

November 15, 2004

To: Henry Yang, Chancellor

From: The Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women (CACSW)

The CACSW looks forward to meeting with you on Friday, November 19, from noon until 1:30 p.m. to discuss the concerns of our committee and are pleased that your senior administrators will be participating in the discussion. We appreciate the strong commitment of our current administration to issues of equity and diversity and appreciate this opportunity to focus particularly on women's issues. While some progress has been made this past year, it is clear that much work is still needed in order to build a community at UCSB that draws on and values the talents of all members. This report highlights a number of issues that are identified as important to the welfare of the campus. The following list is by no means exhaustive nor is it in priority order. Our recommendations are indicated in bold.

- Women in key administrative and staff positions. We are still very concerned about the lack of women in key administrative positions. The current search efforts provide opportunities to improve this situation. We strongly urge that every possible effort be made through the search process to identify women applicants, and hire appropriate candidates.

Statistics presented in the report, "UC Career Staff Workforce Representation Tables for October 2003," from the Director of Employee Relations and EEO/AA/Diversity at the Office of the President continue to be of great concern as UCSB percentages remain dismal (and in fact have declined over the past five years) in all three major staff personnel categories (Senior Managers (SMG), Managers and Senior Professionals (MSP), and Professional and Support Staff (PSS)). In particular, with regard to the percentage of women employed in UC occupational categories on all UC campuses, the Office of the President and the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (DANR), UCSB ranks as follows: Senior Managers (11th out of 12), Managers & Senior Professionals (12th out of 12), and Professionals & Support Staff (12th out of 12). In 1999 our rankings were Senior Managers (11th), Managers & Senior Professionals (10th) and Professionals & Support Staff (9th).

UC-wide, the percentage of women in staff positions continues to decrease as they ascend the job ladder. The representation of women in the Senior Managers program across all UC campuses decreased slightly over the past year, i.e., from 27.7% in 2002 to 27.3% in 2003. While our ranking of 11th out of 12 for Senior Managers may appear to be a slight improvement over last year's ranking (12th out of 12), our actual percentage remains relatively unchanged. Our ranking has improved only because DANR now has 0% female Senior Manager (UC October 2003 Career Staff Workforce Representation Tables).

The outlook for minority women continues to be even worse. Of the 27.3 % female Senior Managers UC wide, 23.2% are White women (UCSB = 7.7%), 1.9 % are Black women (UCSB = 0%), 1% are Hispanic women (UCSB = 0%), 1 % are Asian women (UCSB = 0%) and 0.0% are American Indian women (UCSB also 0%).

In the Managers and Senior Professionals program UC wide, the percentage of women declined to 51.8% from 52.4% in October 2002 although UCSB improved slightly (UCSB = 40.3% up from 38.2%). The ethnic representation is 38.9% White women (UCSB = 37.2%), 3.2% Black women (UCSB = 0%), 2.9% Hispanic women (UCSB = 1.6%), 6% Asian women (UCSB = 1.6%) and 0.4% American Indian women (UCSB = 0%).

Women make up 66% of UC employees in the Professionals and Support Staff category, up slightly from 65.7% in October 2002 (UCSB = 56 %). Of these, 33.8% are White women (UCSB = 36.7%), 6.8% are Black women (UCSB = 2.0%), 10.6% are Hispanic women (UCSB = 11.7%), 13.5% are Asian women (UCSB = 4.2%) and 0.5% are American Indian women (UCSB = .8%).

