71 \%(5)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 6 | $33 \%(2)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Bay State counts a woman of color as board chair and has strong female representation on their board, but falls behind in other categories. With women's enrollment of $71 \%$, we would expect to see greater

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 30\% (3 OF 10)
parity in leadership and among top compensated employees. The institution counts few women and men of color in leadership. Bay State validated all but salary data.

BECKER COLLEGE PRIVATE, BACHELOR'S • 1,892 ENROLLED, 58\% W
PRESIDENT: NANCY CRIMMIN • WOMAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES BOARD CHAIR: CHRISTINE CASSIDY • WOMAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
PROVOST: AMBER VAILL • WOMAN

| WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- |
| $57 \%(4)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

ar

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 17 | $29 \%(5)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $6 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 12 | $67 \%(8)$ | $8 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Becker scored well with a female president, provost, $67 \%$ women among senior leadership, and $50 \%$ women among the top most highly compensated
employees. They do not have gender parity at the board level and count few women and men of color in leadership. Becker validated all data.


BENJAMIN FRANKLIN INSTITUTE OF TECH PRIVATE, SPECIAL FOCUS • 609 ENROLLED, 14\% W
PRESIDENT: ANTHONY BENOIT • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: JED NOSAL • MAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES PROVOST: JEFF VAN DREASON • MAN

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 18 | $28 \%(5)$ | $6 \%(1)$ | $17 \%(3)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 9 | $67 \%(6)$ | $33 \%(3)$ | $11 \%(1)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Benjamin Franklin reached parity among the senior leadership team and the most highly compensated employees, but falls behind in all other categories. The institution is one of 30 schools that have never
had a female president. At top levels of leadership, they count few women and men of color. Benjamin Franklin validated all data.

## BENTLEY UNIVERSITY PRIVATE, MASTER'S • 5,543 ENROLLED, $45 \%$ W

PRESIDENT: ALISON DAVIS-BLAKE • WOMAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: ROBERT BADAVAS • MAN
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: NO
PROVOST: DONNA MARIA BLANCERO • WOC
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 40\% (4 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 24 | $29 \%(7)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 16 | $63 \%(10)$ | - | - |

## SATISFACTORY

Bentley scored well with a female president, provost, and with $63 \%$ women among senior leadership. However, they have not reached parity among top compensated employees, have never had a female
board chair, and are far from gender parity on their board. Bentley did not respond to the request to validate this data.'

BERKLEE COLLEGE OF MUSIC PRIVATE, SPECIAL FOCUS • 6,762 ENROLLED, 39\% W
PRESIDENT: ROGER BROWN • MAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO
BOARD CHAIR: SUSAN WHITEHEAD • WOMAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
PROVOST: LARRY SIMPSON • MOC
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 30\% (3 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 39 | $28 \%(11)$ | $13 \%(5)$ | $8 \%(3)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 32 | $44 \%(14)$ | $3 \%(1)$ | $6 \%(2)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Berklee benefits from a female board chair and near parity on the senior leadership team, but falls behind in other categories. Women comprise fewer than $30 \%$ of board members and only $30 \%$ of the most
highly compensated employees. Berklee is one of 30 schools that have never had a female president. Berklee validated all data.

$\square$BERKSHIRE COMMUNITY COLLEGE PUBLIC, ASSOCIATE'S • 1,847 ENROLLED, $62 \%$ W PRESIDENT: ELLEN KENNEDY • WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: DARLENE RODOWICZ • WOMAN PROVOST: JENNIFER BERNE • WOMAN

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 40\% (4 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 11 | $64 \%(7)$ | $9 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 8 | $38 \%(3)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Berkshire receives points across almost all categories, and at rank \#7, leads all 29 of our Massachusetts public institutions. Berkshire needs
to increase the representation of women and men of color on the board and senior leadership team. Berkshire validated all data.


BOSTON ARCHITECTURAL COLLEGE PRESIDENT: GLEN LEROY • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: RICHARD MARTINI • MAN PROVOST: SUSAN DUNTON • WOMAN

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 20 | $40 \%(8)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $5 \%(1)$ |
| BOARD | 11 | $45 \%(5)$ | $18 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## STATUS QUO

BAC benefits from a female provost and is approaching gender parity on their senior leadership team as well as for the top compensated positions.
However, the institution is one of 30 schools that

PRIVATE, SPECIAL FOCUS • 695 ENROLLED, 49\% W
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 44\% (4 OF 9)


BOSTON COLLEGEł PRIVATE, DOCTORAL • 14,628 ENROLLED, 54\% W
PRESIDENT: WILLIAM LEAHY • MAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO
BOARD CHAIR: PETER MARKELL • MAN
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
PROVOST: DAVID QUIGLEY • MAN
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 0\% (0 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 52 | $27 \%(14)$ | $8 \%(4)$ | $2 \%(1)$ |
| SR ACADEMIC | 8 | $13 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $25 \%(2)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 16 | $25 \%(4)$ | $13 \%(2)$ | $6 \%(1)$ |

## NEEDS URGENT ATTENTION

$B C$ comes in last in this year's ranking due to a lack of parity across all categories. BC is the only university with no women among the ten most highly compensated employees and our data shows that the most highly compensated woman at BC is number
17. The institution is one of 30 schools which have never had a female president. With $54 \%$ women's enrollment, $B C$ should make addressing gender parity a matter of urgency. BC did not respond to the request to validate this data.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
PRIVATE, DOCTORAL • 33,355 ENROLLED, 59\% W

PRESIDENT: ROBERT BROWN • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: KENNETH FELD • MAN
PROVOST: JEAN MORRISON • WOMAN

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: NO \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 30\% (3 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 40 | $28 \%(11)$ | $10 \%(4)$ | $15 \%(6)$ |
| SR ACADEMIC | 17 | $35 \%(6)$ | $6 \%(1)$ | $18 \%(3)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 19 | $47 \%(9)$ | $5 \%(1)$ | $11 \%(2)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

BU receives points for parity on their senior leadership team, particularly the critical role of provost. However, there is room for growth for women among the academic deans. Compared to other doctoral universities, BU does relatively well with
representation of women and men of color in senior leadership. BU is one of only six schools which have never had either a female president or board chair, and count fewer than $30 \%$ women on their board. $B U$ validated all data


BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY PRIVATE, DOCTORAL • 5,721 ENROLLED, 58\% W
PRESIDENT: RONALD LIEBOWITZ • MAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: MEYER KOPLOW • MAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: NO
PROVOST: LISA LYNCH • WOMAN
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 30\% (3 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 39 | $41 \%(16)$ | $3 \%(1)$ | $3 \%(1)$ |
| SR ACADEMIC | 5 | $60 \%(3)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 20 | $25 \%(5)$ | $5 \%(1)$ | $5 \%(1)$ |

## STATUS QUO

Brandeis has strong representation of women among its five academic deans as well as a female provost. However, with women counting $58 \%$ of their student body, we would expect to see greater parity in senior administrative team and among most highly
compensated employees. Brandeis has never had a female board chair, and counts few women and men of color in senior leadership and on the board. Brandeis validated all data except historical board information. ${ }^{\text {r }}$

BRIDGEWATER STATE UNIVERSITY
PRESIDENT: FREDERICK CLARK • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: EUGENE DURGIN, JR. • MAN
PROVOST: KARIM ISMAILI • MOC

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 10 | $50 \%(5)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 17 | $65 \%(11)$ |

PUBLIC, MASTER'S • 11,019 ENROLLED, 61\% W
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 60\% (6 OF 10)

## STATUS QUO

Bridgewater reached gender parity both on their board and among senior leadership; women also count $60 \%$ of the most highly compensated employees. However, all three individual leadership
positions - president, provost, and board chair - are held by men. They have no women of color on their board and count few people of color on their senior leadership team. Bridgewater validated all data.

