Amplify the discussion on your social channels:

@womenspowergap
#genderparitynow
#highereduccation
ABOUT THE WOMEN’S POWER GAP INITIATIVE

GOAL: To dramatically increase the number of women from diverse backgrounds in leadership positions nationally

APPROACH:

- C-suite or equivalent – glass ceiling
- Disaggregated analysis (gender/race) at the organization level
- Use comparative analysis and rankings, wherever possible
WOMEN ARE RECEIVING PHDS IN RECORD NUMBERS

So Many Women PhDs, So Few Women Leaders

All Women

PHD EARNERS: 55%
PRESIDENTS: 22%

Women of Color

PHD EARNERS: 19%
PRESIDENTS: 5%
...BUT THEY FACE A GLASS (OR CONCRETE) CEILING

Is It a Glass or Concrete Ceiling?

“I wish I could share my story with you however, I am still here under the glass ceiling.” — R1 provost
Men have multiple paths to the president’s office
Men can skip steps based on “potential”
Women must pursue traditional path
Women must meet 100%+ of qualifications

“A lot of the work to pursue top positions is in the social domain. Presidential searches are more about your golf game than your capacity to be CEO”. — Vice provost
NO LEADERSHIP POSITIONS HAVE ACHIEVED GENDER PARITY

MEASURING THE WOMEN'S POWER GAP AT ELITE UNIVERSITIES

- Women
- Women of Color (WOC)
- Men
- Men of Color (MOC)

% Women Student Body

- System Presidents
  - Women 90%
  - Women of Color (WOC) 10%
  - Men 15%
  - Men of Color (MOC) 0%

- Presidents
  - Women 78%
  - Women of Color (WOC) 18%
  - Men 22%
  - Men of Color (MOC) 5%

- Provosts
  - Women 62%
  - Women of Color (WOC) 8%
  - Men 38%
  - Men of Color (MOC) 6%

- Academic Deans
  - Women 61%
  - Women of Color (WOC) 14%
  - Men 39%
  - Men of Color (MOC) 8%

- President's Cabinet
  - Women 57%
  - Women of Color (WOC) 12%
  - Men 43%
  - Men of Color (MOC) 13%

- Tenured Full Professors
  - Women 73%
  - Women of Color (WOC) 16%
  - Men 27%
  - Men of Color (MOC) 6%
WOMEN OF COLOR ARE VIRTUALLY NONEXISTENT

Pressing need for institutions to set intersectional goals and benchmarks

Major Gaps for Women of Color Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress for Black Men

Since 2020, Black male presidents have **doubled**

...yet Black women **didn’t** see similar gains
WHAT EXPLAINS THE PRECIPITOUS DROP IN WOMEN AT THE PRESIDENTIAL LEVEL?

- “Fix the women” strategies aren’t enough, and could be setting women back
- “Lean in” instructs women to act like men in the workplace
- Is the “confidence gap” a thing? Or is it just rational analysis?
- The “glass cliff effect” – women and POC offered more CEO jobs during crisis

SOLUTIONS

✓ We need to tackle systemic bias - fix the system, not the women
✓ Lower the walls holding women down
BOARDS ARE LAGGING NOT LEADING

Only 9 Boards Have 50%+ Women Board Members

- Michigan State University (75%)
- University of Colorado
- Washington State University
- Board of Regents State of Iowa
- Princeton University
- University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
- Wayne State University
- Oregon State University
- Virginia Tech

...while 44 have less than 30%!
Beginning in the 2023 proxy season, we will expect boards to be comprised of at least 30% women directors... we will take voting action against responsible directors if (1) companies in the S&P 500 and FTSE 100 do not have a person of color on their board, (2)... do not disclose the diversity of their boards, and (3)... do not disclose their EEO-1 reports.”

- Cyrus Taraporevala, CEO of State Street Global Advisors
NOT ALL DEANS ARE CREATED EQUAL

• Elevate more women to male-dominated leadership positions
• Fight societal bias around female-dominated professions
• Elite universities should lead society, not hide behind “market rates”