We continue to be extremely concerned about the existence of conditions that greatly impair career paths and promotion opportunities for capable and experienced women employees. We recognize that efforts are being made by Joe Castro, coordinator of the Affirmative Action Office. We acknowledge that his office has compiled a list of professional development resources for women that will be placed on the Affirmative Action Office web site and linked to other appropriate web sites on campus (e.g. Chancellor's Committee on the Status of Women and Professional Women's Association). Additionally, that office is exploring the development of a new program that supports the professional development of faculty and staff who demonstrate leadership in promoting gender, racial and ethnic diversity on campus. **We strongly recommend that career growth and development opportunities continue to be provided through the use of internships, sabbaticals, and employer-funded education programs, and that every effort be made to retain and promote qualified women in career positions.**

• Women faculty representation. It is estimated that in 2004-05 women will represent 28% of all permanent faculty at UCSB. This is slightly above the 27.7% reported for 2003-04. In 2003-04, women represented 24% of all tenured faculty (compared to 23.4% in 2002-03). In the non-tenured ranks of assistant professor and acting assistant professor, women represented 38.8% (compared to 41.4% in 2002-03); and in the lecturer ranks (Lecturers with Potential Security of Employment, Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOE) and Senior LSOE), women represented 51.9% (compared to 48% in 2002-03). In numbers, women comprised 234 of 846 permanent faculty in 2003-04 (estimated to rise to 238 of 850 this year), 158 of 659 tenured faculty, 62 of 160 untenured faculty, and 14 of 27 lecturers SOE or PSOE.

The growth rate for women faculty continues to increase only modestly. Between 1985 and 2004, women faculty increased from 13.7% of the total to 27.7%, an increase of 14% in 19 years, or from 85 to 234 – an increase of 149 women in that period. While this growth is encouraging, the continued slow rate of growth in the number of women faculty remains a concern.

In terms of appointments of women faculty, in 2003-04 women comprised 25.9% (14 of 54) of all permanent faculty appointments. While this percentage is estimated to rise to 32.4% (11 of 34) in 2004-05, this reflects the general downturn in hiring and compares unfavorably to the 2002-03 figures of 42.6% (26 of 61). In 2003-04, no senior women were hired; estimates for 2004-05 show that 4 of 9 or 44% of senior appointments are women, or 36.3% of the total

number of women hired. Three of these were at the full professor rank, and one at the associate rank. Women assistant professors in 2004-05 number 7 of 25 (28%), or 63% of the total number of women hired, compared to 12 of 40 or 30% of total assistant professor hires in 2003-04, comprising 92% of the total number of 13 non-tenured women hired (one lecturer was hired in 2003-04, none in 2004-05).

It should be noted that department climates and cultures may impede the advancement of women faculty. In the experience of some women, accessing the benefits of family-friendly policies has been viewed negatively by their departments and has therefore had an impact on their advancement.

In terms of retention, while in 2003-04 UCSB appointed fourteen new women faculty, we lost six to separations. Women faculty accounted for 20.7% of all separations during that period. There were no minority women separations during this period. Last year, CACSW recommended that exit interviews be conducted. It appears that this has not been implemented. **CACSW again recommends that exit interviews be conducted to develop deeper understandings of why faculty members leave UCSB.**

The status of minority women faculty remains discouraging. Between 1985 and 2004, the percentage of minority women in the faculty as a whole went from 1.8% to 5.4%, a figure at which it has hovered for the past five years. The total numbers have increased from 11 in 1985 to 46 in 2004, or only 36 women in 19 years.

Previous memos from the CACSW have noted the impact of key decisions made during the FTE planning process in terms of level and specialization on the chances of hiring women and minorities, since these groups tend to be in greater numbers at the junior level and in certain specializations. UCSB has set a goal of 70% junior hires. However, the value of senior hires should not be overlooked, and more effort should be made to provide search committees for senior hires with suggestions for possible women candidates. **The continued fluctuation in the number and percentage of women hired needs to be monitored carefully and efforts to hire at the junior level should be coupled with redoubled efforts to hire senior women faculty who can provide the leadership needed to transform the institutional culture.**

We appreciate the efforts of Associate Vice Chancellor Maria Herrera-Sobek on promoting diversity and equity issues on our campus. These efforts include establishing the campus diversity website and co-sponsoring a number of workshops including one for science and engineering women graduate students. We appreciate the involvement of her office in plans for the 2004-05 academic year which include: the President's Postdoctoral Fellows Program, the Faculty Enrichment Program, and plans for instituting a Diversity Award for the Department that has made the most progress in Diversity.