BRISTOL COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PRESIDENT: LAURA DOUGLAS • WOMAN
BOARD CHAIR: JOAN MEDEIROS • WOMAN
PUBLIC, ASSOCIATE'S • 7,637 ENROLLED, 63\% W
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: $30 \%$ (3 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 10 | $50 \%(5)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 23 | $57 \%(13)$ | - | - |

## SATISFACTORY

Bristol benefits from a female president, a female board chair, and a female provost. The institution achieved gender parity on their board and senior
leadership team. However, women are only $30 \%$ of the most highly compensated employees. Bristol declined to validate this data.'

BUNKER HILL COMMUNITY COLLEGE PUBLIC, ASSOCIATE'S • 11,881 ENROLLED, 57\% W PRESIDENT: PAM EDDINGER • WOC
BOARD CHAIR: WILLIAM WALCZAK • MAN PROVOST: JAMES CANNIFF • MAN

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 80\% (8 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 9 | $33 \%(3)$ | $22 \%(2)$ | $44 \%(4)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 9 | $78 \%(7)$ | $22 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Bunker Hill is one of only six schools led by a woman of color and scores points across the board. Women make up $80 \%$ of their ten most highly compensated employees. Bunker Hill has also done well with
women and men of color on the board, and women of color in senior leadership. Bunker Hill validated all data.

CAMBRIDGE COLLEGE PRIVATE: MASTER'S • 2,261 ENROLLED, $74 \%$ W

PRESIDENT: DEBORAH JACKSON • WOC
BOARD CHAIR: SUSAN IFILL•WOC
PROVOST: JERRY ICE • MAN

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 60\% (6 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 14 | $36 \%(5)$ | $29 \%(4)$ | $21 \%(3)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 13 | $62 \%(8)$ | $31 \%(4)$ | $8 \%(1)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Cambridge College is one of only six schools led by a woman of color. Their board chair is also a woman of color. They score well for both gender and
racial/ethnic diversity across all categories, except the board which could use a few more women. Cambridge College validated all data.

CAPE COD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PRESIDENT: JOHN COX • MAN
PUBLIC, ASSOCIATE'S • 3,221 ENROLLED, 61\% W
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: TAMMY GLIVINSKI-SABEN • WOMAN
PROVOST: ARLENE RODRIGUEZ • WOC
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 50\% (5 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 10 | $40 \%(4)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 9 | $44 \%(4)$ | $11 \%(1)$ | $11 \%(1)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

CCCC scored well with a female board chair, provost, and with $50 \%$ women among the most highly compensated employees. However, neither the board
nor the senior leadership team have reached gender parity. CCCC validated all data with the exception of the board composition.'


CLARK UNIVERSITY
PRIVATE, DOCTORAL
PRESIDENT: DAVID ANGEL • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: STEVEN SWAIN • MAN
PROVOST: DAVIS BAIRD • MAN

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 28 | $32 \%(9)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $7 \%(2)$ |
| SR ACADEMIC | 3 | $33 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 10 | $70 \%(7)$ | $30 \%(3)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Clark has reached parity on its senior administrative team, including three women of color. However, all three individual leadership positions - president, provost, and board chair - are held by men, and
they are one of 30 schools which have never had a female president. Women and men of color are poorly represented on their board and among the academic deans. Clark University validated all data.

COLLEGE OF OUR LADY OF THE ELMS**ł PRIVATE: MASTER'S • 1,580 ENROLLED, 75\% W

PRESIDENT: HARRY DUMAY • MOC
BOARD CHAIR: CYNTHIA LYONS • WOMAN PROVOST: WALTER BREAU • MAN

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 71\% (5 OF 7)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 33 | $58 \%(19)$ | $3 \%(1)$ | $6 \%(2)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 8 | $88 \%(7)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Elms College is one of only 14 institutions led by a president who is a person of color. They reached gender parity on their board and have a strong representation of women on senior leadership team.

In addition, women comprise 71\% of the most highly compensated employees. However, their senior leadership team lacks both women and men of color. Elms College validated all data.

COLLEGE OF THE HOLY CROSSł
PRIVATE, BACHELOR'S • 2,855 ENROLLED, $51 \%$ W
PRESIDENT: PHILIP BOROUGHS • MAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO
BOARD CHAIR: RICHARD PATTERSON • MAN
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: NO
PROVOST: MARGARET FREIJE • WOMAN \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 40\% (4 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 43 | $26 \%(11)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 11 | $55 \%(6)$ | - | - |

## STATUS QUO

Holy Cross benefits from a female provost and has reached gender parity on the senior leadership team, but falls behind in all other categories. Holy Cross is one of 30 schools that have never had a female
president. In addition, their board counts fewer than $30 \%$ women. Holy Cross did not respond to the request to validate data. ${ }^{\text {r }}$

CURRY COLLEGE PRIVATE, MASTER'S • 2,799 ENROLLED, 59\% W

PRESIDENT: KENNETH QUIGLEY, JR. • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: W. PATRICK HUGHES • MAN
PROVOST: DAVID SZCZERBACKI •MAN

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 38\% (3 OF 8)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 18 | $22 \%(4)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 12 | $67 \%(8)$ | - | - |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Curry College has achieved gender parity on their senior leadership team but falls behind in all other categories. All 3 individual leadership positions president, provost, and board chair - are held by
men. Their board counts fewer than $30 \%$ women, and there are only $38 \%$ women among their most highly compensated employees. Curry College declined to validate this data.'

DEAN COLLEGE PRIVATE, BACHELOR'S • 1,301 ENROLLED, 54\% W
PRESIDENT: PAULA ROONEY • WOMAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: MARK BOYCE • MAN
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YE
PROVOST: MICHAEL FISHBEIN • MAN
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 43\% (3 OF 7)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 25 | $20 \%(5)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 19 | $47 \%(9)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Dean College benefits from a woman president and near parity on their senior leadership team. However, the board counts fewer than 30\% women, and there
are no people of color on the board nor among their senior leadership team. Dean College validated all data.

EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEGE PRIVATE, MASTER'S • 848 ENROLLED, $60 \%$ W
PRESIDENT: JACK CONNELL•MAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: RUSSELLLONG • MAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR:PROVOST: TIMOTHY WOOSTER • MAN \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 25\% (2 OF 8)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 44 | $23 \%(10)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 6 | $33 \%(2)$ | - | - |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Eastern Nazarene College receives points for their past female president, but ranks near the bottom in all other categories. All three individual leadership positions - president, provost, and board chair - are
held by men. Women are poorly represented on the board and among the most highly compensated employees. Eastern Nazarene College did not respond to the request to validate data. ${ }^{\text {r }}$

EMERSON COLLEGE PRIVATE, MASTER'S • 4,459 ENROLLED, $62 \%$ W
PRESIDENT: M. LEE PELTON • MOC
BOARD CHAIR: JEFFREY GREENHAWT • MAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES PROVOST: MICHAELE WHELAN • WOMAN
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 60\% (6 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 30 | $37 \%(11)$ | $7 \%(2)$ | $10 \%(3)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 20 | $60 \%(12)$ | $10 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Emerson College is one of only 14 institutions led by a president who is a person of color. The institution scored well with a female provost and gender parity among the senior leadership team. In addition, 60\% of their ten most highly compensated employees
are women. However, Emerson's board has yet to reach gender parity, and needs greater racial/ethnic diversity among the senior leadership team. Emerson College validated all data.