Data Source: CUPA-HR
CALIFORNIA LEADING, MASSACHUSETTS LAGGING

COMPARISON OF WOMEN PRESIDENTS AT CA AND MA R1 UNIVERSITIES

- **MA**
  - Historically 3 of 8: 38%
  - Current: 0

- **CA**
  - Historically 8 of 11: 73%
  - Current 3 of 11: 27%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>CURRENT WOMAN PRES.</th>
<th># PAST WOMEN PRES.</th>
<th>WOMAN PROVOST</th>
<th>WOMEN ACADEM. DEANS</th>
<th>WOMEN PRES. CABINET</th>
<th>WOMEN TENURED FULL PROFS.</th>
<th>TOTAL POINTS</th>
<th>RANKING CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UC-Santa Cruz</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CUNY Graduate School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UNH</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>U of Iowa</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Brandeis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Colorado State-Fort Collins</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>U of Colorado-Boulder</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>U of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>U Penn</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>U of Alabama-Birmingham</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

Boards/Governing Boards

- Publicly report board diversity data! Set board goals and benchmarks.
- Elevate women/WOC especially to chairs and vice chairs
- Make bold, long-term public commitments for equity at the top of the university
- Governors need to appoint diverse trustees/regents, and those who are skilled in DEI

Presidents/Universities

- Create and implement diversity goals and benchmarks at the very top!
- Root out and eliminate bias in all university processes – hiring and advancement especially
- Hold hiring committees to equitable outcomes in final selection, not just balanced finalist pools
WHAT CAN WE ALL DO?

- Eos Foundation will convene presidents and board chairs
- Follow-up qualitative research
- Call your university to demand transparency
- Follow us on social and share with friends
- Recruit male allies!
Women’s Voices

“Women who have been a CEO in a large organization will say that our successors are going to be men... chairs think they have done their bit by hiring a woman, now the role can go back to a man. It feels as though we took two steps forward and are now taking one step back.”
— Inga K. Beale, Former CEO, Lloyd’s of London

“I wish I could share my story with you however, I am still here under the glass ceiling.”
— R1 provost

“The level of acceptable behavior for women is extraordinarily narrow. Men can be assertive, aggressive, and even obnoxious at times, but for women, those are not acceptable attributes. Instead, it leads to women getting a lot of negative feedback.”
— Provost
Thank you

(See following slides for a deeper dive)
WOMEN OF COLOR ARE NEARLY ABSENT ACROSS ALL POSITIONS

**Race/Ethnicity by Position for Women**

- **White**
  - Presidents: 22% (16.9%)
  - Provosts: 38% (31.5%)
  - Academic Deans: 39% (30.9%)
  - Presidents' Cabinets: 43% (28.3%)
  - Professors: 27% (20.7%)
  - Board Chairs: 26% (21.5%)
  - Board Members: 33% (22.4%)

- **Asian**
  - Presidents: 0.8% (1.6%)
  - Provosts: 2.3% (1.6%)
  - Academic Deans: 1.5% (1.3%)
  - Presidents' Cabinets: 6.9% (1.9%)
  - Professors: 1.2% (1.0%)
  - Board Chairs: 0.9% (2.8%)
  - Board Members: 1.0% (2.0%)

- **Black**
  - Presidents: 1.6% (1.6%)
  - Provosts: 3.1% (1.6%)
  - Academic Deans: 4.6% (1.3%)
  - Presidents' Cabinets: 1.9% (1.0%)
  - Professors: 3.3% (1.0%)
  - Board Chairs: 0.9% (2.8%)
  - Board Members: 5.4% (2.0%)

- **Hispanic**
  - Presidents: 1.6% (1.6%)
  - Provosts: 1.6% (1.6%)
  - Academic Deans: 1.3% (1.0%)
  - Presidents' Cabinets: 1.9% (1.0%)
  - Professors: 2.8% (1.0%)
  - Board Chairs: 0.9% (2.8%)
  - Board Members: 2.0% (2.0%)
PUBLICS OUTPACE PRIVATES FOR DIVERSITY FOR PRESIDENTS

UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS AMONG PRESIDENTS AND PROVOSTS

Presidents

**PRIVATE**
- 14% White women
- 3% WOC
- 5% MOC
- **22%**

**PUBLIC**
- 18% White women
- 6% WOC
- 23% MOC
- **47%**

Provosts

**PRIVATE**
- 38% White women
- 5% WOC
- 16% MOC
- **59%**

**PUBLIC**
- 29% White women
- 6% WOC
- 5% MOC
- **40%**
“Women who have been a CEO in a large organization will say that our successors are going to be men... chairs think they have done their bit by hiring a woman, now the role can go back to a man. It feels as though we took two steps forward and are now taking one step back.”

— Inga K. Beale
Former CEO, Lloyd’s of London

Presidential transitions at R1’s:

• Woman ➔ Woman = 10

• Man ➔ Man = Thousands!!!