We also appreciate the efforts of Joe Castro and the Affirmative Action Office to support women faculty on campus by providing funding for diversity and equity workshops and program funding to a number of departments (e.g., Women's Studies and the ethnic studies departments). Efforts were also made to increase diversity in applicant pools by funding advertisements of approved faculty searches in nontraditional venues.

• Career equity review. We are pleased that the career equity review policy is in place on our campus. We recognize that only a few faculty have taken advantage of this process – three in 2003-04. **We continue to encourage efforts to disseminate information about the process and to encourage pro-active efforts by chairs, deans, and other reviewing agencies in identifying and enabling eligible candidates to participate in the process.**

• Pay equity for faculty women. The issue of pay equity is closely related to retention of female faculty. We continue to advocate the recommendations in the report of the Salary Equity Advisory Committee to implement a statistical analysis to determine potential salary inequities among faculty. Most of the other UC campuses have already conducted such surveys and have developed new policies and practices based on their findings. **We recommend that a statistical survey be administered routinely and new policies and practices developed as needed. Other campuses have also conducted a climate survey to assess campus climate issues that may adversely affect the recruitment and advancement of women faculty. We recommend that such a survey also be conducted on our campus.**

• Pay equity for staff women. The process for salary equity review for staff women varies from department to department with significant dependence on a staff member's supervisor taking the initiative to manage and review the salaries of all staff within a department. If a supervisor does not follow through on an equity review of a staff member, the staff member currently does not have recourse to pursue the review independently. Additionally, if a staff member requests a review and is denied by their supervisor, there is no appeal process in place. Given that an equity increase is dependent on departmental funding, departments will vary in how frequently supervisors review salary equity. **As the budget climate improves in the coming years, we recommend that a mechanism for individuals to request a salary review be created, independent of a direct supervisor's approval. In addition, we request that a proactive effort be made to educate various supervisory groups, such as the Academic Business Officers Group (ABOG), regarding the salary equity review process and the responsibilities of departments to manage internal salary equity. Lastly, we recommend that there be an annual report generated analyzing the approved vs. denied reclassification and equity requests of staff members by department and by gender to provide additional information about departmental efforts to provide salary equity.**

• Faculty & staff governance. It is critical that campus committees and the chairs of these committees more fully reflect the diversity of groups and talents on the campus. We applaud the Administration's concerns and efforts on this issue, particularly with search committees, and encourage continuing dialogue with Academic Senate Committee on Committees, Staff Assembly, Chancellor's Staff Advisory Council, and other relevant parties to ensure diversity in faculty and staff governance.

Specifically with respect to representation of women and ethnic minority faculty on Academic Senate committees (see Appendix A), we note that generally, women are well represented and range from 18.8% (Engineering Executive Committee) to 66.7% (Divisional Representative to Senate Assembly) proportionally to the campus population (women represent 27.6% of Academic Senate members). However, minority faculty members are generally under-

represented and in fact for four major Senate committees (Academic Personnel; Privilege & Tenure; Rules, Jurisdiction & Elections; Senate Effectiveness) there is no minority representation. This points to our concern regarding the appointment of members on Academic Senate committees as expressed in our meeting with Academic Senate Chair Walter Yuen. It appears that some appointments for Senate committees are made by the chairs of those respective committees. **We recommend that committee appointments be monitored to insure diversity and equity of membership.**

- Work/Life Issues. For the past three years, the Work/Life Office has gained visibility as a central clearinghouse for resources, both on campus, and in the community. The establishment of the Work/Life Office is a good step in making UCSB a leader in family friendly workplaces, as well as increasing the productivity of the workforce. In the past year, the Work/Life Coordinator has initiated and promoted a number of important programs related to quality of life issues for our campus community; for example, The Elder Care series, the Aging Parents Support Group, the Wellness Workshop series, and the recently established New Parenting Group. The coordinator has helped to develop a pilot program to promote telecommuting and flexwork options, is serving as Principal Investigator of a three-year grant to provide lactation rooms throughout the campus, and will co-chair the Childcare Advisory Committee. The Work/Life Office, in conjunction with Academic Personnel and Human Resources Employment, is working on developing a spousal/partner employment assistance program to serve as a recruitment tool for relocating staff/faculty hires. These kinds of programs greatly enhance our standing as a family-friendly workplace and help to recruit and retain faculty, staff and students.