EMMANUEL COLLEGE**れ PRIVATE, BACHELOR'S • 2,083 ENROLLED, $74 \%$ W PRESIDENT: JANET EISNER • WOMAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES BOARD CHAIR: MARGARET MCKENNA • WOMAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES PROVOST: JOSEF KURTZ • MAN \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 86\% (6 OF 7)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 27 | $63 \%(17)$ | $7 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 18 | $78 \%(14)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Women are represented well at Emmanuel College with a woman president who is the longest-serving female college president in the country. They have a female board chair as well as gender parity on both their board and senior leadership team. In addition,
$86 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees are women. However, people of color are not well represented on the senior leadership team or the board. Emmanuel College validated all data.

ENDICOTT COLLEGE** PRIVATE, MASTER'S • 4,795 ENROLLED, 66\% W
PRESIDENT: KATHLEEN BARNES (INTERIM) • WOMAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: CYNTHIA MERKLE • WOMAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
PROVOST: JOHN CARON • MAN

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 30 | $53 \%(16)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 24 | $58 \%(14)$ |


| WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN |
| :--- | :--- |
| $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| $8 \%(2)$ | $4 \%(1)$ |

## STATUS QUO

Endicott College benefits from gender parity on their board, senior leadership team, and among the most highly compensated employees. However, the current president is an interim and they have not had a permanent female president since 1987,
so they get few points in the presidential category. Endicott College appointed a man, Steven DiSalvo, as president effective as of July 1, 2019. Endicott College validated partial data.'

FISHER COLLEGE PRIVATE, BACHELOR'S • 1,923 ENROLLED, $73 \%$ W

| PRESIDENT: ALAN RAY • MAN | EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO |
| :--- | :--- |
| BOARD CHAIR: ALEXANDRA BARTSCH • WOMAN | EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES |
| PROVOST: JANET KUSER - WOMAN | \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: $50 \%$ (5 OF 10) |


|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 15 | $27 \%(4)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $13 \%(2)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 7 | $71 \%(5)$ | $14 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Fisher College receives points for a female provost, board chair, and gender parity on their senior leadership team. 50\% of their ten most highly compensated employees are women. Yet, Fisher is one of 30 schools that have never had a female
president. With fewer than $30 \%$ women on their board and lack of racial/ethnic diversity on all levels of leadership, Fisher has further work to do. Fisher College validated all data.

00
FITCHBURG STATE UNIVERSITY
PRESIDENT: RICHARD LAPIDUS • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: DONALD IRVING•MAN PROVOST: ALBERTO CARDELLE • MOC

PUBLIC, MASTER'S • 7,075 ENROLLED, $62 \%$ W
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 20\% (2 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 10 | $60 \%(6)$ | $10 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 13 | $54 \%(7)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $8 \%(1)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Fitchburg reached parity on their board and senior leadership team but falls behind in other categories. They are one of 30 schools that have never had a female president, and only two of the most highly
compensated employees are women. In addition, Fitchburg lacks people of color on their board and among senior leaders. Fitchburg validated all data. FRAMINGHAM STATE UNIVERSITY PUBLIC, MASTER'S • 5,691 ENROLLED, $65 \%$ W

PRESIDENT: F. JAVIER CEVALLOS • MOC
BOARD CHAIR: KEVIN FOLEY • MAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
PROVOST: LINDA VADEN-GOAD • WOMAN
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: $50 \%$ (5 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 9 | $44 \%(4)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $11 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 15 | $47 \%(7)$ | $13 \%(2)$ | $7 \%(1)$ |

## STATUS QUO

Framingham is one of only 14 institutions led by a president who is a person of color. The institution benefits from a female provost and parity achieved among the top most highly compensated employees.

While the senior leadership team and board are approaching parity, both groups count few people of color. Framingham validated all data.


FRANKLIN W OLIN COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
PRESIDENT: RICHARD MILLER • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: KENNETH STOKES • MAN
PROVOST: VINCENT MANNO • MAN

PRIVATE, SPECIAL FOCUS • 380 ENROLLED, $48 \%$ W
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: NO \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 50\% (5 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 17 | $24 \%(4)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $6 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 10 | $70 \%(7)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Olin College has achieved gender parity on their senior leadership team and $50 \%$ of their ten most highly compensated employees are women. However, Olin College is one of 30 schools that have never had a female president. Their board counts fewer
than 30\% women and the institution lacks people of color at all levels of leadership. Olin College validated all data with the exception of the board's racial composition. ${ }^{r}$

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 28 | $32 \%(9)$ | $4 \%(1)$ | $11 \%(3)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 7 | $29 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Gordon College benefits from a female provost, but falls behind in all other categories. While women count $66 \%$ of all students, Gordon is one of 30 schools that have never had a female president. In addition, both their board and senior leadership team
are far from gender parity, and their senior leadership team is lacking in people of color. Gordon College validated all data with the exception of board historical information.

GREENFIELD COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENT: YVES SALOMON-FERNÁNDEZ•WOC
BOARD CHAIR: ROBERT COHN • MAN
PROVOST: MARY ELLEN FYDENKEVEZ • WOMAN

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 10 | $70 \%(7)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 10 | $70 \%(7)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Greenfield is one of only six schools that have presidents who are women of color. The institution scored points for a female provost, as well. In addition, both their board and senior leadership team have reached gender parity. However, with no people

PUBLIC, ASSOCIATE'S • 1,830 ENROLLED, 61\% W
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 40\% (4 OF 10)

| WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF |
| :--- | :--- |
| $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| $0 \%(0)$ | $10 \%(1)$ |

of color on the board and only one man of color among senior leadership team, Greenfield has further work to do on racial/ethnic diversity. Greenfield validated all data with the exception of the board's racial composition. ${ }^{\text {r }}$

HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE PRIVATE, BACHELOR'S • 1,268 ENROLLED, 63\% W
PRESIDENT: KENNETH ROSENTHAL (INTERIM) • MAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: LUIS HERNANDEZ • MOC EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES PROVOST: EVA RUESCHMANN • WOMAN \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 50\% (5 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 19 | $47 \%(9)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 14 | $86 \%(12)$ | - | - |

## STATUS QUO

Hampshire College benefits from a female provost. In addition, women are well represented among the senior leadership, and the institution reached parity among the ten most highly compensated employees.

However, their board has not yet reached gender parity. Kenneth Rosenthal was replaced by Edward Wingenbach after July 1, 2019. Hampshire College declined to validate this data. ${ }^{\text {r }}$

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRIVATE, DOCTORAL • 31,120 ENROLLED, 49\% W

PRESIDENT: LAWRENCE BACOW • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: WILLIAM LEE • MOC
PROVOST: ALAN GARBER • MAN

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 13 | $46 \%(6)$ |
| SR ACADEMIC | 14 | $36 \%(5)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 20 | $55 \%(11)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Harvard is one of few doctoral universities with significant representation of women of color among their academic deans (senior academic leadership). They have reached parity among the senior administrative leadership team, and their board is close to parity, but they fall behind in all

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 30\% (3 OF 10)

| WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- |
| $0 \%(0)$ | $15 \%(2)$ |
| $29 \%(4)$ | $14 \%(2)$ |
| $5 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

other categories. Of the three individual leadership positions - president, provost, and board chair, all are men. Only 30\% among the most highly compensated employees are women. Harvard validated partial data and historical board information was not available.'

PRESIDENT: CHRISTINA ROYAL • WOC
BOARD CHAIR: ROBERT GILBERT, JR. • MAN
PROVOST: MONICA PEREZ • WOC

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 60\% (6 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 10 | $50 \%(5)$ | $30 \%(3)$ | $10 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 12 | $67 \%(8)$ | $17 \%(2)$ | $17 \%(2)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Holyoke is one of only six schools that have a female president of color. The institution received points for a female provost, as well. Additionally, $60 \%$ of their
ten most highly compensated employees are women, and both their board and senior leadership team have achieved gender parity. Holyoke validated all data.

HULT INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS SCHOOL
PRIVATE, SPECIAL FOCUS • 2,798 ENROLLED, 42\% W PRESIDENT: STEPHEN HODGES • MAN

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO
BOARD CHAIR: CHRISTOPHER AHLBERG•MAN PROVOST: JOHAN ROOS • MAN

EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 29\% (2 OF 7)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 11 | $27 \%(3)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 3 | $33 \%(1)$ | - | - |

## NEEDS URGENT ATTENTION

Hult is one of four schools in the Needs Urgent Attention category. The institution has never had a female president and only $29 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees are women. In addition,
neither their board nor their senior leadership team have achieved gender parity. Hult did not respond to the request to validate this data. ${ }^{\text {r }}$


LABOURÉ COLLEGE PRIVATE, SPECIAL FOCUS • 870 ENROLLED, $89 \%$ W
PRESIDENT: DEBRA TOWNSLEY • WOMAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: DAMIEN DEVASTO • MAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 70\% (7 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 10 | $40 \%(4)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 12 | $42 \%(5)$ | - | - |

## SATISFACTORY

Labouré College benefits from a female president and provost, and 70\% of their ten most highly compensated employees are women. Their board and senior leadership team have not yet reached gender
parity, though they are close. Debra Townsley was replaced by a woman of color, Lily Hsu, after July 1, 2019. Labouré College declined to validate this data. ${ }^{r}$

LASELL UNIVERSITY** PRIVATE, MASTER'S • 2,055 ENROLLED, 64\% W
PRESIDENT: MICHAEL ALEXANDER • MAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO
BOARD CHAIR: KEON HOLMES • MOC
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
RANK PROVOST: JAMES OSTROW•MAN
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 50\% (4 OF 8)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 21 | $33 \%(7)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 14 | $57 \%(8)$ | - | - |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Lasell has reached gender parity on their senior leadership team, and $50 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees are women. However, as a former women's school, and with 64\% female enrollment, it is of great concern that they score as unsatisfactory. Lasell is one of 30 schools that
have never had a female president, their board has not reached gender parity, and all three individual leadership positions - president, provost, and board chair - are held by men. Lasell did not respond to the request to validate data. ${ }^{\text {r }}$

LESLEY UNIVERSITY** PRIVATE, DOCTORAL • 4,732 ENROLLED, 82\% W
PRESIDENT: RICHARD HANSEN (INTERIM) • MAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: HANS STRAUCH • MAN
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
PROVOST: MARGARET EVERETT • WOMAN
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 50\% (5 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 23 | $57 \%(13)$ | $13 \%(3)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR ACADEMIC | 4 | $50 \%(2)$ | $25 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 10 | $60 \%(6)$ | $10 \%(1)$ | $20 \%(2)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Lesley benefits from a female provost and gender parity among the senior leadership team, academic deans, and on the board. In addition, $50 \%$ of the most highly compensated employees are women. However,
at the top levels of leadership, they count few women and men of color. Richard Hansen was replaced by a female president, Janet Steinmayer, after July 1, 2019. Lesley validated all data.


MASSACHUSETTS BAY COMMUNITY COLLEGE PUBLIC, ASSOCIATE'S • 4,629 ENROLLED, 52\% W
PRESIDENT: DAVID PODELL•MAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: THOMAS PEISCH • MAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
PROVOST: LYNN HUNTER • WOMAN \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 60\% (6 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 10 | $40 \%(4)$ | $10 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 20 | $60 \%(12)$ | $20 \%(4)$ | $10 \%(2)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Mass Bay scored well with a female provost and gender parity on their senior leadership team. In addition, $60 \%$ of their most highly compensated
employees are women. However, their board has not reached gender parity and lacks racial/ethnic diversity. Mass Bay validated all data.

MASSACHUSEITS COLLEGE OF ART AND DESIGN PUBLIC, MASTER'S • 2,064 ENROLLED, 70\% W PRESIDENT: DAVID NELSON • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: PAMELA PARISI • WOMAN PROVOST: KYMBERLY PINDER • WOC

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 20\% (2 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 9 | $67 \%(6)$ | $11 \%(1)$ | $11 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 11 | $55 \%(6)$ | $9 \%(1)$ | $9 \%(1)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

MassArt scored well with a female board chair and a female provost, as well as gender parity on both their
of their ten most highly compensated employees are women. MassArt validated all data.

MASSACHUSETTS COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS PUBLIC, MASTER'S • 1,588 ENROLLED, $62 \%$ W

PRESIDENT: JAMES BIRGE • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: DENISE MARSHALL • WOMAN
PROVOST: EMILY WILLIAMS • WOC

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 10 | $50 \%(5)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $10 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 8 | $63 \%(5)$ | $13 \%(1)$ | $13 \%(1)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

MCLA benefits from a female board chair and a female provost. In addition, $50 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees are women. They have also
reached gender parity on both their board and senior leadership team, but their board is lacking women of color. MCLA validated all data.

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 66 | $36 \%(24)$ | $11 \%(7)$ | $12 \%(8)$ |
| SR ACADEMIC | 6 | $17 \%(1)$ | $17 \%(1)$ | $17 \%(1)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 14 | $43 \%(6)$ | $7 \%(1)$ | $21 \%(3)$ |

## NEEDS URGENT ATTENTION

MIT is one of only 14 institutions led by a president who is a person of color. MIT is close to gender parity on their senior administrative team, but falls behind in all other categories and consequently, ranks close to the bottom. All three of the top leadership positions

- president, provost, and board chair - are held by men; women are only $17 \%$ of their senior academic leadership and only 1 woman appears in the top 10 most highly compensated employees. MIT validated all data.

MASSACHUSETTS MARITIME ACADEMY PUBLIC, MASTER'S • 1,780 ENROLLED, 14\% W PRESIDENT: FRANCIS MCDONALD • MAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO BOARD CHAIR: DANIEL SHORES • MAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES PROVOST: BRAD LIMA•MAN \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 30\% (3 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 10 | $30 \%(3)$ | $10 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 10 | $40 \%(4)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Mass Maritime's senior leadership team is near parity, but the school falls short in all other categories, counting only $30 \%$ women on their board and among their ten most highly compensated employees. All three individual leadership positions - president, provost, and board chair - are held by men, although
recently they have welcomed a new female provost. Racial and ethnic representation is minimal. Mass Maritime is one of only 30 schools which have never had a female president. Mass Maritime validated all data.


MASSASOIT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PRESIDENT: GENA GLICKMAN • WOMAN
BOARD CHAIR: ROBERT HARNAIS • MOC
RANK PROVOST: BARBARA MCCARTHY • WOMAN

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 11 | $64 \%(7)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 17 | $71 \%(12)$ |
|  |  |  |
| SATISFACTORY |  |  |
| Massasoit scored well across all categories with a |  |  |
| female president (their first), a female provost, high |  |  |
| representation on their senior leadership team, and |  |  |
| 50\% women among the most highly compensated |  |  |

## SATISFACTORY

Massasoit scored well across all categories with a female president (their first), a female provost, high representation on their senior leadership team, and $50 \%$ women among the most highly compensated

PUBLIC, ASSOCIATE'S • 7,154 ENROLLED, 56\% W
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 50\% (5 OF 10)
employees. They also score well on racial/ethnic diversity other than a lack of men of color on their leadership team. Massasoit validated all data.