We are pleased at your decision to continue the funding of this program to 2005, with Wendy Nishikawa as its coordinator, **and hope that permanent funding for this office can be supported at the end of this two-year period in Fall 2005.**

- Housing. Housing for faculty and staff (including lecturers and other permanent employees) continues to be a major concern. Although there have been substantial discussions of possible University housing for faculty and staff, the most significant change this year has been a further increase in the median price of a home on the South Coast to over a million dollars. The prices of rental units have also increased. These increases directly affect university hiring of top candidates, force many families to relocate, and result in long commutes for far too many university employees. These commutes have a negative impact on community service, families, and social life outside of work. They also have demonstrable negative and costly effects on general health, on our environment, and on our children.

The lack of affordable housing directly affects the university's ability to hire and retain faculty and staff. Last year CACSW suggested that a study is needed to determine how the lack of affordable housing affects different academic and administrative departments. The university must also determine how it affects women applicants specifically across the range of faculty and staff appointments, and how it affects retention, as well as faculty and staff satisfaction.

Considering the current realities, the discussion of providing rail link options to Ventura County and other transportation alternatives must continue. UCSB must take a lead role in these discussions. Although the problem of affordable housing is larger than UCSB, as the largest

employer in the area, the University must proactively address this issue both in its own self-interest as a premier educational and research institution and as a responsible community member. Solutions developed here can serve as models for many other areas experiencing what can only be termed a regional crisis with far reaching implications. **We urge that staff and lecturers as well as ladder faculty be included in planning to provide affordable housing to UCSB employees. In order to attract top female candidates to Santa Barbara (at least at the SMG & MSP levels) CACSW recommends a Housing Assistance Program for staff similar to the one offered to faculty including a Supplemental Home Loan Program, Salary Differential Housing Allowance Program and a Mortgage Origination Program (MOP).**

- **Staff-Student Ratio.** UCSB continues to have one of the highest student/staff ratios in the UC system. Since the last report this situation has not improved. In fact, when looking at the University of California, Office of the President report on personnel headcount by ethnicity, personnel program, and gender, from October, 2001 to October, 2002, there was an overall drop of 3% in non-academic personnel. However, at the professional senior management level there was an increase of 14% while at the professional and support staff level there was a 4% drop in numbers. As one might guess, the category that experienced the greatest drop is the group that employs the greater percentage of women and is the frontline staff working directly with students. As was demonstrated last year, these very staff members are the ones who experience the greatest impact from increased enrollments and who are constantly challenged with the need to do more work with fewer resources. They are also the ones experiencing the impacts from year-round enrollment. These impacts include less time for some of the office and program maintenance, such as filing paperwork and planning changes for the next academic year, that once could be done during the less hectic summer months. This is a clear example that maintaining the status quo is in truth moving backwards.

The Student Affairs division is among the first hit with budgetary cutbacks, 13.5% cut in 2003-04 and 10% for 2005-05, as that division was perceived to be somewhat removed from the primary teaching mission of the University. When enrollments increase, the numbers of students who experience problems outside the academic aspect of their lives also increase, which is directly related to the increased demands experienced by Student Affairs staff. The hiring freeze imposed on the Student Affairs division exacerbates the problem by virtue of attrition when people leave. It should be remembered that these are the staff who see students who are overwhelmed by a myriad of problems—academic, financial and/or personal. Over the past several years, the severity of student psychological issues has increased substantially, placing even more burden on the staff who work with these issues. In these difficult times, more students need assistance from the Student Affairs staff, hence increasing the burden on the number of staff available.