MASSACHUSETTS COLLEGE OF PHARMACY AND HEALTH SCIENCES
PRESIDENT: CHARLES MONAHAN, JR. •MAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO
BOARD CHAIR: RICHARD GRIFFIN • MAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 40\% (4 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 14 | $29 \%(4)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 23 | $57 \%(13)$ | - | - |

## STATUS QUO

MCPHS has a female provost and parity on their senior leadership team. However, with 70\% female enrollment, we would expect MCPHS to have reached gender parity across all categories. Their board
has fewer than $30 \%$ women and they are one of 30 schools that have never had a female president. MCPHS did not respond to the request to validate data. ${ }^{\text {' }}$

MERRIMACK COLLEGE† PRIVATE, MASTER'S • 4,191 ENROLLED, 54\% W

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 26 | $23 \%(6)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 16 | $38 \%(6)$ | - | - |

PRESIDENT: CHRISTOPHER HOPEY • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: ALFRED ARCIDI • MAN
PROVOST: ALLAN WEATHERWAX • MAN

## NEEDS URGENT ATTENTION

Merrimack College ranks near the bottom. All three top leadership positions - president, provost, and board chair - are held by men, women are only $38 \%$ of senior academic leadership, the board has fewer than $30 \%$ women, and only two women are in the top
ten most highly compensated employees. Merrimack is one of 30 schools that have never had a female president. Merrimack College did not respond to the request to validate data.'

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 20\% (2 OF 10)


MGH INSTITUTE OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS
PRIVATE, SPECIAL FOCUS • 1,215 ENROLLED, 84\% W PRESIDENT: PAULA MILONE-NUZZO • WOMAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: JEANETTE IVES ERICKSON • WOMAN PROVOST: ALEX JOHNSON • MAN

EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 60\% (6 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 17 | $59 \%(10)$ | $12 \%(2)$ | $18 \%(3)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 13 | $38 \%(5)$ | $8 \%(1)$ | $15 \%(2)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

MGH Institute is a leader in gender parity, scoring well
across nearly all categories. They would benefit from
a few more women of color on their board and senior leadership team. MGH Institute validated all data.

MIDDLESEX COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PRESIDENT: JAMES MABRY • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: JAMES CAMPBELL•MAN
PROVOST: PHILIP SISSON • MAN

PUBLIC, ASSOCIATE'S • 8,206 ENROLLED, 57\% W EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: NO \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 40\% (4 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 10 | $60 \%(6)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 18 | $72 \%(13)$ | - | - |

STATUS QUO
Middlesex has achieved gender parity on both their board and senior leadership team. However, all three individual leadership positions - president, provost,
and board chair - are held by men. They have never had a female board chair. Middlesex did not respond to the request to validate data. ${ }^{\text {r }}$

MONTSERRAT COLLEGE OF ART
PRIVATE: SPECIAL FOCUS • 368 ENROLLED, $74 \%$ W
PRESIDENT: KURT STEINBERG • MAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO
BOARD CHAIR: HENRIETTA GATES • WOMAN
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
PROVOST: BRIAN PELLINEN • MAN
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 40\% (2 OF 5)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 22 | $50 \%(11)$ | $5 \%(1)$ | $5 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 4 | $100 \%(4)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

STATUS QUO
Montserrat's senior leadership team is $100 \%$ women, and they have achieved gender parity on their board, which also has a female board chair. They would benefit from adding more women and men of color
to their board and leadership team. Montserrat is one of 30 schools that have never had a female president. Montserrat validated partial data and did not provide historical board information.r

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE*
PRESIDENT: SONYA STEPHENS • WOMAN
BOARD CHAIR: BARBARA BAUMANN • WOMAN
PROVOST: JON WESTERN • MAN
PRIVATE: BACHELOR'S • 2,334 ENROLLED, 99\% W
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 80\% (8 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 31 | $90 \%(28)$ | $26 \%(8)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 14 | $79 \%(11)$ | $29 \%(4)$ | $7 \%(1)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Mount Holyoke College scored well across all categories in this study and serves as a leader for the representation of women of color among senior
leadership and their board. Mount Holyoke College validated all data.


MOUNT WACHUSETT COMMUNITY COLLEGE PUBLIC, ASSOCIATE'S • 3,854 ENROLLED, $65 \%$ W
PRESIDENT: JAMES VANDER HOOVEN • MAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO
BOARD CHAIR: ROBERT ANTONIONI •MAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
RANK PROVOST: PAUL HERNANDEZ • MOC \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 60\% (6 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 8 | $63 \%(5)$ | $25 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 13 | $69 \%(9)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $8 \%(1)$ |

## STATUS QUO

Mount Wachusett has achieved gender parity on their board, senior leadership, and among their ten most highly compensated employees. However, all three top leadership positions - president, provost, and board chair - are held by men. They would benefit
from more women of color on the senior leadership team. Mount Wachusett is one of 30 colleges that have never had a female president. Mount Wachusett validated all data.


NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE OF BUSINESS PRIVATE, SPECIAL FOCUS • 1,175 ENROLLED, $72 \%$ W AND FINANCE
PRESIDENT: HOWARD HORTON • MAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO

BOARD CHAIR: L. SCOTT HARSHBARGER • MAN
PROVOST: DEBRA LEAHY • WOMAN

EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED:-

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 12 | $50 \%(6)$ | $17 \%(2)$ | $8 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 10 | $70 \%(7)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

NECB benefits from a female provost and gender parity on their board and senior leadership team. However, they are one of 30 schools that have never had a female president, which is of concern
considering women make up $72 \%$ of their student body. Their senior leadership team lacks people of color. NECB validated all data.

NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE OF OPTOMETRY
PRIVATE, SPECIAL FOCUS • 527 ENROLLED, $74 \%$ W
PRESIDENT: HOWARD PURCELL•MAN
BOARD CHAIR: PANO YERACARIS • MAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
PROVOST: ERIK WEISSBERG•MAN
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: NO

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 20 | $40 \%(8)$ | $5 \%(1)$ | $5 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 8 | $63 \%(5)$ | $13 \%(1)$ | $13 \%(1)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

NECO has achieved gender parity on their senior leadership team. However, all three of their individual leadership positions - president, provost, and board chair - are held by men, and only $30 \%$ of their most
highly compensated employees are women. NECO has never had a female board chair. NECO validated all data.


NEW ENGLAND CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC PRIVATE, SPECIAL FOCUS • 844 ENROLLED, 47\% W
PRESIDENT: ANDREA KALYN • WOMAN
BOARD CHAIR: KENNETT BURNES • MAN
PROVOST: THOMAS NOVAK • MAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: NO \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 30\% (3 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 22 | $45 \%(10)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 9 | $67 \%(6)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $11 \%(1)$ |

## STATUS QUO

NEC benefits from a female president (their first) and gender parity on their senior leadership team.
However, their senior leadership team and board lack
people of color. They have never had a female board chair. NEC validated all data.


NICHOLS COLLEGE PRIVATE, SPECIAL FOCUS • 1,634 ENROLLED, 40\% W
PRESIDENT: SUSAN WESTENGELKEMEYER • WOMAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: JOHN DAVIS • MAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: NO
PROVOST: MAURI PELTO • MAN
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 22\% (2 OF 9)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 32 | $31 \%(10)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 13 | $38 \%(5)$ | - | - |

STATUS QUO
Nichols College benefits from a female president. However, neither their board nor their senior leadership team has reached gender parity. Additionally, only $22 \%$ of their most highly
compensated employees are women, and they have never had a female board chair. Nichols College did not respond to the request to validate data.'

PRESIDENT: PATRICIA GENTILE • WOMAN
BOARD CHAIR: J.D. LAROCK • MAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES PROVOST: KAREN HYNICK • WOMAN

TOTAL WOMEN

| BOARD | 9 | $44 \%(4)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 14 | $79 \%(11)$ | \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 60\% (6 OF 10)

## SATISFACTORY

North Shore scored well across all categories and serves as a leader for other institutions. North Shore validated all data.


NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
PRIVATE, DOCTORAL • 21,489 ENROLLED, $48 \%$ W
PRESIDENT: JOSEPH AOUN • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: RICHARD D'AMORE • MAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO
PROVOST: JAMES BEAN • MAN
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: NO

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 37 | $27 \%(10)$ | $3 \%(1)$ | $8 \%(3)$ |
| SR ACADEMIC | 9 | $67 \%(6)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $22 \%(2)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 15 | $20 \%(3)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $13 \%(2)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Northeastern scores well with their academic deans (senior academic leadership). However, their board and senior administrative leadership lack enough women, and men hold all three of the top individual leadership positions - president, provost, and board
chair. They are one of only six schools that have never had a female president, never had a female board chair, and count fewer than $30 \%$ of women on their board. Northeastern did not respond to the request to validate data. ${ }^{\text {r }}$

NORTHERN ESSEX COMMUNITY COLLEGE PUBLIC,ASSOCIATE'S • 5,762 ENROLLED, 67\% W
PRESIDENT: LANE GLENN • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: JEFFREY LINEHAN • MAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO
PROVOST: WILLIAM HEINEMAN • MAN
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 30\% (3 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 11 | $55 \%(6)$ | $18 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 12 | $75 \%(9)$ | $8 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Northern Essex has achieved gender parity on their board and senior leadership team. However, all three individual leadership positions - president, provost, and board chair - are held by men. They are one of 30 schools that have never had a female president,
and only $30 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees are women. In addition, they need greater representation of people of color on their board and senior leadership team. Northern Essex validated all data.


PINE MANOR COLLEGE**
PRIVATE, BACHELOR'S • 450 ENROLLED, 49\% W
PRESIDENT: THOMAS O'REILLY • MAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: ROBERT UTZSCHNEIDER • MAN
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
PROVOST: DIANE MELLO-GOLDNER • WOMAN

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 13 | $46 \%(6)$ | $31 \%(4)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 9 | $67 \%(6)$ | $22 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## STATUS QUO

Pine Manor has the benefit of a female provost and gender parity on their senior leadership team.

However, only $25 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees are women. Pine Manor validated all data.

QUINCY COLLEGE PRIVATE,ASSOCIATE'S • 5,343 ENROLLED, 68\% W
PRESIDENT: MICHAEL BELLOTTI (INTERIM) • MAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES BOARD CHAIR: PAUL BARBADORO - MAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES PROVOST: GERALD KOOCHER • MAN \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 30\% (3 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 11 | $45 \%(5)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 13 | $46 \%(6)$ | $8 \%(1)$ | $15 \%(2)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Quincy College is near parity on the board and senior leadership team. However, all three of their individual leadership positions - president, provost, and board chair - are held by men, and just $30 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees are women. Given a
women's enrollment of 68\%, we would expect to see better representation of women across all categories. Quincy College has no people of color on its board. Quincy College validated all data.

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 10 | $70 \%(7)$ | $10 \%(1)$ | $10 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 17 | $71 \%(12)$ | $18 \%(3)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

PRESIDENT: LUIS PEDRAJA • MOC
BOARD CHAIR: SUSAN MAILMAN • WOMAN
PROVOST: NANCY SCHOENFELD • WOMAN

## SATISFACTORY

Quinsigamond is one of only 14 institutions led by a president who is a person of color. The institution scores well across all categories, benefitting from a female provost and board chair. They have achieved

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 70\% (7 OF 10)
gender parity on both their board and their senior leadership team, and $70 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees are women. Quinsigamond validated all data.

| REGIS COLLEGE*** PRIVATE, MASTER'S $\cdot 2,166$ ENROLLED, $83 \%$ W |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| PRESIDENT: ANTOINETTE HAYS • WOMAN | EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES |
| BOARD CHAIR: JOHN TEGAN, JR. •MAN | EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES |
| PROVOST: MALCOLM ASADOORIAN • MAN | \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: $71 \%$ ( 5 OF 7) |


|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 33 | $61 \%(20)$ | $3 \%(1)$ | $3 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 16 | $75 \%(12)$ | $13 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Regis received points across all categories, serving as a model for other institutions. Regis lacks sufficient
numbers of people of color on their board and senior leadership team. Regis validated all data.

PRESIDENT: VALERIE ROBERSON • WOC BOARD CHAIR: GERALD CHERTAVIAN • MAN PROVOST: CECILE REGNER • WOMAN

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 60\% (6 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 9 | $44 \%(4)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 9 | $56 \%(5)$ | - | - |

## SATISFACTORY

Roxbury is one of only six schools led by a woman of color. This institution scores well with gender parity
across all other categories. Roxbury did not respond to the request to validate data. ${ }^{\text {r }}$

SALEM STATE UNIVERSITY
PRESIDENT: JOHN KEENAN • MAN
PUBLIC, MASTER'S • 8,702 ENROLLED, 64\% W

BOARD CHAIR: PAUL MATTERA • MAN
PROVOST: DAVID SILVA • MAN

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 60\% (6 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 10 | $70 \%(7)$ | $20 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 13 | $62 \%(8)$ | $15 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## STATUS QUO

Salem State has achieved gender parity on both their board and senior leadership team. In addition, 60\% of their most highly compensated employees are
women. However, their three top individual leadership positions - president, provost, and board chair - are all held by men. Salem State validated all data.

SIMMONS UNIVERSITY*
PRIVATE, MASTER'S • 6,283 ENROLLED, 91\% W
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { PRESIDENT: HELEN DRINAN • WOMAN } & \text { EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES } \\ \text { BOARD CHAIR: REGINA PISA - WOMAN } & \text { EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES } \\ \text { PROVOST: KATIE CONBOY • WOMAN } & \text { \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 70\% (7 OF 10) }\end{array}$

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 21 | $86 \%(18)$ | $19 \%(4)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 14 | $71 \%(10)$ | $14 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Simmons scores well across all categories, serving as a model for other institutions. Simmons validated all data.

SMITH COLLEGE* PRIVATE, BACHELOR'S • 2,918 ENROLLED, 98\% W
PRESIDENT: KATHLEEN MCCARTNEY • WOMAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES BOARD CHAIR: DEBORAH DUNCAN • WOMAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES PROVOST: JOSEPH O'ROURKE •MAN \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 60\% (6 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 28 | $93 \%(26)$ | $32 \%(9)$ | $4 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 16 | $88 \%(14)$ | $19 \%(3)$ | $6 \%(1)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Smith scores well across all categories, including for women of color, serving as a model for other institutions. Smith validated all data.