In the literature and reports that deal with the question of increased enrollments and impacts, all the formulas address the student to faculty ratio. No consideration is given, except for a single phrase “student services,” to the need to increase the student support staff. This reflects a lack of understanding of the value that these employees have in the campus community overall, and most importantly the vital role they play in supporting the well being of the very students for whom the institution exists. **We believe that it is important to address the issue of student to**

**staff ratio and recommend that you establish a study group to explore possible methods for improving the ratio.**

- Sexual Harassment and Prevention Education. Assembly Bill 1825 was recently passed and will be effective beginning on January 1, 2005. This new legislation mandates two hours of interactive sexual harassment prevention training for all supervisors every two years. This will require at least 1000 UCSB employees to be trained every two years in regards to sexual harassment training. UCSB has made a huge effort in providing on-line sexual harassment prevention education training this year. Over 1,200 people have taken the on-line training since April, 2003. This has been accomplished through the New Media Learning course as well as having some of the Vice Chancellors strongly encouraging their managers to "require" the training of their employees. The on-line training may fulfill one hour of the required training but at least another hour will most likely need to be followed up by "in-person" trainings by someone who has practical expertise, experience and knowledge in the prevention of sexual harassment and retaliation. **CACSW recommends that the campus direct additional funds to the Sexual Harassment Prevention Education Program, housed in the Women's Center. The position is currently funded at a 75% level, but the new legislation will demand at least a full-time person with an assistant educator to help with the additional trainings. CACSW also recommends that resources for supplies and outreach materials be provided to support the program.**

- Sexual Assault. We would like to thank Maria Herrera-Sobek and Carol Mosely for serving on the Governor's California Campus Sexual Assault Task Force this past year. They worked with the task force to create the California Campus Blueprint to Address Sexual Assault. **CACSW recommends the formation of a campus steering committee to take a comprehensive look at how the campus responds to sexual assault and assess where the gaps are in our response.**

- Priority registration for student parents. CACSW is advocating for priority registration for undergraduate student parents. These students who are responsible for the daily care of dependent children have little flexibility in their schedules. These parents are typically upper-level students who need specific courses in order to complete their degrees in a timely manner.

Currently the benefit of priority registration is granted to approximately 2400 students: 500 students through the disabled students program, 1,450 honor students, and 450 athletes (year round). Previously there was a question of how many additional students would be affected by the inclusion of student parents. The Associated Students completed a survey of undergraduates and determined that there are approximately 250 undergraduates who have dependent children. **We again recommend that priority registration be offered for student parents. We ask for your support in bringing this proposal forward to the Academic Senate.**

- Diversity Training. Last year CACSW recommended that "a timeframe be developed by the Human Resources Training and Development manager by which those in supervisory positions could receive diversity training." We are interested in the status of this recommendation. Over the past year, the Educational Program for Cultural Awareness (EPCA) has been developing an interactive on-line diversity training course. It is anticipated that the program will be ready for use in 2005. **CACSW recommends the Administration strongly encourage faculty, staff and students to take this on-line course once it is completed.**

Deleted: ¶

- Childcare and Housing for Graduate Students. The cost of living in the Santa Barbara area continues to be a problem for graduate students, particularly those with children. The cost and availability of both housing and childcare remains a challenge for many graduate students. The demand for family student housing exceeds supply, leading to long waiting lists for these apartments. Although new housing has been made available to graduate students at Manzanita Village, the fact that residents are expected to vacate their apartments during school breaks makes this an inappropriate option for the majority of graduate students. Childcare is also problematic for many graduate student families. The Orfaela Child Care Center's infant program was full all through the 2002-2003 school year, making it impossible for parents who had not been put on the waitlist well in advance to enroll their children in the program. Furthermore, many graduate student, as well as post doctoral fellows, families earn too much to qualify for the Center's state grant (a 2-member household must make less than \$2,730 per month in order to receive funding for child care; 3-member families must make less than \$2,925), yet still earn too little to meet the cost-of-living demands of the Santa Barbara area. **In order to continue the recruitment and retention of graduate and post-doctoral scholars, particularly those with families, we recommend that more resources be devoted to University family student housing and childcare.**