SPRINGFIELD COLLEGE PRIVATE, MASTER'S • 3,246 ENROLLED,56\% W

| PRESIDENT: MARY-BETH COOPER • WOMAN | EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES |
| :--- | :--- |
| BOARD CHAIR: JAMES ROSS III •MAN | EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES |
| PROVOST: MARTHA POTVIN •WOMAN | \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: $50 \%$ (5 OF 10) |


|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 33 | $39 \%(13)$ | $9 \%(3)$ | $6 \%(2)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 17 | $53 \%(9)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $6 \%(1)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Springfield College scores well across all categories. However, their board has not yet reached gender
parity and they lack women of color on their senior leadership team. Springfield College validated all data.

SPRINGFIELD TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE PUBLIC, ASSOCIATE'S • 5,343 ENROLLED, 59\% W
PRESIDENT: JOHN COOK • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: CHRISTOPHER JOHNSON • MAN
PROVOST: GERALDINE DE BERLY • WOMAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 50\% (5 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 10 | $30 \%(3)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 15 | $47 \%(7)$ | - | - |

## STATUS QUO

STCC scores points for having a female provost and $50 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees are women. Women are underrepresented on their board
and STCC is one of 30 schools that have never had a female president. STCC declined to validate data. ${ }^{\text {r }}$

STONEHILL COLLEGEł PRIVATE, BACHELOR'S • 2,498 ENROLLED, 59\% W

| PRESIDENT: JOHN DENNING • MAN | EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO |
| :--- | :--- |
| BOARD CHAIR: THOMAS MAY • MAN | EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: NO |
| PROVOST: JOSEPH FAVAZZA - MAN | \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: $50 \%$ (5 OF 10) |


|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 34 | $24 \%(8)$ | $3 \%(1)$ | $3 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 9 | $44 \%(4)$ | $11 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Stonehill is close to parity on the senior leadership team and counts $50 \%$ women among their most highly compensated employees. However, they are
one of only six schools that have never had a female president or board chair, and count fewer than 30\% women on their board. Stonehill validated all data.

SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY PRIVATE, DOCTORAL • 7,201 ENROLLED, 56\% W

PRESIDENT: MARISA KELLY • WOMAN
BOARD CHAIR: ROBERT LAMB, JR. • MAN
PROVOST: SEBASTIÁN ROYO • MOC

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: NO \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 30\% (3 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 21 | $43 \%(9)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $14 \%(3)$ |
| SR ACADEMIC | 3 | $33 \%(1)$ | $33 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 15 | $47 \%(7)$ | $7 \%(1)$ | $7 \%(1)$ |

## STATUS QUO

Suffolk benefits from a female president and is near gender parity at the senior administrative leadership level and on their board. However, women only comprise $30 \%$ of their most highly compensated
employees. Suffolk has never had a female board chair. They would benefit from having more people of color in their leadership. Suffolk validated partial data. ${ }^{r}$

BOARD CHAIR: PETER DOLAN • MAN
PROVOST: DEBORAH KOCHEVAR • WOMAN

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 40\% (4 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 40 | $40 \%(16)$ | $18 \%(7)$ | $15 \%(6)$ |
| SR ACADEMIC | 13 | $23 \%(3)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $15 \%(2)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 13 | $54 \%(7)$ | $8 \%(1)$ | $8 \%(1)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Tufts received points for a female provost and gender parity at the senior administrative level. However, they lack parity on their board and among their academic
deans. Tufts is one of 30 institutions that have never had a female president. Tufts validated all data.

5/5 (UMASS CAMPUSES)

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS - AMHERST PUBLIC, DOCTORAL • 30,340 ENROLLED, 50\% W
CHANCELLOR: KUMBLE SUBBASWAMY • MOC EVER WOMAN CHANCELLOR: NO
BOARD CHAIR: N/A EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: N/A
PROVOST: JOHN MCCARTHY • MAN
\% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 10\% (1 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| SR ACADEMIC | 11 | $73 \%(8)$ | $18 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 24 | $46 \%(11)$ | $13 \%(3)$ | $13 \%(3)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

UMass-Amherst is one of 14 institutions led by a person of color. They received points for reaching parity among their senior academic leaders. However, their top two individual leadership roles - chancellor and provost - are held by men, and women only
represent $10 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees. They are one of 30 schools which have never had a female president (chancellor). UMassAmherst validated all data.

$4 \int_{\text {RANK }}^{2}$UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS = BOSTON PUBLIC, DOCTORAL • 16,415 ENROLLED, 56\% W CHANCELLOR: KATHERINENEWMAN (INTERIM) • WOMAN EVER WOMAN CHANCELLOR: YES BOARD CHAIR: N/A EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: N/A PROVOST: EMILY MCDERMOTT • WOMAN TOTAL WOMEN

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| SR ACADEMIC | 9 | $33 \%(3)$ | $22 \%(2)$ | $11 \%(1)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 12 | $42 \%(5)$ | $8 \%(1)$ | $17 \%(2)$ |

## STATUS QUO

UMass-Boston benefits from a female (interim) chancellor and provost. However, they lack parity on both the senior academic and administrative
leadership teams, and only $30 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees are women. UMass-Boston validated all data.

$5 \int_{\text {RANK }}^{2}$
RANK
(UMASS CAMPUSES)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| SR ACADEMIC | 7 | $71 \%(5)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 14 | $50 \%(7)$ | $21 \%(3)$ | $14 \%(2)$ |

## STATUS QUO

UMass-Dartmouth is one of only 14 institutions led by a person of color. They received points for achieving parity at both the senior academic and administrative
leadership levels. However, only $20 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees are female. UMassDartmouth validated all data.

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS - DARTMOUTH PUBLIC, DOCTORAL • 8,406 ENROLLED, 50\% W CHANCELLOR: ROBERT JOHNSON • MOC EVER WOMAN CHANCELLOR: YES
BOARD CHAIR: N/A EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: N/A \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 20\% (2 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| SR ACADEMIC | 8 | $50 \%(4)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $13 \%(1)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 19 | $58 \%(11)$ | $5 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

UMass-Lowell is a model of gender parity across all categories, which is impressive given their engineering focus. However, they do not have enough
people of color among their deans and senior administrative leadership. UMass-Lowell validated all data.

BOARD CHAIR: N/A
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: N/A
PROVOST: TERENCE FLOTTE • MAN
(UMASS

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| SR ACADEMIC | 2 | $100 \%(2)$ | $50 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 17 | $53 \%(9)$ | $6 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

Women are well represented on UMass-Medical's senior academic and administrative teams. However, their top two individual leadership roles - chancellor and provost - are held by men, and women only
represent $10 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees. They are one of 30 schools which have never had a female president (chancellor). UMassMedical validated all data.


UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS - SYSTEM PUBLIC, DOCTORAL • 74,571 ENROLLED, 51\% W
PRESIDENT: MARTIN MEEHAN • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: ROBERT MANNING • MAN
PROVOST: KATHERINE NEWMAN • WOMAN

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 20\% (2 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 17 | $29 \%(5)$ | $6 \%(1)$ | $24 \%(4)$ |
| SR ACADEMIC | 47 | $51 \%(24)$ | $11 \%(5)$ | $11 \%(5)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 11 | $36 \%(4)$ | $9 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

The UMass-system earns points for having a female provost and gender parity amongst its deans.
However, they have not reached parity on their board or within their senior administrative leadership. Only
$20 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees are women. The UMass-system is one of 30 institutions that have never had a female permanent president. The UMass-system validated all data.