- Retention/graduation rates for female graduate students. According to a survival analysis conducted by UCSB's Budget and Planning Department, women appear to lag behind men by about 5% in their rate of graduation during times when students are expected to finish their PhDs. (For Masters and Credential students, no major differences appear to exist.) The analysis revealed an especially disturbing trend in Arts and Humanities, where females lag behind males in graduation rates by almost 20%. At 10 years, approximately 50% of males in Arts and Humanities have *not* graduated, compared to 70% of women. Given these data, **it is important to examine the reasons for gender discrepancies in graduation rates within the departments. We recommend that the issues surrounding retention and graduation be examined with interviews of graduate students, particularly in those departments in which gender differences in graduation rates are largest.**

CACSW would like to acknowledge several efforts that are being made across campus toward the recruitment, retention, and well-being of female and ethnic minority graduate students. We would like to acknowledge the publication of the *Graduate Student Survival Guide*, and to express our thanks to the Chancellor for his support of this valuable resource. Additionally we would like to recognize outreach and academic support efforts including the work of the Office of the Associate Dean of Graduate Division on the Alliance for Graduate Education in the Professorate (AGEP), the Graduate Division Outreach and Admissions Office's academic preparation activities, and Women in Sciences and Engineering (WISE).

- Female graduate student representation. There are 14 (out of 40) departments or interdisciplinary major programs that have 35% or less female graduate student enrollment. Three of these departments or major programs have female graduate student enrollments under 20%--this number is down by half from the previous year. Please see Tables 1A and 1B for an alphabetical listing and the percentage by department or major program. Overall at UCSB, the ratio of male to female graduate students is approximately 1.3:1 (see Table 3). This points to the



**continuing need to dedicate ongoing recruitment and outreach to attract female graduate students in those departments and major programs in which females remain underrepresented. At the same time, the retention of our female graduate students should be examined with interviews of graduate students who are both continuing in and leaving those departments in which they are most underrepresented.**

- Female graduate student employment. Data provided by the UCSB's Budget and Planning Department for the 2002-2003 school year indicate that there were several departments that had an unequal ratio of female graduate students with appointments relative to the number of females enrolled (please see Tables 2A and 2B). For the departments listed in Table 2A, a low percentage of the total female graduate students in the department are employed as TAs or GSRs. For those departments listed in Table 2B, on the other hand, the number of females employed is high relative to the number enrolled. There were no significant mean differences in pay rates between male and female TAs, although the average salary for females was approximately \$158 per year higher than that of males. There was a significant difference, however, in pay rates between male and female GSRs, with the average male salary being approximately \$3270 more per year than that of females. (Please note that, although the average annual full-time pay is listed, graduate students generally receive only half-time pay). Within the departments, however, there were no significant differences between the genders in GSR salary. In other words, there is no evidence that female graduate students are paid less than male graduate students within any given department. The gender difference in GSR pay rates across the University is primarily due to the highest paying departments (Engineering and Math/Science) consisting of mostly male GSRs and the lowest paying department (Education) consisting of mostly female GSRs. Considering these data, **we recommend that TA/GSR appointments be carefully examined within the department or major program in an effort to reduce any discrepancies between enrolled female graduate students and department employment. In addition, efforts should be made to promote gender equity in pay rates across the University, particularly for GSR appointments. This issue may be addressed through improved recruitment and retention of females in the highest paying departments.**

- Faculty mentors for graduate students. The general lack of women faculty mentors at UCSB has been, and continues to be, an ongoing concern. There are few women faculty, tenured and/or untenured, in many UCSB departments who can serve as mentors for female graduate students. Many of the current women faculty are overburdened due to their high demand as women mentors, particularly within departments where the majority of the faculty is male. As UCSB intends to increase the number of females admitted to graduate studies, the demand for women faculty mentors will only continue to grow in the coming years. **Both male and female graduate students would benefit greatly from interacting with a more diverse faculty at UCSB. However, it is crucial that we increase our pool of female faculty mentors so that we can adequately support and facilitate our female graduate students.**

2003-2005 Committee Members:

Deidre Acker, Director, Women's Center (advisory)  
Carolyn Buford, Professional Women's Association Co-President (03-04)  
Sarah Dillingham, Graduate Division (staff)  
Carol Dixon, Education (faculty)  
Andrew Doerr, Associated Students (staff)  
Simonetta Falasca-Zamponi, Senior Women's Council Co-Chair, 04-05 (faculty)  
Anita Guerrini, Senior Women's Council Co-Chair, 04-05 (faculty)  
Hsiu-Zu Ho, Education and CACSW Chair, (faculty)  
Sharon Hoshida, Women's Center (staff)  
Amy Kyratzis, Education (faculty)  
Susan McLeod, Co-Chair Senior Women's Council, 03-04 (faculty)  
Claudia Martinez, Center for Chicano Studies (staff)  
Lupe Navarro-Garcia, Professional Women's Association Co-President, 04-05 (staff)  
Wendy Nishikawa, Work-Life Coordinator (advisory)  
Julie Nguyen, (graduate student) Education, Graduate Students' Association representative  
Laura Oaks, Women's Studies (faculty)  
Kim Parent, Professional Women's Association Co-President, 04-05 (staff)  
Paula Rudolph, Title IX Coordinator and Sexual Harassment Officer (advisory)  
Jan Smith, Academic Personnel (staff)  
Heather Tomlinson (graduate student) Education, Graduate Students' Association representative  
Chris Van Gieson, Director of Admissions (staff)

Table 1A: UCSB Graduate departments with <35% female enrollment

<u>UCSB Department</u>	<u>% Female Graduate Students</u>
Chemical Engineering	28.5%
Computer Science	21.6%
Economics	30.2%
Electrical & Computer Engineering	14.3%
Geography	27.3%
Geology	31.5%
German	21.4%
Latin American & Iberian Studies	56.5%
Materials Science	23.7%
Mathematics	29.3%
Mechanical Engineering	20.7%
Media Arts*	23.2%
Philosophy	12.3%
Physics	15.6%

\*This is an interdisciplinary major program

Table 1B: UCSB Graduate departments with >65% female enrollment

<u>UCSB Department</u>	<u>% Female Graduate Students</u>
Art History	75.9%
Communication	78.5%
Comparative Literature	66.8%
Education	77.7%

Table 2A: Ratio of UCSB graduate women with appointments to the percent of UCSB graduate women in the department at .85 or less (with 1.0 being the optimal ratio)

<u>Department FTEs</u>	<u>% Females Employed</u>	<u>%Males Employed</u>	<u>GSR/TA% to % Female</u>
Biomolecular Science and Engineering	45%	69%	0.75
Computer Science	20%	27%	0.79
German	33%	100%	0.39
Latin American & Iberian Studies	20%	45%	0.64
Media Arts	0%	22%	0.00
Psychology	65%	93%	0.85

Table 2B: Ratio of UCSB graduate women with appointments to the percent of UCSB graduate women in the department at 1.15 or higher (with 1.0 being the optimal ratio)

<u>Department FTEs</u>	<u>% Females Employed</u>	<u>%Males Employed</u>	<u>GSR/TA% to % Female</u>
Chemical Engineering	56%	43%	1.20
Dramatic Arts	60%	41%	1.15
East Asian Languages	11%	0%	1.89
Environmental Science and Management	17%	8%	1.37
Geography	70%	56%	1.17
Political Science	60%	41%	1.21

Table 3: Total number of female and male graduate students employed as Teaching Assistants or Graduate Student Researchers

<u>Position/Gender</u>	<u>Students</u>	<u>Average Annual Pay</u>
Teaching Assistant/Female	445	\$25,800
Teaching Assistant/Male	510	\$25,642
Graduate Student Researcher/Female	212	\$37,416
Graduate Student Researcher/Male	373	\$41,311
Total* – Female Graduate Students	1296	
Total* – Male Graduate Students	1707	

(Note: The average annual full-time pay for each category is listed, however, graduate students generally receive only half-time pay.)

\*This number includes all enrolled graduate students including those without TA/RA appointments