URBAN COLLEGE OF BOSTON
PRESIDENT: MICHAEL TAYLOR • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: PETER EBB • MAN
PROVOST: NANCY DANIEL • WOMAN
TOTAL

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 14 | $50 \%(7)$ | $14 \%(2)$ | $7 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 5 | $100 \%(5)$ | $60 \%(3)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## STATUS QUO

Women are well represented on Urban College's board and senior leadership team. In addition, they have a female provost, but neither of their two most highly
compensated employees are women. Urban College of Boston validated all data.

WELLESLEY COLLEGE* PRIVATE, BACHELOR'S • 2,508 ENROLLED, $98 \%$ W

PRESIDENT: PAULA JOHNSON • WOC
BOARD CHAIR: DEBORA DE HOYOS • WOMAN PROVOST: ANDREW SHENNAN • MAN

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 60\% (6 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 32 | $81 \%(26)$ | $22 \%(7)$ | $3 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 13 | $85 \%(11)$ | $23 \%(3)$ | $15 \%(2)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Wellesley College is one of only six institutions led by a woman of color, and scores well across all
categories, including for women of color. Wellesley College validated all data.

WENTWORTH INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
PRIVATE, MASTER'S • 4,457 ENROLLED, 21\% W
PRESIDENT: ZORICA PANTIĆ • WOMAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: MICHAEL MASTERSON • MAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
PROVOST: ERIC OVERSTRÖM • MAN \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 50\% (5 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 26 | $19 \%(5)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 15 | $60 \%(9)$ | - | - |

## SATISFACTORY

Wentworth benefitted from a female president, parity on their senior leadership team, and $50 \%$ women among their most highly compensated employees. However, their board has not yet achieved parity.

Zorica Pantić was replaced by a male president, Mark Thompson, after July 1, 2019. Wentworth did not respond to request to validate data. '

PRIVATE, MASTER'S • 3,776 ENROLLED, $43 \%$ W
PRESIDENT: ANTHONY CAPRIO • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: KENNETH RICKSON • MAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
RANK PROVOST: LINDA JONES • WOMAN \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 38\% (3 OF 8)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 37 | $27 \%(10)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 9 | $33 \%(3)$ | - | - |

## UNSATISFACTORY

WNE has the benefit of a female provost, but neither their board nor their senior leadership team have reached gender parity. In addition, only 38\% of their
most highly compensated employees are women. WNE declined to validate data. ${ }^{r}$

WESTFIELD STATE UNIVERSITY
PUBLIC MASTER'S • 6,237 ENROLLED, 55\% W
PRESIDENT: RAMON TORRECILHA • MOC
BOARD CHAIR: KEVIN QUEENIN • MAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 50\% (5 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 10 | $30 \%(3)$ | $20 \%(2)$ | $10 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 12 | $67 \%(8)$ | $17 \%(2)$ | $8 \%(1)$ |

## STATUS QUO

Westfield State is one of only 14 institutions led by a person of color. They benefit from a female provost, and parity among their senior leadership team and
their most highly compensated employees. However, their board has not achieved gender parity. Westfield State validated all data.

WHEATON COLLEGE** PRIVATE, BACHELOR'S • 1,688 ENROLLED, $61 \%$ W
PRESIDENT: DENNIS HANNO • MAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: JANET LINDHOLMLEBOVITZ • WOMAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
PROVOST: RENÉE WHITE •WOC \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 20\% (2 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 31 | $52 \%(16)$ | $6 \%(2)$ | $6 \%(2)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 10 | $50 \%(5)$ | $10 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## STATUS QUO

Wheaton College leads across all categories except that only $20 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees are women. They would benefit from
greater representation of people of color. Wheaton College validated all data.

WILLIAM JAMES COLLEGE PRIVATE, SPECIAL FOCUS • 748 ENROLLED, $78 \%$ W
PRESIDENT: NICHOLAS COVINO • MAN
BOARD CHAIR: DONALD SIEGEL•MAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: NO
EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES
PROVOST: STANLEY BERMAN • MAN \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 38\% (3 OF 8)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 20 | $30 \%(6)$ | $5 \%(1)$ | $5 \%(1)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 10 | $50 \%(5)$ | $30 \%(3)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## UNSATISFACTORY

William James College benefits from parity among their senior leadership team. They welcomed a female provost in June 2019. However, their board has not reached gender parity, and only $38 \%$ of their most highly compensated employees are women.

The would benefit from more people of color on their board. William James is one of 30 colleges that have never had a female president. William James College validated all data.


WILLIAMS COLLEGE PRIVATE, BACHELOR'S • 2,134 ENROLLED, 48\% W
PRESIDENT: MAUD MANDEL • WOMAN
EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: MICHAEL EISENSON • MAN
PROVOST: DAVID LOVE • MAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 40\% (4 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 22 | $55 \%(12)$ | - | - |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 9 | $56 \%(5)$ | - | - |

## STATUS QUO

Williams College scored well with a female president
(their first) and parity on their senior leadership team. However, only $40 \%$ of their ten most highly
compensated employees are women. Williams College declined to validate data. ${ }^{r}$

WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE PRIVATE, DOCTORAL • 6,642 ENROLLED,35\% W
PRESIDENT: LAURIE LESHIN • WOMAN EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES
BOARD CHAIR: JOHN MOLLEN • MAN EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: NO
RANK
PROVOST: WINSTON (WOLE) SOBOYEJO • MOC \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 20\% (2 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 31 | $35 \%(11)$ | $3 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR ACADEMIC | 7 | $43 \%(3)$ | $14 \%(1)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR ADMINISTRATIVE | 13 | $46 \%(6)$ | $15 \%(2)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |

## STATUS QUO

WPI received points for their female president and comes close to parity on their senior academic and administrative teams. However, women only count
as $20 \%$ of the most highly compensated employees, and their board lacks gender parity and racial/ethnic balance. WPI validated all data.

BOARD CHAIR: CRAIG BLAIS • MAN PROVOST: LOIS WIMS • WOMAN

EVER WOMAN PRESIDENT: YES EVER WOMAN BOARD CHAIR: YES \% WOMEN TOP SALARIED: 60\% (6 OF 10)

|  | TOTAL | WOMEN | WOMEN OF COLOR | MEN OF COLOR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BOARD | 11 | $64 \%(7)$ | $0 \%(0)$ | $0 \%(0)$ |
| SR LEADERSHIP | 15 | $67 \%(10)$ | $27 \%(4)$ | $7 \%(1)$ |

## SATISFACTORY

Worcester State benefits from their female provost and gender parity on both their board and senior leadership team. Additionally, 60\% of their ten most
highly compensated employees are women. However, their board is lacking both women and men of color. Worcester State validated all data.

## About the Eos Foundation

The Eos Foundation is a private philanthropic foundation supporting organizations and systemic solutions aimed at nourishing children's bodies, nurturing their minds, building family economic security, and achieving gender equity and diversity in leadership positions across all sectors of society. In 2018, we introduced the Women's Power Gap Initiative, which aims to dramatically increase the number of women from diverse backgrounds in leadership positions across all sectors in Massachusetts. For more information about the Eos Foundation and the Women's Power Gap Initiative, please visit EosFoundation.org and WomensPowerGap.org.


[^0]:    4. For three institutions compensation data was not publicly available and several smaller schools listed fewer than ten top earners on their 990 's. In those cases, we performed the analysis on the total number listed.
[^1]:    5. For the purpose of analysis, when counting presidents, senior leadership, and top salaries, we count all five campuses plus the central office. For the comprehensive index, only UMass-system is included as it is the only institution which has its own board.
